

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the Galleries on behalf of hon. members three members of the Council from the town of Kippens, the Local Improvement District of Kippens, including the Chairman, Mr. Lionel Vincent, and Counsellors Curtis O'Neil and Kator Best. I trust they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would now like to deal with the co-incident points of privilege raised on Friday past by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (L. Stirling) and in the same sequence of events by the hon. the President of the Council (W. Marshall). I will quote first of all from Beauchesne, fifth edition, paragraph 17, page 11, which reads in part: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament." It goes on to say that, "A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House."

On page 12, paragraph 19, subsection 1, the following is stated: "A dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." Beauchesne, fifth edition, paragraph 80 states that "A question of privilege is a question partly of fact and partly of law, the law of contempt of Parliament, and is a matter for the House to determine." So it follows that a Speaker cannot rule on a question of privilege. His function, when a question of privilege is raised, is limited to deciding whether the matter be of such a character as to entitle the motion, which the member who has raised the question desires to move to priority over the Orders of the Day." In other words, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. So the Speaker requires to be satisfied both that the privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): and also that the matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity. Considering all these references and in doing some research on the precedents and types of points of privilege that have been raised in this House in the past, I find that the points of privilege raised on Friday fall into similar categories that we have had before in that both hon. members took the opportunity in rising under a point of privilege to clarify their positions with respect to remarks or with respect to stories that had been carried in the media.

Both members pointed out that their remarks were misinterpreted and asked for a retraction. So I would therefore rule that in the case of the points of privilege raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (L. Stirling) as well as the hon. the President of the Council (W. Marshall), my ruling would be the same for both, that each member took the opportunity to clarify his position and that in this particular situation a prima facie case has not been established.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice. It is no longer, Mr. Speaker, hypothetical or speculative that there is a planned walkout of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. My question is to the minister in connection with the police protection that is given to the city at this time. I would like to know what the normal complement of policemen are in the city on any given shift - the graveyard shift, eight to four etc. - and how that compares to the complement of RCMP officers now policing the city?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, actually the city is being policed now by the RCMP and also commissioned officers of the Constabulary - they are not involved in the walkout - and there is the same complement of men, those two categories, on the shift now as would be if it were not for the walkout. So just to make it clear, the city is being policed by the RCMP and also by commissioned officers of the Newfoundland Constabulary and the same number of people, the same complement of men in the cars, etc., is in operation using these two sources as if there were not a walkout.

Now with respect to what the usual numbers are at specific times, I think the hon. gentleman will probably see that, in terms of security it is not a matter which has usually been given, how many say, are patrolling, you know, on 'a' shift or 'b' shift or 'c' shift or that type of thing. I would give it to the hon. gentleman in private and in confidence, but it is not a matter which is usually made public, you know. Irrespective of present circumstances, I think the reasons would be obvious. But I certainly would give it to the hon. gentleman in private and in confidence.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister of Justice would not agree that it is probably that you need more RCMP policing this city than you would city police because I understand that the RCMP do not know the city like the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and it is a matter of fact that the RCMP have to

MR. L. THOMS: ask directions within the city.
So would you not agree that you need more RCMP to police the city than you do the normal policemen?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if I did not, and I well may not have, but I intended to say that at least the same number of men in cars as would be-out of these two sources-as would be if it were not for the present situation. So that is what I certainly intended to indicate. The hon. gentleman's question with respect to some of the RCMP officers not knowing the city as well, I suppose that would depend on the individuals, I imagine some would and no doubt some would not, You know, that could well be, yes.

MR. L. THOMS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) where the RCMP personnel are coming from to police the city of St. John's and whether or not this may, in fact, weaken the police protection outside the city of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am assured that it will not, that there is no weakening of police protection in other areas. Now specifically where each comes from and that I really could not say because once we communicated to the RCMP under the contract, because as the hon. gentleman is aware under the contract with Canada and the Province, the RCMP may be called in to do provincial policing in any area of the Province, then obviously they supply the men. So I think a number are from here and it is not always necessarily a question of men necessarily coming from somewhere else, although there may well be some but there are also questions such as longer shifts, double shifts, shift and a half, vacation or two days off or time off being cancelled, being postponed, vacations being postponed, that type of internal arrangement.

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

MR. STIRLING: I will yield to the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, just one further question, if I may, to the minister and that is whether or not there is at the present time any attempt by his department being made to get all parties together, all parties concerned together to try to resolve the problem that we have at present?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker. The department is in close touch with the officers of the Constabulary, and with the RCMP in that they are provincial policing here, that is essentially co-ordinated by Chief Roche and by his officers.

There has been no request for a meeting. Certainly I know that the Chief and the Deputy Chief, certainly officers would be glad to meet and indeed officials of the Department of Justice would be glad to meet. But up to now to my knowledge there has not been any initiative with respect to seeking a meeting.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Justice. I would like his opinion on a suggestion, and I do not know whether it has been made to him or not, the minister has made the point that of course the government has the right and the responsibility to manage the police force, and a leader has to have somebody behind him and obviously now you have a man in a position of a deputy position and the feeling, I take it the minister now accepts, it just was not the President speaking, that he does accept the fact that generally all the men feel that this is not an acceptable position. Has the minister accepted that position that the men generally will not accept this position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the decision is quite unpopular in a number of quarters.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is obvious. I do not really know that there is much more that I can answer to that question. Obviously it is not universally welcomed and is unpopular in some quarters, that would appear to be a matter of fact in the record.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Taking what the minister said earlier, that this particular individual has very special qualities in the recruiting, training, experience personnel area, and you now have a problem from the point of view of all the men and the career officers, would the minister consider a suggestion in which this person be put, because of his special training experience, into a special category as a special advisor, somebody that uses his - like a staff type position rather than insert him into the ranks and cause this problem? In other words, you can use his skills in a position of being an advisor to the Chief on all of these special areas, and then remove him out of the line of fire where the man is now put in a position where he cannot operate. Would you give that some consideration?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can sort of reorganize the management and senior management, the top management of the Constabulary on that basis. The general delineation of authority is Chief Roche, obviously Chief of Police, at the top; the next senior man is Deputy Chief Randell, with respect to operations, and then Deputy Chief Coady with respect to administration. And this is the kind of organization and management organization and working relationship which has been agreed upon and planned out, and indeed suggested by the Chief, so I do not think really that we would undertake total reorganization and change people's titles or positions or that. I do not think that that would be beneficial; it may well be nothing more than cosmetics and, you know, I am not trying to fool anybody,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: none of the government is trying to fool anybody, the person in question has been appointed Deputy Chief and we are not going to try to blindfold the devil in the dark and call him something else.

MR. STIRLING: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Would the minister not agree that we have now reached the position in which there is a stand-off, the government has taken the position that 'we have deemed it, we have made the rules and that is it, you are going to have to follow it,' and if people that are being governed have decided that is unacceptable, would the minister confirm to this House that he is prepared - forgetting all of the rights and powers and authority, I am not questioning that - would the minister, in the interest of the protection of the people, would the minister indicate to the House that he is prepared to take the initiative in finding out why this is so unacceptable and to bring together on your own initiative the people who are involved at all of the levels to see if this thing cannot be talked out and find a way to solve the problem? Will the minister take the initiative in calling that kind of a meeting?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly willing to take any kind of initiative which would be a reasonable one and which might, without prejudicing certain matters of principle and policy, which would lead to a resolution of it, I certainly am willing to do that. I do not think that it would be appropriate at the moment for me to, for example, take the Chief and two Deputy Chiefs and try to get them involved in something else because obviously they are quite busy -

MR. L. STIRLING: Will you call it within the next twenty-four hours?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - but apart from that, certainly any reasonable effort which can be made, I am certainly quite willing to make it. But when one hears the word, 'The only thing that will satisfy will be so-and-so being fired or resigning or not being deputy chief,' then that obviously narrows the area of discussion in this particular case if that continues to be the adamant position.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has indicated that they have a number of RCMP on shift work to bring it up to the same level at least as before. Presumably they are from the rural parts of Newfoundland. Could the minister indicate to the House, Sir, how they can decrease the number of RCMP working in the rural parts of Newfoundland, or at least outside of St. John's, and not in fact decrease the efficiency of the law outside of St. John's? How can you decrease the number of RCMP people in rural Newfoundland or outside St. John's and not decrease the efficiency of law enforcement outside the St. John's area?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, of course, as hon.

members are probably aware, there is a detachment of RCMP just a few miles from here.

MR. F. ROWE:

Yes.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

And as I mentioned in answer to a

question from the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms), there are more ways than one of covering shifts, you know, vacations can be cancelled or postponed.

MR. F. ROWE:

Are they?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

There are so many days off a week or

a working period that people have that can be cancelled. Shifts can be longer. There are a number of things. What I said in answer to a previous question is that these are factors as well.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE: The minister has indicated that there are a number of things, there can be a number of things that can be done. Now, the question is not whether they can be done, are they in fact being done? Do we have double shifting, do we have people being recalled from holidays and that kind of a thing to keep the law enforcement equal in St. John's and at the same time outside of St. John's? Not can - are, was, is.

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, of course, our instructions to the RCMP were to, you know, in concert and in consultation with the Chief of Police, the Constabulary, you know, to provide -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Wishful thinking from the hon. gentlemen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Has he resigned?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Actually the man has never resigned at all, he has been rumored as having resigned. Coming into work this morning I heard an interview that he was due to resign and then he was out jogging, apparently. But to get back to the hon. gentleman's question, our instructions were for the RCMP to make available for policing in the St. John's area the men and facilities which, in conjunction with the commissioned officers of the Constabulary, would provide a level of policing which is customary and to do so without a prejudicial effect on policing in other parts of the Province. Now the exact detail, you know, they do not send into me, you know, 'We are taking Constable So-and-So and cancelling his day here, and instead of working eight hours this one is going to work twelve.' You know, those internal details, the Force itself implements so I could not say how many men have had a vacation cancelled or how many men are going to lose their one or two days off this week or how many men will work a shift and one half or a double shift, that type of thing. You know, those are matters which the officers in the forces concerned work out. It does not really come through me or go through anybody in the Department of Justice, those kinds of internal administration

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: and assignments of people and that, you know, that really would not come to my knowledge, those details.

MR. F. ROWE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Those obviously should certainly come to the knowledge of the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker; he should make himself aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary involves the fact that the minister stated that they had about the same number. - if I can get the minister's attention - of people now on shift work in the St. John's area as previous to this booking off with the blue 'flu -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I am sorry, I did not hear you.

MR. F. ROWE: This is why I was trying to get the minister's attention. The minister has stated that they have approximately the same number of people at least on shift work -

AN HON. MEMBERS: And in cars.

MR. F. ROWE: - and in cars and this sort of thing. Now what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the situation as it relates to special ongoing investigations and stake-outs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Stake-outs not take-outs.

MR. F. ROWE: Not take-outs, stake-outs and I have been reluctant in the last few months to bring this before the floor of the House of Assembly, but the matter has been made public on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker,

MR. F.B. ROWE: through the news media. But in the St. John's East area, as the minister well knows, there is a terrific scare in that area, there is a madman on the loose since last June -

MR. J. CARTER: A peeping Tom.

MR. F. B. ROWE: That is some funny, Mr. Speaker. Let it be heard that the hon. member thinks this is funny, the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

AN HON. MEMBER: A rapist.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well, in the area where he presently resides, Mr. Speaker, there is a nut running around the area with a bayonet, dressed up in an old army uniform, who has successfully completed three rapes. And there have been stake-outs in the East end of St. John's for almost twelve months now and, obviously, that is not the only incident of its kind in a city of in excess of 100,000 people. What I am asking the minister, what is happening to these types of ongoing serious, intensive investigations which require, obviously, more people than just the normal shift work, parking meters and this kind of a thing?

I could not give a heck how many people are parking illegally in this city as long as we, the House is informed that the people in this Province are safe from that kind of a situation. Is that situation being covered? And would the minister please indicate to the House exactly how it is being covered? Without what can be done, or what may be done, what is being done to protect these people who are extremely nervous in this particular instance?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the level, the same level of police protection, and by that I mean the whole area of police protection, is being provided now as previously because the personnel being used are coming from the officers of the Constabulary and from the R.C.M.P. And, obviously, the situation the hon. gentleman refers to, and the attempt to apprehend, identify and apprehend that person has not lost anything in its priority nor, indeed, in its seriousness nor in the efforts to bring to a successful conclusion that investigation.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend would agree.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to explore with the Minister of Justice another aspect of the very serious situation which has developed with the sudden epidemic of sickness which has swept through our police force in St. John's. The minister mentioned that the R.C.M. Police have responded to his request for assistance and I assume that is under the terms of the contract between the Province and Ottawa, the same contract, I may add, under which Mr. Diefenbaker refused to provide the Government of the Province with R.C.M. Police twenty-odd years ago, leading to the resignation of - who was the man? - Commissioner Nicholson.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) a question or a speech.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) may think it is a speech but if he was not so set in his ways he might learn and that would not do him any harm, Sir, it might even benefit the rest of us.

The question I have, I do know whether this contract has been made public in its current form. I think from time to time it has been tabled but I am not aware of whether the present one has been or not. Perhaps the minister could tell us whether the government are going to have to pay any extra monies to the Government of Canada? Because, as I understand it, the minister could confirm or deny this as is appropriate, we pay the RCM Police in return for the policing services which they provide at the provincial and municipal levels as opposed to the federal level. And they are now providing provincial and municipal services here in the city of St. John's, that is certainly not federal work, they are replacing the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary for the time being. Will this cost us any extra money? What are the terms of the contract?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is quite right. It is under the terms of the contract between Canada and Newfoundland with respect to provincial policing. The general breakdown there is 56 per cent for the Province, 44 -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Fifty-six/forty-four.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - per cent from the Federal Government. There is a provision, obviously, in the contract covering the present situation and indeed, it was as a requirement and obligation that, you know, the services are being performed. It is not, in a sense, as I am sure the

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: hon. gentleman is aware, as a favour type of thing but as a requirement.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Oh, it is a contractual requirement but Davey Fulton refused to honour it (inaudible)

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: With respect to whether this will bring additional cost or not, that is a matter which to be accurate, I would want to check the specific clauses of the contract. It is my understanding, but I say this, you know, subject to correcting and giving more information tomorrow, that initially that need not be the case, that that is not necessarily the case but before saying any more I would want specifically to have that particular clause to examine it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, and I thank the minister and I look forward to getting further information. Could he also perhaps tell us now, and if he could not, would he undertake to get the information, whether extra RCM Police officers - when I say officers I do not just mean - or personnel are being brought into the Province? The RCM Police, I believe, have about 700 men and women of all ranks stationed within Newfoundland now and if they are going to move 200 of them into St. John's, which is what it will take -

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, to replace 200 it will take 200.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: (Inaudible) on shifts.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, the 200 are on shifts, I would say to the minister too. Either it takes 200 to police St. John's adequately or it does not, and we have been using 200, therefore presumably it does. The minister is on a cleft stick when he tries that one.

