



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 51

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Thursday, 22 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of Ministerial Statements to make, the first one concerning the Labour Relations Board. I am pleased to announce at this time that the following appointments and reappointments to the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board have been approved: Mr. Gerard McDonald, Personnel Manager with Carling O'Keefe, has been appointed as alternate employer representative, and Mr. Frank Taylor, who is the Business Agent of the Retail/Wholesale and Department Store Union has been appointed as Alternate Employee Representative. These two appointments have been approved for a period of two years effective October 25, 1984.

Also, Mr. Speaker, three other appointments: Mr. William Alcock, Director of Labour Relations with the Newfoundland Construction Labour Relations Association, has been appointed Employer Representative to replace Mr. Robert Goose who recently resigned from the board; Mr. Gonzo Gillingham, the International Representative of the International Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America has been appointed Employee Representative, and Ms. Anne Fagan, Assistant Executive Director with St. Clare's Mercy Hospital, has been appointed

Alternate Employee Representative.

I am also pleased to inform the hon. House of Assembly that for the first time in the history of the Labour Relations Board a female representative has been named to the board. I am confident that the knowledge and expertise Miss Fagan has exemplified in labour relations will prove to be very beneficial in her capacity as a board member. These three appointments have been approved for a period of two years, effective January 1, 1985.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, we can only take the hon. gentleman's word that there had been prior consultation with the employer and employee groups, and that each one of these recommendations made by the minister today is as a result of recommendations that were made by either the employers group or by the trade union movement. That is what I understand from the hon. gentleman.

We are, of course, pleased to see the first woman appointed to the Labour Relations