June 2, 1980

Tape No. 1978

DW - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS: Could he tell us whether the
RCM Police are intending or have they already moved in
extra personnel? If not, do they intend to? And that is
not a matter of wanting any secret security information,

MR. E. ROBERTS: it is simply a matter of, you know, 700 men are now attempting to do what 900 men have hitherto been doing, how long are we going to have to put up with the 700 or so forth?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge there are no additions from outside the Province and that, of course, part of the slack is taken up through vacations, perhaps longer shifts, days off being cancelled or postponed. So, as of now, to my knowledge, there are no additional out of Province personnel.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Any intention of bringing them in?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: As of now, no.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Because, I mean, those arrangements will only work in the very short term.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, all I can say is, you know, as of now and the hon. gentleman is aware it is a matter in which one has to judge a situation as and when and if it continues and develops.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The minister then is living from day to day?

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure, speak now.

MR. S. NEARY: I will yeild to my hon. friend who wants to get on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile yields to the hon. member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock).

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Justice with regard to the police issue and that basically as regards that in art of politics when you have a problem the best way to divert the problem is create a camouflage and get some other issue, and it is that regard that we heard on the news today that extradition of John C. Doyle between

MR. E. HISCOCK: the provincial government. My question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), is this a diversionary tactic? And basically we have been waiting so long in this Province - we have been waiting so long in this Province and we always hear the announcement but nothing is ever done about it, when can we expect this Department of Justice to basically have a date and to have Mr. Doyle back in the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman's question is a diversionary tactic not the interview that he may have heard. Actually, I do not recall if it was last Thursday or Friday, last week some day, a reporter, one of the radio stations ask me that question -

MR. S. NEARY: Probably CBC.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I do not think it was CBC. I believe it was one of the two private radio stations asked me the question with respect that the hon. gentleman has referred to, and I presumed they used it that day. I was not even aware that it was used today, but it was last week that the question was asked. And the hon. gentleman wants to know what the answer was. The answer is obviously the same as I gave to that reporter and that is that, you know, it is something which is in progress. It is not a matter, obviously exclusively of provincial jurisdiction, there is a federal area as well. Obviously there is a country, a non-Canadian country involved as well. That essentially is what I told the reporter and that was a few days ago. I am not sure if it was last Thursday or Friday.

But with respect to that being diversionary, it certainly was not because I gave him the answer last week and I presume they did not use it until today.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Nobody else on the police?

MR. NEARY: My question has to do with police work, Mr. Speaker, but I want to change the subject slightly and the question has to do with these Nevada tickets that are being sold now wholesale around this Province. Would the minister indicate to the House if it is legal, if it is legal for anybody and everybody to peddle these tickets, and if it is not legal, then what is the minister doing about it?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman probably knows, Newfoundland, PEI, New Brunswick, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories are the five jurisdictions where there is no licencing body, group, with respect to games of chance, bingo, wheel of fortune, etc.

Newfoundland, we, are now examining the practice in the provinces where there are licencing boards, with a view to developing regulations and procedures for the licencing of certain games of chance by charitable and philanthropic organizations. And then it would be illegal - only people, let us say, in bona fide charitable organizations, philanthropic organizations, that type, whether church affiliated, fraternal club affiliated groups working for handicapped or for other people, only those would be granted a licence and obviously there would be certain regulations and it would not be - no others would then be allowed to operate any of these games of chance. It is the first time in this Province there has been thought of this kind of regulation and licencing board and we hope to bring that into effect and have it refined and finalized within approximately a six to eight week period.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for one final question.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would gather from the hon. minister's answer that these tickets are being peddled and sold illegally in this Province at the present time and I asked the minister in the beginning if it is illegal to peddle these Nevada or Las Vegas, whatever you want to call them, tickets, What is the minister doing about it, especially in these corner stores that are selling them to school children? Would the minister indicate if they are going to put a stop to this nonsense right away because obviously it is illegal at the moment?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, technically all games of chance are now illegal, you know, including when a group go out to play bingo; you know, all of these things are now illegal. What has to be determined, where you have to have licencing is to see that it is only those kinds of organizations, which I indicated, are running these things. In other words, it would be quite improper for somebody, you know, commercially to be selling these things, whereas under a licencing system, permission would be given or could be given for a

June 2, 1980

Tape No. 1981

AH-1

MR. OTTENHEIMER: philanthropic or a charitable organization to so do. So these are the matters which we have to get definite guidelines on and see from the practice in other provinces with respect to such a licensing board what their criteria for charitable, philanthropic, etc., kinds of organizations are.

MR. NEARY: You still have not answered the question.

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

NOTICE OF MOTION

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Mines and Energy Act, 1973." (Bill No. 65). This will ratify the setting up of the petroleum directorate.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I will answer question number nine asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on Thursday, May 8th with regard to building lots at Hogan's Pond area and just say that there are eighty-three lots approved.

MR. NEARY: Hawco's Pond.

MR. POWER: Hawco's Pond. I am sorry, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: In Hawco's Pond, Mr. Speaker, there have been eighty-three building lots or summer cottage lots approved. They were all approved in the order in which they were received by the department. There was absolutely no interference from either the former Premier or former minister. There were no applications recommended by either the former Premier or the former minister and they were all done above board.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the people of Cartwright-Paradise River area and it concerns having Groswater Mountain Zone area opened up for caribou. They say that this should be opened immediately, 'we feel that the zone has been closed long enough to allow the herd to increase.' Basically they feel that now that the herd there has increased and if it is opened now even for a short period in the Winter or in the Spring. I would ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe) to look into this matter and have their environmental biologists study this area of having the caribou herd opened. What has happened, they say, is that when the construction of the Upper Churchill took place it cut across through the migrating pattern and as a result the major herd is now up North and the small herd is down South just North of Groswater Mountain. I would hope that the minister would also look into the fact that the caribou herd farther down the coast and also the moose herd that is coming across the straits area from Quebec and basically with regard to wildlife on the South and East coast of Labrador. Two hundred and twelve people, by the way, Mr. Speaker, signed this petition and with the high cost of living on the coast of Labrador and with particularly meat this is basically a stable diet. If they find that the herd is not increasing itself naturally, then would the minister look into the possibility of having some of the herd air lifted from the North of Nain and brought down South thereby giving the chances of increasing that herd in the future?

MR. SPEAKER: Any further petitions?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - so ably presented by the member

May 2,1980

Tape No. 1981

AH-3

MR. NEARY:

for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). It

seems to be a very serious message in this particular petition that because of man disturbing the environment, namely the construction of the Upper Churchill, the caribou herd seem to have - at least the people think the caribou herd has been divided and the majority of the caribou went North up towards Nain, And for some reason, I would gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, the caribou herd that was left behind, the smaller portion of it, are not reproducing and if something is not done, if a study is not undertaken, the caribou herd and indeed the moose herd could probably become extinct. So I hope that at least as a result of this petition the minister, if he does not see fit to open Groswater Mountain to hunting now by the people who live in the area, that at least they do a study to see what is happening, why the caribou herd is not reproducing in that area.

Does the minister want to say something?

MR. E. HISCOCK:

North of Eagle River.

MR. S. NEARY:

Yes.

MR. L. THOMS:

And he is from Labrador.

MR. S. NEARY:

And the hon. gentleman represents the Labrador district and did not know where Groswater Mountain was or the Mealy Mountains. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, 212 people have signed the petition. They apparently have been denied the privilege and the opportunity to hunt caribou and moose in that area. There has been a freeze put on, brought about mainly because of the construction of the Upper Churchill, and I believe now the time has come to take a good, hard look at this situation. And as my hon. friend says, if they are not reproducing, if there is some reason for it, then they should airlift, because I believe up in one of the member's other districts recently they were hunting caribou from a helicopter. They were doing some research and I believe they killed off a large number of caribou to help them with their research. Some of these helicopters should be used to bring the caribou down into Labrador South, down in the area that my hon. friend referred to in the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Concurrence debate, Mr. Speaker, on Government Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 4, concurrence motions, Government Services Committee. I understand there are forty-five minutes remaining on the concurrence debate of that particular report.

The hon. the member for LaPoile, if he is standing.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words on this concurrence debate. I want to raise, first of all, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the government's bankers. I am glad today to see that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) is in his seat because perhaps he can enlighten the House, and me in particular, as to why it is necessary to carry on with the Bank of Montreal. The Bank of Montreal now have been

MR. S. NEARY: the government's bankers for a considerable period of time and I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if that is necessary, and what we have to do to change the government's bankers? Why should the Bank of Montreal be the government's bankers for so long? Is it possible that we could get a better deal with another bank? Could the government get a better deal with the Royal Bank of Canada, the Bank of Nova Scotia or the Canadian Bank of Commerce? Why must we continue to do business with the Bank of Montreal? Could we save taxpayers' dollars, Mr. Speaker, by changing banks? Could we save taxpayers' dollars by inviting proposals from other banks? Why are we locked into doing business with the Bank of Montreal? I have never been able to get a satisfactory answer, Mr. Speaker, to that question, and I am going to put it now to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), who I am sure is interested in saving a few dollars for the hard pressed taxpayers of this Province. It is about time, in my opinion, that we took a good, hard look at getting the best deal we can, saving as many taxpayers' dollars as we can, and if that means changing banks, well then, let us do it.

When was the last time, for instance, the government looked around, talked to the other banks to see if they would give Newfoundland a better deal than the Bank of Montreal? The Bank of Montreal now has had a monopoly on this long enough and I think the Minister of Finance and the government owe it to the people of this Province to explain why. Maybe the Bank of Montreal is the best deal we can get, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is, but at least let us find out if we have to continue with the Bank of Montreal or can we get a better deal from another bank? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one matter that I wanted raised.

The other matter that I wanted to raise, Sir, was we are now well into the construction season in this Province and there are a tremendous number of construction workers unemployed. We have no announcement worthwhile from the Department of Public Works or from the Department of Municipal Affairs in connection with water and sewerage or the construction of public buildings in this Province

MR. S. NEARY:

and the outlook for the construction workers, for the tradesmen in this Province is very bleak indeed. And I have talked to an awful lot of construction workers of late who are seriously thinking about getting back to the fishery but that is even getting more difficult than in the past, Mr. Speaker. You now need a licence, why the fishery is getting to the extent now where it is almost like passing out a brewer's retail licence or a liquor licence. It is very difficult to get a licence. And so a lot of these construction workers, who were former fishermen who went to the vocational schools and to the colleges and upgraded themselves and got a trade, can now not find employment and the outlook for these workers is very bleak indeed. And here we are now, Mr. Speaker, we understand from reports that the government are trying to force the shutdown of the House of Assembly. We are told from rumours and reports that we are picking up that the government would be very happy if the House of Assembly shut down today or tomorrow or Wednesday - well, at least by Friday of this week. We have not accomplished anything yet in this session of the House except pass that rag that we spent almost three weeks debating. The government have not seen fit to raise the matter of unemployment in this Province, the cost of living, the cost of electricity, a realistic fishery policy, the price of heating fuel. The government have not seen fit to raise any of the bread and butter issues in this session of the House. They instead preferred to talk about a flag, a foolish old flag for Newfoundland while our people are faced with the worst problems in their history, record unemployment, the highest cost of living in Canada, the second lowest per capita income in the whole nation. And all this government wants to talk about is a foolish old flag.

Everybody thinks in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's approach to the problems is silly. They think the hon. gentleman has become a silly coot. The government is silly in its approach to everything. All they want to do is argue and fight and attack; they are governing with a policy of confrontation and doing nothing to resolve the problems that are facing the ordinary people of this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: The word is getting through to the people out there, the voters, who are very discouraged and very disappointed with this government that they are just being plain silly about everything, that they are not doing anything to develop this Province. They can not point to one item that they have accomplished in the last year, or in the last seven or eight years for that matter, since we have had a Tory government in this Province. No harm to say, 'Tory times are hard times', Mr. Speaker, they can not point to one item that they have accomplished; they have a sad, sorry record indeed. It is pathetic, their record - they have no record, the record does not exist. People think that the Premier is just being silly about everything

MR. J. MORGAN: A new hospital for Port aux Basques.

MR. S. NEARY: It is not there yet.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The new one promised for Bonavista five years ago is not there either.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hear Tories in droves talking about how disappointed they are with this government. They had their hopes built up by the Premier when he campaigned in June of last year. Their hopes and expectations were built higher than by any other Premier in this Province. And what a letdown it has been, Mr. Speaker, what a tremendous letdown. The outlook is dismal for young Newfoundlanders who will be pouring out of the university, the College of Trades, the vocational schools, the high schools, pouring out by the thousands in another couple of weeks and no chance at all of finding a job unless they go to Saskatchewan or Alberta. And God only knows, Mr. Speaker, a lot of Newfoundlanders now are having second thoughts about going to Western Canada after that unfortunate accident recently when a large number of young Newfoundlanders were forced out of this Province because they could not find employment in their own Province, they had to leave and go West. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. The government have no record at all, no track record and there is no indication that they are going to do anything except the Premier wants to take a position

MR. NEARY:

paper on everything. He wants to publish a position paper. He wanted a position paper on this, he has got to give Cabot Martin and the crowd of separatist advisers that he has, he has to give them something to do, so they are producing little coloured documents that do not mean a thing. It is all academic. What the people of this Province want is action, and they want it now. They want to know what this government is going to do about the fishery. The fishery is headed for disaster, in serious trouble, and all we hear is old Chaw-mouth telling us what a grand fellow he is, Mr. Dress Up, not enunciating plans for the fishery, trying to attract attention to himself. And if the Premier does not have his picture taken twenty or thirty times a day and call a news conference when he is driving off from the airport on the spur of the moment, why, he thinks he is out of touch with everything and everybody. He has got to have his picture taken at least twenty or thirty times a day.

MR. MORGAN:

Raised any funds for your campaign yet?

MR. NEARY:

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough.

The people are very discouraged, very disappointed, and disillusioned with this government and with the Premier especially, who they say is beginning to look silly, who is making Newfoundland the laughing stock of Canada. They are referring to him now as a silly coot. I would not say that he has gone bananas, but they say he is not behaving like a mature, common sense individual, just plain downright silly, doing Newfoundland all kinds of damage in the international and national financial and business world, and with other jurisdictions; attack Nova Scotia, attack the police, attack the teachers, attack everything and everybody in sight, attack the Government of Canada, twist and turn when you want to attack a minister up in Ottawa and the Prime Minister of Canada, and not one single thing being done while that is happening. My hon. friend referred to diversionary tactics -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well, I hope I will get another ten minutes shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Do I hope you will be (inaudible).
Do I ever hope you will be (inaudible).

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) is not in his seat today, I do not know whether he will be or not, but there were a couple of points that I wanted to bring to his attention and hopefully get some -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Who? (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no, his father died three or four days ago.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, I am sorry to hear that, Mr. Speaker.
Probably some other hon. gentleman could try and answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, the Trans-Canada Highway situation is one that disturbs most all of us in the Province at the present time and I refer to three different things and that is the situation with regard to these slow lanes on the Trans-Canada Highway. Now if I can remember correctly, or as I understood it correctly, over the last number of years the slow lane had to be the lane that yielded to the rest of the traffic on the outside, whereas this year it appears, at least in certain locations where I have driven over the highway, where the fast lane, if you will, the one in the middle, written right at the end of that particular lane is 'yield.' So there appears to be a change of rules or regulations as it applies to the Trans-Canada Highway, and I do not know what kind of publicity this has been given, if any; what kind of an educational programme has been given to this, if any, because quite frankly I myself, I am confused on the highway now, which lane is supposed to yield, whether it is the slow lane or the fast lane because the instructions on the highways have changed themselves.

MR. F. ROWE: Last year, if I can remember correctly, there was a yield sign vertically stuck up on the side of the road in the slow lane. This year it appears in the fast lane written on the pavement itself, "Yield."

MR. BARRY: Which one, left lane or right lane?

MR. F. ROWE: Well, last year to me it appeared to be on the right lane, the slow lane, yield. Well that is where the sign was, Mr. Speaker, sticking up on the highway, yield.

MR. POWER: Only a merge sign, not yield.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, merge or what have you. And this year it is - Well, look, the obvious confusion in this House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is an indication of the reason why there needs to be some explanation about the Trans-Canada Highway with respect to fast and slow lanes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a second

MR. F.B. ROWE: point that I want to mention with respect to the highway and it is this, that there is no trouble whatsoever in getting a speeding ticket in this Province on the Trans-Canada Highway, no problem whatsoever.

Now, I do not know what the situation is with respect to the minimum speed limit. I understand that there is a minimum speed limit on the Trans-Canada Highway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Forty.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well, I would like to hear from the - well, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) is, unfortunately, away today. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) comes back or the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), or the Premier wishes to answer the question, I would like to know to what degree the law is being enforced with respect to the minimum speed limit. Because I am afraid that many of the accidents that occur on the Trans-Canada Highway, and potential accidents that occur, are caused by slow drivers on the Trans-Canada Highway and the impatient people trying to pull out, in dangerous situations, to get past them.

The third point, still pertaining to the Trans-Canada Highway, Mr. Speaker, is this business of tractor trailers. Now, it appears to me that we should have some law - if we do not have it, I would like to have it. If we do have some regulations I would like to have them explained - where there should be certain times when these tractor trailers are not allowed on our highways. Because we have situations in this Province where we have the rush hours, people in rural Newfoundland returning back to their small rural communities from the larger, high-density population centres where they are fortunate

MR. F.B. ROWE: enough to have a job, returning in the evenings or coming into these centres where they have employment in the mornings, where you have great convoys of tractor trailers roaring in or out of town. And I would like to see some sort of a regulation whereby they can travel only at certain times or certainly be stopped from travelling during rush hours.

Now, there are probably reasons why they are allowed to travel at any hour of the twenty-four hours of the day, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there should be certain restrictions, particularly during rush hours, of people travelling in and out from rural to urban centres for purposes of employment, I would suggest that these huge tractor trailers travelling at great speeds at sometimes going down hill and going at a snail's pace trying to get up over a hill, where they should be kept off the highways during these periods of time.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a district question - unfortunately we do not have the minister here. I do not know whether there is anybody who can answer it, but I will have to go on record as mentioning the problem with respect to roads in the district, and that is this, that the New Harbour Barrens Road, between New Harbour and Victoria, was a high priority last year before the election. Upgrading and paving was promised -

MR. R. MOORES: Between New Harbour and Spaniard's Bay.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Spaniard's Bay, I am sorry. Right. New Harbour and Spaniard's Bay. And that is, Sir, one of the oldest dirt roads on the Avalon Peninsula. And the people of Trinity South

MR. F.B. ROWE: agreed to the concept of the Carbonear Hospital, I believe, when that was built, agreed with the concept of the hospital being put in Carbonear providing that that road was upgraded and paved so the people could go from Trinity South area over to Carbonear. As of this day, Sir, there has been very little if any upgrading, certainly no paving, of that particular stretch of road, the New Harbour Barrens Road, one of the oldest dirt roads on the Avalon Peninsula.

 They have a miserable \$300,000 for upgrading of the Eastern end of that highway this year. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that \$300,000 would be better spent on the dirt roads in the various communities such as New Harbour, Greens Harbour, New Chelsea, New Melbourne where you have fish trucks and that sort of thing travelling over these roads daily, the people not being able to open their windows, not being able to put out their wash for drying purposes, they are smothered in dust during the Summer. Fish quality control is out of control because the fish trucks have to travel over these bumpy, dusty, dirty roads. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, the government should either start and finish that New Harbour Barrens Road, start it and complete it, or stop fooling around with it with little bits of money one year, little bits of money another year for upgrading and the next year it is all washed away again. I would suggest that that money would be better spent in upgrading and paving the dirt local roads under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation and Communications in such communities as New Harbour, Greens Harbour and the other unincorporated communities

MR. F. ROWE:

that I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, we had a spectacle in 1975 in Hant's Harbour. Look, this is a pamphlet, Mr. Speaker, a pamphlet from the PC candidate, who happened to be a Cabinet minister of the day, in 1975 wherein it said, 'Roads committed for this year to paved by September 30th., 1975,' Hant's Harbour, the Cluster's Head Road. A little stretch of road on Cluster's Head in Hant's Harbour promised to be paid during an election campaign in 1975, here is living proof of it, that road is still being washed out to sea, Mr. Speaker. Very little re-construction and certainly no pavement.

MR. J. HODDER:

And a dangerous road with it.

MR. F. ROWE:

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the people of the district asked for a simple thing, calcium chloride on the roads in Trinity South, in that part of the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde. Not one ounce, not one gram of calcium chloride was spread on the dirt roads in that district, Mr. Speaker. And I would simply ask if there is to be no re-construction and pavement of the roads, the least the minister can do this year is to put some calcium chloride on the dirt roads, the gravel roads in the district of Trinity - Bay de Verde.

And, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would hope that - I do not know if there is anybody on the other side who can answer the questions relating to the district in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), but certainly, I would like somebody to reply to the situation with regards to the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. F. ROWE: And, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there has been a death in the family of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). I had not realized that when I started and I certainly would like to pass my sympathy along to the minister on behalf of the

members of the Opposition at this particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt to address all the questions raised by the hon. member but I will address the first one as it relates to changing policy in the passing lanes. The hon. gentleman is quite correct there has been a change in policy, but he is about a year behind. We changed last year. Whereas previously it was slow traffic keep right, now it is all traffic keep right except to pass. So the person who has to yield is now the centre lane instead of the right lane, whereas previously the centre lane travelling through had the right of way and the right lane, the slow traffic, yielded to the faster traffic. But that was changed a year ago.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, that is wrong.

MR. N. WINDSOR:

No. No, it is not wrong, it is quite correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR:

The law is quite clear. The law now states that you keep right except to pass and when you are running out of passing lane then the person passing yields to the person in the right lane. And that is why the yield sign.

MR. F. ROWE:

And that is why you have to come to a screaming halt to let the slow guys out?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No, no it is all traffic keep right unless you are passing. It is a passing lane, not a slow lane.

MR. F. ROWE: You are normally passing when you are out there.

MR N. WINDSOR: You are passing when you are out there, exactly. If you do not have enough lane left to pass, then you do not haul out there. It is quite simple.

MR L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, just on that particular subject. Actually if you are passing when you are out there you should be getting a ticket because where the solid white line begins is not a passing lane. You are not allowed to pass from the beginning of the solid white line. So this gives the right hand traffic the opportunity to merge onto the Trans-Canada.

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) if that is right.

MR. L. THOMS: Of course that is right. If the hon. minister would like for both of us now to go and hire a lawyer and get independent legal advice on that, I will only be too happy to pay the cost and any bet you want to make on it.

Mr. Speaker, just to get off the - well, not actually to get off the Trans-Canada, I certainly would like to support the comments made by my colleague for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) in connection with the tractor trailers. There is not only a period of time which they should be eliminated from the road altogether, but I think more attention has to be paid to the tractor trailers. There is nothing quite as frightening on the Trans-Canada - and I had this happen to me; if you recall when the fire was out in Gambo and they had a gravelled

MR. L. THOMS: detour which was hardly wide enough for two vehicles, but I had one of these tractor trailers actually pass me on a detour. They really do not care for the travelling public in this Province. They just barrel at you whichever way they want and they can frighten the living daylights out of you. And I think that the minister should pay more attention to it and possibly do something about it.

My friend was also talking about district problems and

MR. L. THOMS: I have a district problem this year. When the roads programme was tabled in this House there was not one single solitary cent for my district. Of course, there are all kinds of reasons given for it none of which, of course, I accept but, then, maybe election promises, maybe campaign promises are made to be broken. Maybe that is a fact. Maybe that is why the people of this Province are so cynical about politics and politicians. That is why they came to the conclusion that, you know, any election promise is one that we do not expect to be kept. It is going to be broken. But campaign promises were made in my district. There were written and verbal commitments made by the previous member, by the candidate, by the previous administration that two things would happen for sure and one is that Grand Bank would get a new bridge.

It had a single main bridge there at the time, at this moment, but Grand Bank was going to get its bridge. No problem. Do not worry about it. It is there. It is approved. It is just a matter of the Budget coming down in 1980 and the money will be there. We received that commitment. I received the commitment after I got elected, as a matter of fact. Maybe I am being penalized for voting against the flag. That might be it. That might be just how small the administration of this Province is. That might be the slap across the wrist that I am getting from this administration. I would hate to think that that was the case, Mr. Speaker. I would hate to think that the people of Grand Bank and the people of the shore are getting penalized because I happened to take a particular stand which I thought was right and voted against what was happening in the flag issue in this case.

Then, again, there is the section of road between Lord's Cove and Lawn over which the fishermen must take their fish and then the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) talks about the quality of

MR. L. THOMS: fish in this Province. You cannot have a good quality of fish and have to truck the fish to the fishplants over dirt roads. And there are only seven or eight miles of dirt road which would complete that particular stretch of road. Again, there were written and verbal promises that this would be done. But it seems like promises of this administration on paper just are not worth the paper they are written on. They do not mean anything. They are forgotten -

MR. S. NEARY: Water on a duck's back.

MR. L. THOMS: - the next day. Completely forgotten. Maybe, again, maybe the people of Lord's Cove, maybe the people of Lawn, maybe the people of Taylor's Bay, Point au Gaul and Lamaline - maybe they are being penalized for my voting against the flag.

MR. HANCOCK : Or you being a Liberal, one or the other.

MR. L. THOMS: Well, if you want to bring in the flag the same way as this one was brought in then I would vote against it again. Now as long, of course, as it is the official flag of this Province at the moment, as long as it is, I will respect it just like I would respect any other flag.

But, I would hate to think that this administration was so small, so small that they would penalize the people of the district of Grand Bank for something like this.

Mr. Speaker, to get off Transportation and Communications for a minute I would just like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (N. Windsor) - maybe the President of Council (W. Marshall) would like to comment on it as well. You will recall when I

MR. L. THOMS: spoke on the new Municipal Act in the House I questioned the logic of extracting directly from the Public Tendering Act a section that admittedly had a flaw in it - taking it, extracting it out of the Public Tendering Act and putting it into the Municipal Act without making a very slight change, and I am referring to the extension of contracts by municipal councils where it says that a contract must be extended at the same unit price. All you needed was a very simple amendment where it would say that the contract could be extended at the same or a lesser unit price. The Minister of Municipal Affairs at the time got up and basically what he said was, 'Well, I agree with you, there is a flaw in the Public Tendering Act that should be changed, but we do not want the Municipal Act to conflict with the Public Tendering Act; therefore, we will put the same flaw in the Municipalities Act.' That was the convoluted logic that I heard at the time. So maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. N. Windsor) or the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) can tell me what time they expect that the Public Tendering Act will be reviewed, will be looked at, and a flaw such as this corrected so that we can get an amendment to the Municipalities Act as well at the same time so that councils are not forced to pay a higher unit price if they can get it for a lower unit price. It just does not make sense. Maybe the minister could address himself to that point.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the ministers are not going to address themselves to anything. We have raised some very, very interesting and very important questions concerning the people of this Province. The ministers and the Premier sit there like a crowd of dumb-bells. They have no intention, obviously, Mr. Speaker, of coming to grips with the real problems facing the ordinary people of this Province.

MR. L. THOMS: They have the flag debate over now.

MR. S. NEARY: They have their flag now.

MR. L. THOMS: They did not speak on that one either.

MR. S. NEARY: No, the Premier did not even speak on that. They got their flag so now they can go off and talk about oil. That is all they want to talk about, oil, as if oil were going to be the salvation of this Province. That is going to create more problems than it is going to do good. Although let me say one thing about the oil, Mr. Speaker. I have to say this. I listen to these academics and these experts day in and day out telling the people of this Province, 'Oh, we are not going to be ready for the oil boom.' 'We are not going to be ready for oil,' they say. We have only been exploring off the coast here since 1968. It was the Liberal administration that brought the oil drilling rigs to Newfoundland and now we are told twelve years later, we are not ready, we are not going to be ready. Well, if we are not going to be ready or we are not ready it is our own fault. And I hope I hear no more foolish nonsense from that crowd of academics and experts who are saying, 'Oh, we are not going to be ready for oil.' Every time they want to get their names in the news, in the headlines, 'Newfoundland is not going to be ready for oil.' We have been twelve years at it now and if we are not going to be ready, if we are not ready, then it is our own fault, our own stupid fault.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather intrigued the other day, following the referendum in Quebec, about a statement that the Premier made about the Government of Canada. He thought the federal government should be an agency of the Province, the Premier said. Now, the hon. the Premier, the same man who makes that statement, is up then the next day, and in this House a few days later, presenting a document asking the Government of Canada for literally millions piled upon millions of dollars to try to keep Newfoundland afloat. He wants the Government of Canada to pay for all the projects in this Province, to pay all the bills - to write the cheques and pay the bills, but they can only be an agency of the Province. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the people of this Province think that the hon. gentleman is silly? This is the image that

MR. NEARY:

is being left. The hon. gentleman is portraying an image of a silly immature individual who is not capable of grappling with the problems of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we only have a few more minutes in this concurrence debate. The government have managed again this year to get a free ride on their estimates by putting the estimates out in Committees in various and sundry parts of St. John's. We have only a few more minutes left and there is no evidence, no indication yet, even though the government are rushing to close the House by this weekend, forcing us, forcing the House to close down without presenting any realistic solutions to the problems that are facing the ordinary people of this Province. And let me repeat what some of those problems are; record unemployment, especially in the construction industry, amongst our tradesmen, tradesmen being forced to go to Saskatchewan and Alberta and other provinces of Canada; no fishery policy, no plans to develop the Lower Churchill; the highest cost of living in Canada; the second lowest per capita income in the nation -

AN HON. MEMBER: The highest unemployment rate in Canada.

MR. NEARY: No, I said the highest unemployment rate in Canada. Electricity rates escalating, cost of gasoline and heating fuel going up, vandalism and crime on the increase, and what is it that this crowd want to talk about? They want to talk about a foolish old flag with a big dart in the centre of it. Well, that little dart is going to be like a boomerang -

MR. MORGAN: You will get a dart pretty soon.

MR. NEARY: The government are going to get the dart because that little dart is going to be like a boomerang, it is going to come back and give the government the dart in due course.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the last seven or eight years in this Province, especially the last year, have been a dismal, dismal failure. The government have not lifted a finger to try to come to grips with the problems of the ordinary people of this Province, they have been let down. The people have been conned, they have been had by this administration and the previous administration and there is nothing looming on the horizon to offer any hope to the people of this Province, especially young people who are unemployed and cannot find employment. The Province is slipping badly, Mr. Speaker. They cannot point their fingers at one single item that they have accomplished in the last seven or eight years, especially the last year. The Premier is just acting like a silly coot, as I said a few minutes ago. People think the hon. gentleman is silly, silly, should not be in control, they want a mature person, a man with common sense, with a firm hand on the tiller at the most difficult time in our history. And they are not getting that leadership and the people are disappointed and discouraged and browned off.

MR. CARTER: Now is your chance.

MR. NEARY: Now is anybody's chance, Mr. Speaker, anybody's chance. I will tell you one thing, if the hon. gentleman, there a few weeks ago - a few weeks ago it looked like the hon. gentleman might rush into the House in his silly, foolish way and bring in a resolution and dissolve the House and have a general election over the offshore oil ownership.

MR. NEARY: I will guarantee you now, Mr. Speaker, that is the furthest from the hon. gentleman's mind. The whole situation in the Province has changed in less than one month, the people now think that the hon. gentleman is silly in his approach, the way he approaches everything, waving his arms, wild-eyed, fanatical, tugging at his coat, looks like a fellow that is going berserk, somebody who cannot cope with the problems of the ordinary people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we asked some very important

MR. S. NEARY:

questions of ministers, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) and what did they do? I do not know if we gave them diarrhea or what but they all got up and scattered out of the House as fast as they could.

MR. R. BAIRD:

You get action with action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY:

That is right. The voters will give them diarrhea before the next election but they have all had time to go outside, if it is the call of nature that brought them out of the House, but now they should be back in their seats and answer the questions that we have raised, tell us how they are going to deal with the unemployment situation, tell us what plans they have for the fisheries. It is absolutely scandalous, Mr. Speaker, the contempt that this administration has for the people, and the arrogance. They used to talk about Joey Smallwood, after twenty-three years, how he became arrogant, how he was a dictator, why we have seen that happen to this administration and this Premier in less than one year. I would be the last one in this Province to compare the hon. gentleman to former Premier Smallwood, I think Mr. Smallwood's little finger -

MR. L. THOMS:

The Tories are doing that.

MR. S. NEARY:

- nail accomplished more and did more in one month than the Tories have done in eight years. We have had a Tory administration in Newfoundland now for eight years, even though they want us to forget about the last seven years. They usually jump over that to go back to the Smallwood administration, jump over seven years of corruption, embezzlement, thievery, crookey, they want to jump over that and blot it out as if it never happened in Newfoundland's history. They are ashamed to admit that seven years of Tory administration and I guarantee you after another two or three years, when we have a new leader, he will be ashamed to associate himself or identify himself with this administration.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, they have no plans, they want to shut the House down as fast as they can. They figure as long as they keep the House open they are getting themselves in more hot water. The Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) and the

MR. S. NEARY: Premier are forcing a shutdown of the House. We should stay here all Summer and try to wrestle with the problems that are facing the ordinary people of this Province and come up with solutions to these problems instead of being forced to debate foolish things like that monstrosity we passed in the House there a week or so ago, that rag they call a flag.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was complaining a few moments ago that members of this side of the House do not answer but the fact of the matter is there have been four speeches on the other side, it usually takes about four speeches to come up with enough substance to answer anything in about half the time allotted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will answer a few matters, albeit, I know it will not be satisfactory to some of the hon. gentlemen there opposite but I shall attempt to answer, particularly some matters raised by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms).

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde indicates that there seems to be a perfusion of slow drivers on the highway and what are we doing about it.

MR. L. THOMS: There is a minimum speed limit.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I know there is a minimum speed limit. The fact of the matter is that this regulation and that law is being enforced equally with the others and we have not had any amount of undue complaints about this but if they are a matter of undue complaints and the hon. gentleman can demonstrate that to us, we would be perfectly happy to pass that on to the appropriate enforcing authorities for the purpose of seeing that if, in fact, the rule is not being followed, it is followed.

He mentioned tractor transport and this is a matter the member for Grand Bank mentioned and the members, you know, from time to time have mentioned, should there not be some restrictions on the tractor trailer traffic in the Province on certain specific days,

MR. W. MARSHALL: I believe it has been suggested that perhaps on Sundays and holidays and other periods of time as they do in other areas apparently. Our main situation, Mr. Speaker, here, the main specific situation that we have before us here, is that we have only one real transportation link in this Province

MR. MARSHALL: and this is the highway. If the hon. gentleman had read the discussion paper which was filed the other day on major bilateral issues he would have seen certain answers to his questions in it. One of the major facts we have, we have a Trans-Canada Highway that is not up to standard, that should be up to standard. Hopefully it will be up to standard in the years to come. We have a railway system, Mr. Speaker, that has been downgraded regrettably since the days of Confederation. We have seen the passenger service taken away from us and we have seen very regrettably a downgrading of the freight service and we believe that one of the ways and one of the policies to alleviate the problems on the highway is to build up the alternate mode of transportation and that is the railway through the CNR. And as the hon. gentleman there opposite knows, this is a matter of concern for the federal government, a responsibility for the federal government, it is a matter that they undertook in the terms of union to look after but instead of looking after it, unfortunately we find ourselves as one of the few provinces in the Canadian Confederation that gave a railway and saw the railway services being downgraded by the federal presence, whereas other provinces joined Confederation for the purpose of getting a railway. So that is my answer to the hon. gentleman. We realize the pressures of tractor trailers on the road and we realize the inadequacy of the links but at the same time, we also realize that some of this has been caused to a great degree, as I say, by the downgrading of the railway and by the fact that we have such a large area to provide with roads, a large mileage or kilometers, whatever one will, and we require federal assistance for that purpose. So if the hon. gentleman wants to help us to this end he could, I suggest, contact his friends in Ottawa and help us as we make our representations from a governmental point of view, he could certainly make his representations from a political point of view. I understand there is only one minute left, Mr. Speaker, and this is in the concurrence debates. On the Public Tendering Act mentioned by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), I will say

MR. MARSHALL: that any changes in the Public Tendering Act will be made, or in any act with respect to tendering, will only be made with a view to strengthening the act itself. He indicates that this would be the - the proposal that he makes would be a measure to strengthen it and so it may be but we will be considering this when we finally get the report of the commission that was struck by the previous administration for the purpose of inquiring into these matters and we will take them all at once and we will consider them at the same time. However, I am bound to point out, and perhaps I should not bring up a tender matter such as this, that what he calls strengthening the act, the proposal that he makes for strengthening the act - and members on the opposition have joined in agreement in this, is the very thing for which they condemn the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when he made a certain decision, made in good faith at a particular period of time, to do a certain act, to award at less than a unit price. They condemned him roundly for it and at the same time they come in and say we should bring in an amendment because it is the beneficial thing to do. So it really seems to be speaking out of both sides of one's mouth.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, there is only a short period of time. There are other questions that were raised. A lot of these, I think, have been answered in Question Period, they have been answered in the committees themselves but this, I believe, is the end of the concurrence debates and I hope I have touched the main gist of questions that have been asked by the other side. It suffice it to indicate that it took them forty minutes to ask and it took me four minutes to answer.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time has expired. The motion is that this House concurs with the report of the Government Services Estimates Committee. Those in favour 'Aye' contrary 'Nay' carried.

June 2, 1980

Tape No. 1991

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The adjourned debate on the

Budget.

Before recognizing the hon. member

for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) I would like to welcome to the galleries today the Vice-President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour accompanied by Mr. Grimes and Mr. Dan Hiscock, both from the great and historic district of Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I did not anticipate speaking in the Budget debate this afternoon and I do not seem to have a copy of the Budget with me. However, be that as it may I think I have, since the House

MR. L. THOMS:

opened, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions now I have stated emphatically that we have not accomplished by way of worthwhile legislation in this House very much over that period of time. My hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) says that we are trying to get the House closed on Tuesday or Wednesday or Friday. Of course, for what we are accomplishing, for what meaningful legislation is going through this hon. House, we may well have closed last Friday, let alone this Friday or Monday or Tuesday, whatever the case might be. This afternoon, of course, I got conclusive proof that we are getting very little in the way of legislation from this administration when the Page laid on my desk in the House Bill No. 60 which is "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act". I opened it up, Mr. Speaker, and lo and behold, it is blank. There is nothing there, proof positive that this is a 'do nothing' administration.

They have done a lot of negative things, however. We have seen this Province - thank you very much - this one does have something on it. We have seen this Province, Mr. Speaker, since June 18th become something that concerns me, and I think, concerns a lot of people in this Province. And I am concerned about the direction that this Province is taking. I am concerned that we seem to be unalterably opposed to everything that the federal government, whether it was the P.C. Government from May 22nd to February 18th or whether it was the national Liberal Government prior to May 22nd, 1979 or whether it is the Liberal administration since February 18th, 1980. We seem to be at war on every side. We saw a situation where the Premier of this Province was at war with the then Prime Minister, Joe Clark. We saw the embarrassing situation of 'Mr. Peckford' making an announcement on the front steps of Confederation Building and then we saw Mr. Clark immediately contradicting 'Mr. Peckford', the Premier of this Province. That was an embarrassing situation. It was embarrassing to me as a Liberal member of this House, as a citizen of this Province, as I am sure it must have been to hon. members on the other side of the House and Progressive Conservatives throughout this Province.

MR. L. THOMS:

That particular situation has not gotten better since February 18th. And the Premier of this Province has no intentions of letting it get better.

We have seen the situation in this House where members on this side of the House have had their loyalty to this Province questioned. We were not being good Newfoundlanders and we are not good Newfoundlanders because we are not toeing the Premier's line or this administration's line on the question of offshore oil and gas. We have seen a situation where the Premier has stood up in this House and called on members of the Opposition, members of this party to support him in his position on offshore oil and gas.

It has been pointed out to this administration that in 1975, on a resolution that was passed unanimously in this House, that both sides of the House agreed that ownership of offshore oil and gas would be in the hands of Newfoundland. So what is the argument from that

MR. L. THOMS: point of view? What is the argument?

There is none. But we have seen a deliberate attempt by this administration to paint the Liberal Party of this Province as the black sheep. Now, I say to the Premier of this Province and I say to hon. members on the other side of the House, if you want the Liberal Party of this Province to form the government and to govern, then call an election or abdicate or do something. Resign. Resign and as I said before -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) one year.

MR. L. THOMS: And as I said before, I can assure you I can assure you - I think one year the people of Canada had their opportunity. They had a Tory administration in Canada from May 22 to February 18th but on February 18, they had their opportunity to turf that Tory administration out of office and they did so.

Now, I think it would be only human kindness, human kindness if the Premier of this Province gave the people of this Province the opportunity to turf this administration out. But do not sit - do not sit on the other side of this House and ask us to govern. We are not the government. As I said before, I can assure you that you put me in the same position as the Shah of Mount Scio, as the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry), you put me in the -

MR. BARRETT: You change your mind too often.

MR. L. THOMS: I do not change my mind as often as Joe Clark changed his mind, I will remind the hon. member for St. John's West (H. Barrett).

DR. COLLINS: Did you change your mind on the flag?

MR. L. THOMS: No, I did not change my mind on the flag, Mr. Minister of Finance (J. Collins), no. What I changed my mind on was the dictatorial attitude that was being displayed by this administration in ramming that particular design down the throats of the people of this Province. That is what made me change my mind.

MR. L. THOMS: What made me change my mind on the flag, Mr. Speaker, was when the Government House Leader, speaking on behalf of the government, refused to permit a member of the Canadian Legion to appear before the Bar of this House, when the hon. the President of the Council (W.Marshall) and the rest of this administration reduced the Canadian Legion in this Province to a status nothing more than the Rod and Gun Club, that is what I objected to. I objected to the members of the Flag Committee putting the condition that this design would be acceptable to the people of this Province and then saying to hell with our own condition. That is what I objected to. That is what I objected to and that is what my friend from Eagle River (E.Hiscock) objected to.

If we are not going to pay any attention - if we had no intentions of paying any attention to public opinion, why did we make this condition? Why did we make this condition?

MR. J. DINN: Then why did you make the recommendation?

MR. L. THOMS: There was nothing - the recommendation is fine. I mean, it made no difference what the design was like, it was only when the design was shown to the people of this Province that the people of this Province could make any sort of a rational decision on whether or not it was acceptable. Every piece of evidence that I have, every piece of evidence that I had, indicated that it was not acceptable.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, maybe it will grow on the hon. member for Bally Haly, maybe it will -

MR. WARREN: Even the Minister of Mines and Energy (L.Barry) -

MR. THOMS: Maybe it will grown on that hon.member, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it does. I hope it does. I figured I would get him on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

June 2, 1980

Tape No. 1993

EL - 3

MR. J. DINN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): A point of order, the hon.the Minister
of Labour and Manpower.

MR. NEARY: On the nineteenth hole, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, bh!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite,
number one, if he is going to adress anybody in this House -

MR. THOMS: You were not in the House -

MR. J. DINN: - he has to address them

by the district that they represent and number two, just because the
hon. member cannot make a decision himself, you know, there is no reason
why he should attack personally other hon. members in this House.

MR. WARREN: Tough titty, Tough titty.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.
I would suggest that the hon. gentleman take a few minutes and go read
the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, there is no
point of order. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr.Speaker. Maybe
I will include the nineteenth hole the next time. That will make him
happy.

MR. S. NEARY: The water hole.

MR. L. THOMS: So anyway, Mr.Speaker, I got sidetracked
there for a moment on the Christopher Pratt design for a new flag for

MR. THOMS: this Province, a little bit of digression. But anyway, as I said earlier, we now have a new flag, I will honour the new flag and I will respect the new flag and, I guess, there will be an occasion or two when I will be embarrassed by the new flag, but I will certainly honour and respect it, it is the official flag of this Province.

MR. NEARY: But it can be repealed.

MR. THOMS: Oh, it can be. Of course! But we will know by the time the next election rolls around whether or not it has grown on the people of this Province. But my main concern was the arrogance of the Premier of this Province and the arrogance of the administration of this Province, that they would come in and ram this thing through the House of Assembly. You know, Mr. Speaker, total arrogance.

For example, we received this position paper on Thursday or Friday of last week. Now, the new flag had to be printed on this prior to the flag becoming the official flag of this Province. It is just another example of the arrogance shown by the present Premier of this Province, complete arrogance.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before I did digress to the flag, was forced into digressing to the flag, we have a situation in this Province today where the provincial government is at war with Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: With everybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: All the provinces are.

MR. THOMS: I will get on to the rest of them, give me a chance. I want to talk about Ottawa first. As I said, and I see the Minister of Mines and Energy coming in, if I were in his position I would have an agreement with Ottawa on the offshore oil and gas. I would have it.

MR. BARRY: Sure you would. It would be all gone, given away. You would give it away.

MR. THOMS: I would have it. And it would not be gone.

MR. BARRY: You would give it away tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: We would have 100 per cent of the offshore oil and gas.

MR. BARRY: One hundred per cent of what?

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, I have never referred to the Prime Minister of this country as a fraud. I have never referred to him as something lower than somebody else.

MR. BARRY: Who did? When?

MR. THOMS: So, Mr. Speaker, you know, I could go to the Prime Minister -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, or a point of privilege or whatever it is.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Is it a point of order or a point of privilege?

MR. BARRY: Is the hon. member saying -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - that I have accused the Prime Minister of Canada of being a fraud?

MR. HANCOCK: He did not say that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is a queer implication and I would like the hon. member to qualify it so I can take the appropriate action if that is what he is saying.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I would submit, Your Honour, that the hon. gentleman is a little bit confused because he raised a point of order and then got up and asked my hon. friend

MR. NEARY: a question. It should have been a point of information and not a point of order. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order. I did not hear any point of order.

MR. BARRY: To a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of privilege. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has insinuated by his words that I have accused the Prime Minister of Canada of being a fraud. I have accused him of being other things but never that, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for the hon. member to acknowledge that that is the case.

MR. THOMS: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege. The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I really have absolutely no idea whether the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) at any time in his political career or otherwise, has ever referred to the Prime Minister of Canada as a fraud. I have no idea. His question to me was was I referring to the hon. minister. No, I try not to refer to the hon. minister at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege. There is no point of privilege, the hon. minister took the opportunity to question remarks attributed to him.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, the Premier of this

MR. L. THOMS: Province is on radio now and in the media as saying, 'They are holding up the DREE agreements, we cannot get any money under the DREE agreements and it is for political reasons'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you in favour of that?

MR. L. THOMS: No, I am not saying I am in favour of that. But what I am saying is I could sympathize with the federal position -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are condoning them.

MR. L. THOMS: Would the minister please let me finish? I could sympathize. I am sure that we will get our agreements under DREE, I am sure we will get them. Not like my own case, Mr. Speaker, where I was probably cut off without a cent under the roads programme because I hurt the feelings of the Premier of this Province and voted against the flag. The Prime Minister of Canada is not as small as the Premier of this Province. He is just not as small!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: And we will get our money. But like I say, I would not blame him. Here we are on the one case saying what a rotten deal we are going to get out of Ottawa on every turn and the next minute we are up asking for millions and millions of dollars. The Premier of this Province says that Ottawa should be nothing more than a mere agency, that Ottawa should be no more than an agent of the Province. And then the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) gets up and says, 'We can develop the Lower Churchill but we are going to need money from Ottawa. We are going to need money from Ottawa'. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not the heights of hypocrisy? On the one hand we are saying Ottawa should be nothing, they should be stripped of all their powers and the next

MR. L. THOMS: thing we are going asking them for millions and millions of dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: It is like robbing your banker and then asking him for a loan.

MR. L. THOMS: That is right. It is like robbing your banker and then asking him for a loan.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is one area of conflict that we have in the Province today, is the situation between Newfoundland and Ottawa. I make no apologies to anybody in this Province for my being a Newfoundlander. I make no apologies to anybody.

MR. HANCOCK: You do not have to.

MR. L. THOMS: And I say again to the Government of this Province, if they want a fair and reasonable, and that is all Newfoundlanders want, deal with Ottawa on offshore oil and gas, then abdicate and turn it over to the Liberal Party, we will form a government we will get a deal that is fair and reasonable. We will do it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, that would not fit into the incipient, separatist plans of the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and a few more on the other side of the House. They do not want Newfoundland to be a part of Canada, they do not want it. They are saying to themselves, 'We have got oil and gas now worth billions and billions and billions of dollars, we do not want to share it with anybody, we will take the Province out of Confederation'. If the vote, Mr. Speaker, the vote on May 20th. had been reversed, as I am sure some hon. members on the other side would have wished it to be, there are some hon. members who would have been very, very happy because then they would have had their issue. It is going to be much more difficult, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier of this Province and the two or three Tory blue people

MR. L. THOMS: who he has around him, to haul this Province out of Confederation today than if the 'No' forces had not won on May 20th. Let my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) look at me. I do not think you really understand or know or appreciate what you have associated yourself with. You should have really stayed with the Liberal Party. I think you are going to regret, I think you are going to regret -

MR. D. STEWART: I will never be a Liberal (inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN: He will be back.

MR. S. NEARY: You still have your Liberal card in your wallet, you and 'Haig Young'.

MR. G. WARREN: Come on down.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I have no problems with the offshore oil and gas issue, none whatsoever. And I am not going to be panicked into a situation by the Premier of this Province or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) telling me what a lousy Newfoundlander I am.

MR. WARREN: You are not coming to the (inaudible) are you?

MR. BARRY: No, we do not have time, the House is closing.

MR. L. THOMS: No, the House does not have to close, Mr. Speaker. We can keep it going to Bastille Day if that is what you want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is another area of confrontation that we see ourselves in, and that is with Nova Scotia at the present time. We are at war with Ottawa and then, again, we are at war with Nova Scotia over the Northern cod issue, simply because the Nova Scotians fish about 15 per cent of what is the so-called Northern cod stock. But I attended a fisheries conference in Salt Pond, Burin, and I realized at that time - and I will admit that I did not realize it before - that we now have the South Coast fishermen, you know, I guess the Northeast Coast fishermen - because here you have the Premier on one hand saying that if we do not have access to 100 per cent of the Northern cod then we have 500 communities that are going to disappear off the face of Newfoundland. What a lot of tommyrot, Mr. Speaker, absolute tommyrot. The people of Newfoundland, as I understand it, fish about 85 per cent of the Northern cod stock in any event, so what are we arguing over? We are arguing over 15 per cent. There was a lady at that conference who stood up and she read off a list of names, Stewarts, Murphys, Powers, Slaneys, Brakes, all Newfoundland names, and she said, 'These are all Newfoundlanders who have moved to Nova Scotia and are fishing out of Nova Scotia. Then you get Eric Miller from Fortune who stands up and says, 'What happens?' He said, 'If we deny Nova Scotians to take 15 per cent of the Northern cod stock, what happens to my brother fishing on the Scotia Shelf? Does Nova Scotia turn around and say, 'No Newfoundlanders are going to fish off the Scotia Shelf'? I mean, what happens if we become so provincial and we turn completely inward? What happens to the thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders who are out in Alberta? What happens to the thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders who are in Toronto or Nova Scotia or Boston? You know, I heard the ridiculous suggestion from the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) during the Estimates Committee - he said, 'We are going to eliminate - just get this, Mr. Speaker, he actually said this - 'We are going to eliminate unemployment in Newfoundland.' This is the first thing the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower is going to do. He is going to eliminate unemployment in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. That is fine. Whatever the hon. minister can do to eliminate unemployment in Newfoundland, I am all for it, Mr. Speaker. But then he went on to say

MR. L. THOMS: that with the oil and gas offshore, he is going to eliminate the unemployment in Newfoundland and then he is going to take a grand tour of Canada and the United States and he is going to knock on every Newfoundlander's door in Halifax, in Toronto, in Alberta, in Vancouver, in Boston, in New York and Palm Desert, California, and he will probably take a trip over to the Carribean and see if there are any Newfoundlanders hanging around over there, and, Mr. Speaker, he is going to invite them all to come back to Newfoundland. He is going to invite them all back to Newfoundland then.

MR. S. NEARY: For what? And then ask the Government of Canada, the agency of the Province, to give them social assistance.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of a more ridiculous situation than that? And, Mr. Speaker, these are the people who are governing this Province today. No wonder they want to abdicate and ask the Liberal Party to form a government - no wonder they should abdicate and ask the Liberal Party to form a government. But to make a suggestion as foolish and as ridiculous as the one made by the Minister of Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn)! I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that after the Minister of Manpower brings back all those thousands upon thousands upon thousands of Newfoundlanders, that he will at least have the decency to write to these towns and communities and thank them for having the Newfoundlanders there for so long. Of course, Mr. Speaker, he may also get a surprise. He may find that there are some Newfoundlanders who do not want to come back, who would not come back and live under a Tory administration, and that would be an excellent reason.

MR. S. NEARY: Tory times are hard times.

MR. L. THOMS: So, Mr. Speaker, we do have a conflict with Ottawa. We have a conflict with Nova Scotia. We have a conflict between the Newfoundlanders versus Newfoundlanders over the Northern cod issue. We have a running battle, albeit in lots of respects, valid, between Newfoundland and Quebec. And now, Mr. Speaker, in the city of St. John's today we have a conflict with our Royal Newfoundland Constabulary

MR. L. THOMS: where we have seen a stubborn -
probably the worst handled situation this Province has ever seen.

MR. S. NEARY: The minister should resign.

MR. L. THOMS: There is no question about that,
the minister should resign. As a matter of fact, the Premier of this
Province should ask for his resignation. He has bungled it right from
the start. Right from the start he got on his

MR. L. THOMS: high horse and he said, "I am not going to speak to the Brotherhood of Police, who do they think they are, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to tell the government of this Province what to do or how to act, no siree, not while I am Mr. Justice or not," he says. Well, how puerile -

MR. BARRETT: When did he say that?

MR. L. THOMS: He has been saying it all week

MR. S. NEARY: Thursday and Friday, the whole week.

MR. L. THOMS: Your problem is you sit next to him and you can not hear him.

MR. S. NEARY: You were not here. You were out looking after Crosbie's interests when he said that.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: - a problem, we have a walkout and we have the city of St. John's policed by the RCMP today simply because the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) decided that there was nobody, he had to be obstinate about it, purely and simply obstinate - the problem can be resolved before six o'clock, before this House adjourns, the police problem can be solved and without removing Mr. Coady I might add.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How?

MR. L. THOMS: All we need is a Minister of Justice who is not on his high horse, who is not obstinate, you know, who will get the interested parties together. All he has to do is sit down with the Police Chief, sit down with the President of the Brotherhood and himself and it can be worked out. There is nothing that can - the problem is the Minister of Justice will not talk to anybody unless it is to his law partner who sits next to him there. I doubt very much whether he would confide in the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). Certainly if he wants sensible advice he would not because he is not going to get it from the Minister of Finance. But that is all he has to do, Mr. Speaker, that is all he has got to do and this problem would

MR. L. THOMS: be resolved.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do a flip flop.

MR. L. THOMS: Look, it is the Tories who are so good at flip-flopping. Do you want me to list the flip-flops the Tories have done? Why do you think Joe Clark was turffed out?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. THOMS: Because he did so many -

MR. S. NEARY: He had no chin.

MR. L. THOMS: - flip flops. I will flip flop again tomorrow.

MR. S. NEARY: He should have grown a beard.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! I wish to remind the member his time is up.

MR. L. THOMS: Already; What, thirty minutes gone already, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time is up.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) eleven.

MR. L. THOMS: I could not get leave to carry on for another thirty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: I would like to make a few comments on the Budget debate, I have not to this point in time and needless to say, we all need to. I will be a few minutes.

Needless to say, I think it is important, having listened to the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) expound great Liberal theories, that somebody on this side of the House get up and say a few words about the positive aspects that have been happening in this Province over the past year and indeed over the past few years.

The hon. member indeed quoted me correctly in saying that it was my aim to eliminate unemployment in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: And there should be no greater aim than that.

MR. J. DINN: Surely the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) agrees with his former, former, former, former leader, the hon. J.R., Mr. Speaker, Sure that is what is his main claim to fame was jobs, jobs, jobs. The only difference, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not going to create jobs by burning boats.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: Now, there are some jobs in that, one needs a match and some other small implements and one can get out and burn boats and, I suppose, you could employ one or two people in Newfoundland and eventually get all the boats burnt. And that could be, I suppose, a job creation programme funded by the federal government and we would be back in shape again. Now, the hon. member criticized the government for some of the legislation we brought in and I can understand the hon. member, he would not want to be in government and have an Environmental Assessment Act. He would not want environmental assessment sure, good heavens anything that was done in Newfoundland before 1971, it was done without any environmental assessment. The Upper Churchill was done and ERCO was done and the iron ore mines in Western Labrador, that was all done albeit it is costing us dollars now is just to find out what these various things are costing the Province. It is costing us millions to study, to get some control, to make sure that some of these companies clean up their act. That is what is happening, half of the time the

MR. J. DINN:

Ministry of the Environment is out policing and making sure that these people clean up their act. Now, he would not want environmental assesment in this Province. Sure, there would be absolutely no need for an arts council in this Province. The hon. member does not want arts in this Province. If you are unemployed after you burn all the boats, obviously everybody is going to be unemployed because fishery is the mainstay in this Province.

MR. BARRETT:

(Inaudible)

MR. J. DINN:

After all the boats are burned you certainly will not need an arts council. You will not need an arts council. You will not need a new flag. Certainly you do not need that. My God, we have been subservient for 400 years, we would not want to fly anything that would be distinctively Newfoundland, We should cower under somebody elses flag. That should be our situation. We do not want a higher minimum wage in the Province. You should not have that. My God, we should go back to 1961 for \$1.20 an hour.

MR. BARRETT:

The good old days. Good Liberal times.

MR. DINN:

\$1.20. We should go back to the \$1.20 an hour.

MR. STAGG:

Six cents a day.

MR. DINN:

Six cents a day is what the hon. member would have us go back to. That is all Ottawa would give us. 500,000 if you devide the budget we are getting from Ottawa now, over 500,000 souls 570,000 souls, you would get the six cents an hour again, we would be back to that.

So the hon. member would not want any increases in minimum wage. Surely he would not fight for that. He would sit in his corner and let it all happen.

MR. BARRETT: He does not want Workers' Compensation for fishermen either.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I kind of skipped over the flag awfully quick but it was the hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms) who was a member of the Select Committee that went out to choose a new design for a flag, decided on which design we should have come in and presented it to the House and then claimed that we were trying to push the design down his throat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.'

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard such nonsense in all your life? This has been the topic of debate ever since the flag has been passed. The hon. member for Grand Bank, one of the senior members on the Select Committee who went around this Province and listened to all the briefs, got the Select Committee to ask one of the top Newfoundland designers to design a flag, brought it into the House and then when he saw a little bit of pressure coming from various areas in the Province he said, 'I do not want anybody to push that flag down my throat'. It was his flag. It was his design. He was on that Select Committee, and he did not want it pushed down his throat. So with that kind of logic, Mr. Speaker, it makes no wonder that there is nobody going to get up and laud the hon. member for Grand Bank. The biggest contribution he has made was the fact that he had been screaming for select committees. We put him on a select committee, he made a decision, brought it into the House and when he saw a little bit of pressure he said "Nobody is going to push that down my throat.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have not intentions of pushing anything down the hon. members throat.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He cannot even get it down his own throat.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not need Occupational Health and Safety.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where would you suggest?

MR. DINN: Sure I suppose—the hon. member could stick it wherever he deemed it necessary ;

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: We do not want occupational health

MR. J. DINN: and safety in this Province we should not have that. We should let the people - Here is an hon. member who represents a district in which St. Lawrence is and he does not think it is important that we have occupational health and safety legislation in this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear anything as ridiculous in all your life as that, as silly and as foolish? In this Province, you do not need occupational health and safety.

MR. BARRETT: Say no. Get up and say no.

MR. J. DINN: Well, that is silly legislation -

MR. BARRETT: Oh, yes.

MR. J. DINN: -that the government is bringing in amendments to that, that is silly. We should have more mines developed. When any company comes in and knocks on the door, when John C. comes in and knocks on the door and he says 'I want to start a mine'. Well sure, all we got to do is say 'yes boy, do whatever you want they are only Newfoundlanders'. We should not fight for occupational health and safety legislation, we should allow them to be poisoned. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody on this side of the House calling any hon. members opposite traitors, sure that would be

MR. DINN: unparliamentary and Your Honour would call us to order for that, But what we are saying is that some things are important. We do not need Workers' Compensation for fishermen. Well, sure, that was a silly piece of legislation. We have done nothing since we came in here. You know, Occupational Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation for fishermen, well, how silly and ridiculous is that for a government to bring in. Well, sure let them go out in their burnt boats and drown. What odds! They are only fishermen. What about the children and the wives that are left home? Give them nothing.

MR. BARRETT: They do not need it in Grand Bank.

MR. DINN: They do not need any of this foolishness like Workers' Compensation for fishermen. That is a foolish and a silly piece of legislation for government to bring in. The hon. member for Grand Bank gets up in this House without thinking, I am sure, I mean, he is not thinking. Certainly there is no hon. member who could stand in this House of Assembly and say what the hon. member for Grand Bank said and claim that he thought about what he said. He did not sit down and think it out and rationalize and say that this piece of legislation, that amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act was silly and foolish and we did nothing in here. It only covers 23,000 fishermen in this Province and their families. Well, what a foolish piece of legislation for a government to bring in, the likes of which was never heard of before, that a government should bring in legislation to protect our fishermen. Sure, why would we need to protect our fishermen? If we burnt all the boats, we would not have any fishermen. I can understand his logic and there is a certain amount of logic in it. You burn your boats, you do not have any fishermen, so you do not need Workers' Compensation for fishermen.

DR. COLLINS: You burn your boats because you do not have any fish, you give away the fish first.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, so you do not burn your boats. We have a government here now that says do not burn boats, build boats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

We have a government that says if you have fishermen in those newly built boats that they should have Workers' Compensation so that if anything happens to them their wives and families are protected, a foolish thing to have but, I mean, that is the way this government believes. Now, Mr. Speaker, now that you have your boat built and now that you can go out and fish, sure it is foolish for a government to think that the fish off our coast should be there for our fishermen. What a silly and foolish government to think that! We should give that away. Now we gave it away to the foreigners. Nobody squawked about that. It took Walter Carter and a few people in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, to circulate a petition and wake up 'Romeo' and the boys, to wake him up so that we got a 200-mile limit -

MR. STAGG:

And do not forget the unanimous resolution of this House.

MR. DINN:

- and a unanimous resolution of this House. Now, why should we protect the Northern cod stock or demand that that Northern cod stock be for Newfoundland fishermen? What a silly, foolish thing to ask Ottawa to think about! We had a person in the university on the weekend at the convocation, he said that Alberta made it because they had the oil resource and that it has brought their economy to such a point that, if the oil were gone now, their economy would be so diversified that they could still be one of the leaders in Canada. Well, is it not foolish for this government to want ownership and control of our oil and gas? Well, what a foolish government that we have here in this Province today to want ownership and control of our natural resources so that maybe one of these days we could be well-off.

MR. BARRETT:

We would rather have the handout tomorrow.

MR. DINN:

Well, I think that is foolish and silly and greedy -

MR. BARRETT: Equalization payments are much better.

MR. DINN: Oh, yes, equalization payments, these are the things that we should be working towards.

MR. BARRETT: Certainly. Also the social programs.

MR. DINN: Oh, yes, the social programs, let us get all of those. Let us not get anybody up working and proud of their heritage. There is nothing in Arts Councils, Occupational Health and Safety, Environmental Assessment, new flag, higher minimum wages. We do not need to protect our inshore fishermen. We do not want the offshore oil and gas. That is the policy of hon. members opposite, because if we get that we will be able to call our own shots.

MR. STAGG: A bunch of flag wavers.

MR. J. DINN:

They are not a bunch of flag wavers on the Opposition side. If it were left to them they would not have a flag to wave, Mr. Speaker.

Now, to hon. members opposite we want to make it quite clear about what the position of this government is. Number one is we believe that we own and we should control offshore oil and gas and the resources under the sea to the edge of the Continental Shelf and we want to do that because we believe it is ours, and we think that with that we can protect and develop our renewable resources. Number two, the Northern cod stock, which was fished by Newfoundland fishermen for 400 or 500 years, should be for those people along the Northeast Coast and any fish caught out there should be brought to the plants so that instead of working 40 per cent of the time they would be working 50 per cent or 60 per cent or 70 per cent of the time so they could be economically viable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN:

That is the position of this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the position of this government is also that we do not just forget the fact that we have to develop economically, but we have to develop socially; thus, we need Arts Councils, thus we need other things in this Province. And this government intends to bring in these things and we would hope that hon. members opposite, who have been elected to come in here and fight for their people in their constituencies, would support in those areas that they believe they should support and be in opposition, constructively criticize those things that they do not believe in. Do not criticize ownership of offshore oil and gas. Do not call us separatists because we are fighting for our rights. That was what we were elected to do. We had an election last June on those issues and won on that basis.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN:

And we do not need another election this year. But I can guarantee you this, that the more we speak, the more the people of Newfoundland and Labrador hear what we are saying, that time is

MR. J. DINN: on our side, and in the next election, we may have to appoint an Opposition if hon. members opposite do not change their minds.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: Suppose the Liberals have a convention and nobody wins 'Jerry', what happens then?

MR. J. DINN: Well, if the Liberals have a convention and nobody wins it would probably be the brightest thing that ever happened to the Liberal Party in Newfoundland since 1949. The hon. member asked me a question, Mr. Speaker, and I had to answer it.

MR. L. THOMS: Does the hon. member have a mind to change?

MR. J. DINN: The hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) is back in his place - the hon. member who just had thirty minutes to speak and it was enough because there is no way, Mr. Speaker, he can put a position across where the people of Newfoundland are going to believe the hon. member anymore. His credibility is totally shot, destroyed. Mr. Speaker, he just cannot do it. There is one thing the people of Newfoundland do not go along with. You get in a group of seven people and you agree that this is the case, you agree that this is what you should do and you put that case forward and when you get a little bit of opposition, to turn tail, to turncoat - that is what the people of Newfoundland do not want in their member.

MR. L. THOMS: The turncoat is on the other side.

MR. J. DINN: That is what the people of Newfoundland do not want and there is no way the hon. member is going to convince the people of Newfoundland that this government side of the House shoved it down the hon. member's throat. It was his design and the people of Newfoundland know it was his design. And Mr. Speaker, there is no way, and the hon. member knows it. If the hon. member told everything about what happened during the flag debate, the hon. member would tell us of an incident that happened over in the Aquarena, a little bit of discussion over there about the flag, and the hon. member looking for somebody to support him and could not find one, Mr. Speaker.

June 2, 1980

Tape 2000

EC - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN:

The hon. member did not tell that during the debate. But I want to tell some other positive things that happened

MR. L. THOMS:

Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Point of order. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

Sit down boy, I have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has alluded to something which is supposed to have taken place over at the Aquarena. I cannot ever remember discussing the flag at the Aquarena with anybody on any

MR. THOMS:

serious note, maybe the minister could tell us a little more about it. He must be running out of something to say now.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, that was a foolish -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

To the point of order?

MR. DINN:

Yes. That was -

MR. THOMS:

You raised it.

MR. DINN:

- not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS:

You raised it.

MR. DINN:

That was not a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was as good as the one you had earlier.

MR. DINN:

I do not have to present an argument against that point of order, Mr. Speaker. You know that that, Mr. Speaker, is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order there is no point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

The hon. members, Mr. Speaker, should read a copy of the rules, just the simple rules of the House. He knows that he cannot get me down in my seat to stay on a silly point of order like that. **your** Honour will call him to order immediately, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should also know a few facts about Newfoundland. Now, hon. members opposite have been claiming that employment wise in Newfoundland we have been losing the battle. Nothing could be further from the truth. The hon. member, the critic for Labour and Manpower who did not attend one minute in the Committee stages and is not here now during the Budget, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who was not here in the Committee stages when I went through seven hours, I believe, of grueling questioning from all members of the Committee, did not even attend a minute, Mr. Speaker, at the Committee meetings and did not ask questions. But the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) was there. He was there and asked questions.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is employment over the past year, when December comes and the final statistics are in, I will report on the average employment increase, 1980 over 1979. Until that time I will not speculate. I will say that the employment rate this year will be higher than the employment rate was last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

But, Mr. Speaker, there was a target last year. The hon. Premier said we would get 40,000 jobs in five years and the target last year was 8,100. There were supposed to be 40,500 jobs and the target, a simple little bit of mathematics indicates that the target should be 8,100. Now, Mr. Speaker, 8,100 would be what you would aim for if you had 40,500 jobs to get in five years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to this House that the average in 1979 was over 9,000 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Now, I would like to tell hon. members opposite what it was in 1980 and I probably will in 1981, when we have all the statistics in. And I will probably tell them in 1982.

MR. STAGG:

And 1991.

MR. DINN:

And I will probably tell them in 1991 what they were in 1990 because the hon. members opposite, if they continue with their foolish policies, will never get an opportunity to be able to tell me, Mr. Speaker, because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS:

Go down in Goose Bay and tell them about the jobs you got.

MR. DINN:

Hear the hon. member! Hear the hon. member! This was the old and great last Liberal gasp, the Linerboard Mill. Created a few jobs in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and, Mr. Speaker, it could never have worked. Everyone agrees, any expert in the field knows that it never could have worked. And now, Mr. Speaker, this October we will have a new newsprint mill in Stephenville that will work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Why will it work? It will work because we certainly have the resource. It will work because we will not have to cut the log in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and put it on a boat and bring it down and then develop it in Stephenville and then load it aboard a boat again and then sell it somewhere else. Mr. Speaker, every economist, every reasonable person in the Province, every expert in the field indicated that there was no way the Stephenville Mill could work as a linerboard operation. There was no way it could work, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite should know. And now the hon. member for Torngat (MR. Warren) is here, the great debator is back in his seat, not in his seat but he is back in the House and he was wondering last week, "What are you doing about offshore oil and gas jobs in Labrador?". Mr. Speaker, that is what he asked. "What is the hon. minister doing about offshore oil and gas jobs in Labrador? Why is the hon. minister discriminating against the people in Labrador? Why does he not get some jobs for the people in Labrador in the offshore?" Well, I told the hon. member that it was very important for him as a member to indicate -

MR. STAGG:

His federal member is trying

to give it away, that is why.

MR. DINN:

It is very important for the hon. member to make sure that we have advertised in all the papers in the Province about how you make application. We need the names in the Department of Labour and Manpower so that if somebody is looking for people to work in the offshore we

MR. J. DINN: have the names available of people in the area. So, Mr. Speaker, what did the companies do? Well, the dirty old oil companies what they did was first of all they advertised. And then when they did not get enough reaction from the hon. member's district they got the list, the 6,000 names, from the Department of Labour and Manpower and went through the list and said, we have three rigs offshore. They went through the list and they ticked off all the names of all the people in Labrador who were looking for jobs in the offshore. And what did they do then, Mr. Speaker? The dirty old oil companies, in trying to conform to our regulations, called all of them individually, or wrote them individually to ask them if they would be willing, are they ready, would they work for the companies in the offshore. And, Mr. Speaker, they did it all individually. Now, Mr. Speaker, what did they say? Well, Mr. Speaker, all of the replies -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: Now, the hon. member obviously knows nothing about what is going on in his district and he wants me to tell him everything that is going on in his district. Well, I cannot be involved in every fifty-two districts in the Province and tell hon. members - I would be wasting the time of the House -

MR. WARREN: (inaudible) hundred jobs.

MR. J. DINN: - to come in here in the House of Assembly

MR. WARREN: (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: and to relate to the hon. member everything that happened in his district. But, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: - people in the Torngat who were contacted replied, and, Mr. Speaker, some of them positively and some of them negatively. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, if he had, when the regulations were outlined, when he was elected here in this House, taken a positive approach, he would have gotten more people registered, and thus the oil companies would know of more people in the Torngat and on the Coast of

MR. J. DINN: Labrador, to contact and next year we may have been able to report that the three rigs that were working for Petrocan off the Labrador Coast, all the people who were employed were employed from Labrador.

MR. G. WARREN: You are all St. John's.

MR. J. DINN: But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite did not do his job and he is over there now trying to make excuses by shouting in the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: He did not do his job. He was offered assistance to do the job. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not do the job. He has mail-outs that he can put four or five times a year. Every member has that capability. The hon. member did not do it, Mr. Speaker. He could have done a mail-out six times since he got elected last year. I do not know how many he did. But he certainly could have put the information with respect to registering for the offshore in the mail so that his constituents would know what was going on and how they could register. Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite, every time I get up to speak, try to interrupt, they try to shout me down, they know it is unparliamentary, they know it is not proper according to the rules of the House, they continue to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to sit down and take my place and wait for the great debater from the Torngat to get up and lay his case forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what was all that about?

I have never heard in my life, Mr. Speaker, such an acute case of constipation of thought and diarrhea of words and ideas from an individual member in this House, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we do not need the Minister of Labour and Manpower to ask us and try to impress the House about how silly and foolish he is, he has already demonstrated it in his speech here this afternoon. I have never heard such ranting and roaring, Mr. Speaker, from an individual

MR. F. ROWE:

member across the House. The member is beside himself. He did not make one single point that made any sense whatsoever. Now, Mr. Speaker, now that all the turbulent violence is settled down I hope that I can make a few points with respect to the fiscal strategy of this government, and the overall policy of the government with respect to the fisheries in particular.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it has already been established by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) earlier and to my surprise Mr. Speaker, to my surprise it was not that widely publicized, but it has already been established by the Minister of Fisheries that they have, in fact, dropped their five year fisheries program. The minister has admitted it on two occasions in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, once during the Question Period, I believe, and once during the concurrent debates.

MR. HOLLETT: We are going to get the New Testament.

MR. F. ROWE: That is a \$500 million dollar five year programme for which - and we are in the second year of it now - for which no money has been spent, no money has been spent. The superport concept has been dropped and we have had no indication as to what has been left or what is left of the overall fisheries strategies program. Well, so be it Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members opposite are not going to indicate to this hon. House what their strategy is with respect to the fisheries I can assure them opposite that they are not going to fall for the camouflage of this Northern cod stock resolution, nor the screaming and the yelling about offshore oil and gas, because that is all it is Mr. Speaker. Hon. members opposite, and the Premier in particular, I do not know what public relations firm they have employed to work out their strategy but let it be heard that they have failed dismally, they have failed entirely to provide for the basic needs of this Province under the previous P.C. administration that they keep referring to, and under the present P.C. administration. And they are going out of their way, Mr. Speaker, to camouflage their inactivity their lack of success by dredging up day after day, little press releases, little digs, little pamphlets, T.V. appearances, threats and everything else around two issues, the Northern cod stock on which we basically agree, and on the offshore oil and gas which was first advocated, not a difference, by the Smallwood administration. My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has heard the same stand on offshore oil and gas repeated under the Smallwood

MR. F. ROWE: administration that is being repeated under the present administration with one exception, the style, the style. The only difference is the style Mr. Speaker, This hon. crowd over there are taking a great confrontation tactic with Ottawa, they are taking a separatist tactic with Ottawa. We saw the Premier on T.V., nationally, talking about the federal government should be an agent of the provincial governments. And the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) keeps trying to ask them - keeps asking, Are we silly, are we foolish on these things? Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker that that is the silliest and most foolish statement that I have ever heard come from a head of state or a head of province anywhere in the Western democratic world, where a federal government should be the agency or the agent of a provincial government. If you carry that kind of logic to its final conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that would mean that the Premier and the administration opposite should be the agents for the various local governments, the municipalities throughout this province.

I have never heard, Mr. Speaker, anything so absolutely foolish in my life.

MR. NEARY: Write the cheques, and pay the bills but you are only our agent.

MR. F. ROWE: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Minister for Labour and Manpower gets up and takes a few cheap swipes at burning your boats

MR. F. ROWE: and this kind of a thing. It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, how hon. members opposite can repeat falsehoods and myths of the past, both pre and post confederate past, with the Liberals and not mention one thing about their own past, their own sorry, miserable, dismal and corrupt seven or eight years of the previous Moores administration. Not a word about that, not a word about that. We do not hear them repeating now, Mr. Speaker, about the Resettlement Program of the previous Liberal administration because they know what our answer is for that, it is their resettlement program to Alberta and over across the Atlantic. Never before, Mr. Speaker, have we seen such a resettlement program as since 1971-72, when we had people being resettled out of this Province, not being moved into communities where they can get hospitals and decent schools and a decent education and that sort of a thing. And now, Mr. Speaker, talking about resettlement, we are going to resettle them all in the Avalon region.

Mr. Speaker, going back to this whole business of the fisheries strategy for the next five years, of which two have already passed, and the dropping of the superport concept for Harbour Grace or any other place in this Province, I want the government, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Let us get that straight. It has to be dropped. The press are reporting that it is just being postponed or it is going to be developed. The fact of the matter is it has been dropped.

MR. F. ROWE: It has been dropped. The people of Harbour Grace have been conned, Mr. Speaker. The people in the area of that part of the East Coast have been conned. There were beautiful coloured pamphlets put out a couple of years ago. We had a seminar in the Holiday Inn when the then minister Walter Carter announced this great fisheries program and that is where it began and that is where it ended, Mr. Speaker. But that is not the point I wanted to make, the fact that the people of that area were conned.

MR. NEARY: The superport is dead.

MR. F. ROWE: It is dead as a dead duck, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want the government to do is to find out and indicate to this House who spent the money and how it was spent, under what department of government it was spent for the land acquisition and the site preparation in Harbour Grace, or else somebody on the opposite side get up and say that the minister of the day, Walter Carter, lied to this House of Assembly. You can only have it one way. Either the minister of the day, Walter Carter, either he lied to the House of Assembly when he answered my question in saying that site preparation was ongoing, the Premier said - that is Premier Moores - site preparation was ongoing - that very first year after the announcement - was ongoing, land acquisition was taking place. Yet, in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat it again, ad nauseam if necessary, I repeat that not one red copper was spent under the Department of Fisheries, under that particular corporation for land acquisition in the last year or the last two years, nor was it spent for site preparation. Now, either the minister of the day or the Premier of the day was lying to this House, Mr. Speaker, or there was misappropriation of funds, misappropriation of funds, because if land acquisition did take place, if site preparation did take place, where did the money come from? It did not come from the Department of Fisheries, it did not come from the Department of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Confederation Trust.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is time for a - unless we get answers from hon. members opposite, I would submit that there should be a full-fledged investigation into every aspect of anything that occurred in the Harbour Grace region in the last three or four years.

MR. NEARY: Do not forget the Birch Hills investment.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like to know all about these things,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) investment.

MR. F. ROWE: I probably have not done the research that
my friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) has done -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: - but it is passing strange when you are
told that there is site preparation going on and land acquisition going
on, to find out that there was no expenditure for that in the Department
of Fisheries under that particular head which was the Fisheries
Development Corporation of Newfoundland. They set aside the miserable
sum of \$100,000 and spent zero in 1979-80 and in 1980-81 they got the
great sum of \$1,000, Mr. Speaker, what that is for I have no idea,
operating grant of \$1,000.

MR. G. WARREN: That was for a party.

MR. F. ROWE: \$1,000 for the Fisheries Development
Corporation, the functions of the Crown corporation are to co-ordinate
the development of a primary landing and distribution centre which does
not exist.

MR. B. TULK: That was to get hair tonic for the minister.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, we got \$1,000 for operating.

MR. G. WARREN: That was money for a party in Harbour
Grace.

AN HON. MEMBER: You know better than that.

MR. F. ROWE: I know better than that, you are damn right,
I know better than that, Mr. Speaker. \$1,000 estimated the first year,
zero dollars spent, land acquisition and site preparations supposedly
going on and \$1,000 there this year for something that does not exist. I
think these questions should be answered, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the government or hon.
members opposite can not indicate that the Premier of the day or the
Fisheries Minister of the day, Mr. Moores or Mr. Carter, were either
lying or there was a misappropriation of funds, funds were spent under
another department,

MR. H. BARRETT: There is no need for that.

MR. F. ROWE: There is a need for that

MR. F. STAGG: It looks bad in the headlines.

MR. S. NEARY: Dunphy looked after all of that.

MR. G. WARREN: Oh, yes, that is right.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not looking for headlines. Hon. members opposite should know better than that, the number of times I have spoken in this House and got headlines.

MR. G. WARREN: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower tried it (inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Hon. members opposite should know that I am not a headline sinker but I am concerned about people getting off and blowing their horns and sucking the people of Newfoundland in just before an election with a \$500 million promise for a fisheries programme for this Province and they come in a year later, less than a year later - the 18th of June - come in less than a year later and say, 'Oh, all that \$500 million, forget about that. That was the previous administration, forget about that.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. ROWE: Not to mention the fact that we had a \$54 million scandal in the Fisheries Loan Board -

MR. S. NEARY: I am surprised that they fired a fellow who was a hangover from the former administration today.

MR. G. WARREN: No.

MR. S. NEARY: I am really surprised they fired him.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want a full fledged investigation launched into this fact; if there was land acquired, who acquired it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Somebody.

MR. F. ROWE: From whom was it acquired?

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: For what purpose was it acquired?

MR. S. NEARY: For 'Frankie' baby.

MR. F. ROWE: Was it acquired for fisheries development? Was it land speculation for some sort of potential happenings in the oil industry? Was there land speculation on the part of some individuals for some other purposes?

MR. F. STAGG: Speculation, indeed.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a lawyer, he should be able to answer these types of hypothetical questions. I may be talking about legalities here but what I am more concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the way the taxpayers' money is being spent and the fact that we had the people of Harbour Grace being hoodwinked, conned into believing that this administration opposite was going to provide a great new superport.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite will have their opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker, and I ask for the portection of the Chair from that unsavoury character representing St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. F. ROWE: He runs out of the House, Mr. Speaker, to pull a few weeds and comes back to the House and gets a few snarky comments back in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. ROWE: - if he wants to pull weeds, Mr. Speaker, I suggest he start right here in the House on the opposite side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sadly disappointed for the people of this Province

MR. F. ROWE:

whose expectations were raised. Everybody and his dog, Mr. Speaker, in the rural parts of this Province, before the last election and right up until quite recently, were encouraged to get into the fishing industry, were encouraged to get into the fisheries. And day after day, Mr. Speaker, I get -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence. I would ask all hon. members, on both sides of the House, to allow the gentleman to proceed in silence. That is his right.

The hon. member for Trinity-

Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Look,

I am sincerely sorry for the people of this Province who were led to believe that there was a great future in the fishery. Now, that is not to say that I do not still believe that there is a great future for the fishery, the people in the fishery in this Province. There is a great future for the fisheries in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite are guilty of one fundamental sin and that is raising the expectations of the people in this Province and encouraging too many people to go into the fisheries. Even the hon. Minister of the Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has acknowledged this fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is an overprocessing capacity, that there is an overcatching capacity. There are endangered species. Yet year after year after year up until quite recently, when they realized there was a scandal in the Fisheries Loan Board, hon. members realized that there were too many people entering the fisheries. We got a new set of regulations, Mr. Speaker, which I can say at least are regulations. We do not have the sorry, sad, dismal situation where we have a Minister of Fisheries circumventing the Fisheries Loan Board and approving of loan applications on his own and then when the Fisheries Loan Board goes bankrupt he turns around and blames it on the Fisheries Loan Board. We do not have that situation. At least we have a set of regulations. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that these regulations are designed for more

MR. F. ROWE:

than just trying to put some order with respect to the processing of the applications in the Fisheries Loan Board. Let me be heard, Mr. Speaker, these regulations, new Fisheries Loan Board regulations are designed for more than stabilizing and putting some order in the processing of the applications coming before the Fisheries Loan Board. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental reasons for these new regulations is to keep people out of the fisheries, is to keep people who already have applications before the Fisheries Loan Board, to make sure that their applications never see the light of day as far as processing is concerned and as far as approvals are concerned. Because, Mr. Speaker, I have gotten hundreds of phone calls, I have had numerous constituents and people outside of my own constituency come into my office and explain to me ways that these new regulations have put the blocks to them as far as having their applications approved is concerned and having their provincial boundaries approved is concerned. Hundreds of fishermen, Mr. Speaker, who a year ago and two years ago and three years ago were being urged to go into the fisheries by previous - this administration. I cannot say the previous administration, it is the same bunch over there. They have a new leader who sat in that same Cabinet encouraging hundreds and thousands of people in this Province to get bigger boats, get bigger longliners and at the same time they talk about the importance of the inshore fishermen, encouraging new people, new entrants into the fisheries and this year it caught up with them. Too many people in the fisheries, overcatching capacity, over processing capacity, money run out. And this document, Mr. Speaker, these new regulations, which took the form of a thirteen page Ministerial Statement, I say did more than put order in the Fisheries Loan Board, it is ordering people out of the fisheries. They have been overregulated,

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker. Now I am not one to condone the actions of the government and the way that they dealt with the applications. It was a crime, Mr. Speaker, an absolute crime the way these applications were dealt with. When a minister of the Crown has coming over his desk a bunch of applications which he approves of, with the Fisheries Loan Board not sitting - in fact, having been fired, the Fisheries Loan Board goes bankrupt - I am not one to condone that kind of activity, I am one to ask for some semblance of regulations.

But this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, these new regulations and I will get into it in detail, these are good sound -

MR. BARRETT: They are good, sound regulations.

MR. F. ROWE: Right on, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite is right on. These are good, sound regulations to stop new entrants into the fisheries, number one, and to keep some people who are already in the fisheries from progressing in the fisheries. I had an example, for example, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when a constituent of mine sent a note into me and I whipped out to see him for a few minutes and that poor person, Mr. Speaker, who has been in the fishing industry for four years, got a \$1,600 fisheries loan four years ago, a \$600 provincial bounty, now wants to get a longliner, along with his brother and a few other crew members, in the vicinity of thirteen to fourteen tons. Mr. Speaker, he has a loan before the Fisheries Loan Board and is told that he cannot qualify for the provincial bounty, which is \$1,000 per ton for that classification of a boat, cannot qualify for a \$13,000 provincial bounty because he got a \$600 bounty four years ago, because they have changed their regulations. Mr. Speaker, from four years to

MR. F. ROWE: eight years. Now you have to wait for eight years and the poor fisherman, Mr. Speaker, who has been in the fishing boat now for four years, a bona fide fisherman, a young man, along with his brother, wants to progress in the fishing industry, being encouraged by this administration, he has even gotten on his knees to the Fisheries Loan Board and said, 'Look I will pay back the \$600, if it will make any difference, in order to qualify for the provincial bounty for his longliner.

MR. D. HOLLETT: They are leaving him to drown in his punt.

MR. F. ROWE: So as my hon. friend for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) just mentioned, they are leaving him to drown in his punt. And that is exactly what is happening. That hon. crowd over there, Mr. Speaker, with their new set of regulations are leaving some of the fishermen in this Province to drown in their little punts, because that is all some of them could start off with.

MR. HODDER: The worst Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) we ever had.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have never seen anything so - I cannot find the word for it - so abysmal in my life, so misleading to the people of this Province - and that is not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, it is unparliamentary to say that an hon. member is misleading the House and misleading - but this government, particularly during election campaigns, the party over there which they represent, misled the people as far as the fisheries of this Province is concerned.

MR. F. ROWE: We are coming to the time, Mr. Speaker - last year if I had to have said this I would have been accused of not being a Newfoundlander, but we are coming to the time now where the fishery has -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. BARRETT: You are not a fisherman.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: I was talking about the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly while the member opposite was still working for Crosbie's -

AN HON. MEMBER: He still is.

MR. F. ROWE: - and still is. So I feel as qualified as the hon. member to talk about the fisheries. And I would invite him to get up and speak on the fisheries afterwards and ask him why he joined the party that broke the fundamental promise of providing a cheap fisheries gear insurance programme to the fishermen of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am so fed up with this administration that I am going to move an amendment of non-confidence in it that all the words after 'that' be deleted and replaced with the following: 'This House regrets the inability of the government to develop and present positive programmes to cope adequately with the problems which concern the people of Newfoundland and Labrador', seconded by my colleague and friend, the M.H.A. for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The amendment is that all the words after the word 'that' be deleted and replaced with the following:
"This House regrets the inability of the government to develop and present positive programs to cope adequately with the problems which concern the people of Newfoundland and Labrador". The amendment is in order.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before my hon. colleague carries on with his amendment -

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order?

MR. NEARY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the rules of this House is that you cannot bring objects in and put on your desk. Well, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) just came in with a can of gingerale, poured it into his glass and is now over there gulping it down. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you want to get a drink of water in this House you send for one of the pages. If we allow this thing - well, I am bringing it to the attention of Your Honour because, if we allow it to happen, the next thing they will be bringing in bottles of beer and pouring them into their glass. I think Your Honour should rule on this and put a stop to it right in the beginning before it gets out of hand. It has never been done. I have been here eighteen years - the first time I have ever seen it done - a can of gingerale poured into the glass and the can thrown under the desk on the floor. This is not Robin Hood Bay, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, that ruling has been made in the past that food and beverage was not allowed in the hon. House, so I would ask the hon. member if he would remove it from the Chamber.

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

MR. THOMS: The point of order was ruled on.

MR. STAGG: A point of privilege or whatever.

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

I have ruled on the point of order, I assume the hon. member is raising another point of order.

MR. STAGG: I just want to say that certainly I am going to remove it from the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I was just -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - thirsty and came in having a little drink of gingerale but I will certainly remove it from the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member has agreed to remove the beverage.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: If the hon. member **wants to cease to be** completely a litterbug, he **will** stay out of the House **himself**

Now, Mr. Speaker, why did I move that kind of a resolution? How dare I suggest that this House regrets the inability of the government to develop and present positive programs to cope adequately with the problems which concern the people of Newfoundland and Labrador? How dare I, within one year and eight years of PC administration, how dare I question the ability of the government to develop programs in the best interests of this Province? Why do I ask that question, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will ask a question with another question. What has this administration done in the way of developing new industry in this Province since they have taken over since 1971-72? What have they done? What new industry has been created in this Province since this administration took over since 1972, 1971?

AN HON. MEMBER: Start a new (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, hon. members can get up opposite and list off the great achievements of this administration when they get up later on. I will say this, Mr. Speaker, the hon.

MR. F. ROWE: the bag of hatred over there from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), that bag of hatred for J. R. Smallwood, which keeps oozing out, keeps going back, Mr. Speaker, to the Smallwood days. Well, I will say one thing about the Smallwood administration, that they made some mistakes, they made some mistakes -

MR. CARTER: Mistakes of the heart.

MR. F. ROWE: - mistakes, and mistakes of the heart if the hon. member wants to call it that, but they had a tremendous number of achievements, Mr. Speaker, that administration, and they tried a tremendous number of things on behalf of the people of this Province. They brought the people of this Province into a new era, and the only way you can make mistakes, Mr. Speaker, is to try to do something for the people of this Province. The only way you can make mistakes is to try to do something. With the one notable exception, that crowd over there they make mistakes without doing anything, Mr. Speaker. They make mistakes without doing anything.

MR. HOLLETT: There is a lot of difference in the per capita debt rate.

MR. F. ROWE: A few years ago, Mr. Speaker, talking about the budget, we had that other bully boy, up there in Ottawa now causing all sorts of trouble, standing before this House in 1969, 1970, talking about the fact that we are on the verge of bankruptcy, the Province is finished, we are on the verge of bankruptcy because we were approaching a billion dollar debt. Well, before he was finished with the situation, Mr. Speaker, we were approaching a three billion dollar debt, a three billion dollar debt. He managed to achieve twice as much in about an eighth of the time in terms of the provincial debt of this Province. Then he has the gall to be on radio today, Mr. Speaker, the previous Minister of Finance for Canada, the previous Minister of Finance for Newfoundland, the previous Liberal minister, the previous

MR. F. ROWE: Liberal backbencher, the previous leadership candidate for the Liberals, the previous minister for the PCs,- the only party he has not joined, Mr. Speaker, is the NDP and I suppose one of these days he will probably run to them, that will be his next move.- gets up and starts talking about the restraints that the present federal government has on Newfoundland, when he was the one that froze the small craft harbours, when he was Minister of Finance, froze the small craft harbours' vote in this Province, then turned around during an election campaign and announced an increase of something like \$30 million. Mr. Speaker, this administration has failed on a number of fronts. They have failed completely and utterly. They have failed in industrial development. There has not been one major industrial development activity take place since this administration took over. There have been a number closed up, Mr. Speaker. There have been a number closed up.

MR. BARRETT: We were trying to bail out the old ones.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, if they were trying to bail out the old ones they better go back to a Mr. John Crosbie because whatever you say about the Linerboard Mill, you can blame every bit of it on John Crosbie, every single bit of it. He was responsible for the demise of the Linerboard Mill. That is the one single person in this Province, and now he is up on the Mainland, the one single Newfoundlander who is most responsible for the demise of the Linerboard Mill was John C. Crosbie. And as well, Mr. Speaker, if you can single out any person who is responsible for the demise of the Come by Chance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. F. ROWE: -Oil Refinery it has got to be John Crosbie.

MR. L. THOMS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague and friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde has requested that he be heard in silence. The member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) now has been out of this House for the last two weeks. We have had peace and quiet for two weeks. We have had good decorum in the House for two weeks. He has arrived back in his seat today full of vim and vigor and he has not stopped yapping all afternoon. So, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that my friend has a right to be heard in silence.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to that point of order, probably we can -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the member for Stephenville

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, I have been out of the House for a while. I have been back tending to certain matters in my district, representing my district. I do visit it on occasion unlike the hon. member. And I understand that while I have been away this strange metamorphosis overcame him. When I left he was flying the Newfoundland flag and when I came back he was flying his own flag or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. STAGG: So, I am glad that I am back. He might learn some sense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. With respect to the point of order, all members are aware that every hon. member has the right to be heard in silence and I would ask that members consider that rule as a tradition of this House and of parliament. The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, after that parliamentary wrangle the wind has been taken out of me and since it is approaching six o'clock I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

June 2, 1980

Tape 2009

MB - 3

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Is it agreed to call it 6:00 P.M.?

Agreed.

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
TABLED
JUNE 2, 1980

*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of Lands +
Forests, 12 June '80*

Question #29, dated Thursday, May 8, 1980.

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

- (a) Number of lots in Hawco's Pond Development, Salmonier Line.
- (b) List of names of people who were awarded lots.
- (c) What procedure was used to select names of people who received lots?
- (d) Did ordinary people have an opportunity to apply for a building lot? If so, were all applications treated equally or were some of the applicants screened or recommended by the former Minister or the former Premier?

Answers:

- (a) There are eighty-three (83) lots in the Hawco's Pond Development.
- (b) The list of successful applicants is attached; also noted is the corresponding date that the application was received by the Department.
- (c) Lots were assigned on the basis of applications on file with the Department for land in the general area. The applications were processed on the basis of the dates they were received by the Department. The applications were reviewed and screened by Departmental officials in order to determine eligibility. In the spring of 1979 three meetings were held, which allowed the applicants to select their respective lots.
- (d) The applications on file with the Department for this area represents a typical cross section of the general public. All applications were treated equally. They were not screened by either the former Minister or the former Premier, nor were there any specific applications recommended by them.

HAWCO'S POND
ELIGIBILITY LIST
DATE APPLICATION RECEIVED

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Ronald McGrath 73/03/16 | 36. Brian D. Martin 74/10/15 |
| 2. Eric Chafe 73/04/27 | 37. Margaret Mutford 74/10/16 |
| 3. Leslie Morgan 73/09/06 | 38. Heather Lester 74/11/05 |
| 4. Gerald Hannon 74/02/26 | 39. Harold J. Howell 74/11/08 |
| 5. John F. Kearsey 74/03/19 | 40. Gordon E. O'Keefe 74/11/13 |
| 6. J. Gordon O'Brien 74/03/20 | 41. Gerald S. Quigley 74/11/19 |
| 7. James Bourne 74/03/21 | 42. Charles White 74/11/21 |
| 8. Lloyd Benson 74/04/27 | 43. Kenneth Barnes 74/11/28 |
| 9. Herbert L. Day 74/05/13 | 44. David G. Clark 74/12/04 |
| 10. Neil Benson 74/05/30 | 45. Ronald G. Hughes 74/12/13 |
| 11. Paul Burt 74/06/07 | 46. Maxwell Skinner 74/12/16 |
| 12. Robert Mullins 74/07/02 | 47. Bernard J. Merchant 75/01/17 |
| 13. Estate of John Kelland 74/07/23 | 48. Robert Constantine 75/03/04 |
| 14. John Snow 74/07/23 | 49. Robert K. Halfyard 75/03/04 |
| 15. Frederick Locking 74/08/21 | 50. Bernard J. Caul 75/03/05 |
| 16. Albert Smith 74/08/30 | 51. Bruce Foss 75/03/05 |
| 17. Gloria Edwards 74/09/10 | 52. John Constantine 75/03/06 |
| 18. Milton Jackman 74/09/11 | 53. Albert R. Escott 75/03/11 |
| 19. Robert J. Smith 74/09/11 | 54. William A. Hall 75/03/13 |
| 20. George White 74/09/18 | 55. Ruby T. Harvey 75/03/14 |
| 21. Garry Brown 74/09/19 | 56. Edward Escott 75/03/14 |
| 22. Cyril Fitzpatrick 74/09/26 | 57. T. Douglas Harvey 75/03/14 |
| 23. Francis Fitzpatrick 74/09/26 | 58. Donald J. Woodford 75/03/14 |
| 24. Howard Mullaly 74/09/26 | 59. Robert G. Boland 75/03/20 |
| 25. Alexander Traverse 74/09/30 | 60. Walter H. Baird 75/03/20 |
| 26. Norman H. Brown 74/10/04 | 61. Peter R. Murphy 75/03/25 |
| 27. Leonard C. Rideout 74/10/08 | 62. James Campbell 75/04/03 |
| 28. Edward J. White 74/10/08 | 63. Wilfred E. Butler 75/04/03 |
| 29. Lawrence Diamond 74/10/09 | 64. Frederick Cook 75/04/11 |
| 30. Ronald Rose Jr. 74/10/11 | 65. Launcelot Shirley 75/04/16 |
| 31. James R. Roberts 74/10/11 | 66. Lloyd G. Hann 75/04/16 |
| 32. Brian Hanley 74/10/15 | 67. Leonard F. Hunt 75/04/18 |
| 33. Edward Furlong 74/10/15 | 68. Donald Keeping 75/04/29 |
| 34. Raymond D. Sparkes 74/10/15 | 69. John T. Murray 75/04/30 |
| 35. Arthur Wight 74/10/15 | 70. Thomas Noftall 75/05/25 |

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 71. Frederick R. Bragg 75/05/25 | 78. Kevin J. Whittle 75/07/02 |
| 72. George J. Casey 75/06/05 | 79. Frank Pretty 75/07/09 |
| 73. Reginald A. Rideout 75/06/13 | 80. Newman S. Petten 75/08/07 |
| 74. Edward B. Roderick 75/06/16 | 81. Chesley D. Martin 75/08/18 |
| 75. John F. Pugh 75/06/16 | 82. Jude E. Long 75/08/26 |
| 76. Hubert Vaughan 75/06/19 | 83. Brenda M. Dunne 75/09/05 |
| 77. Donald Oakley 75/06/24 | |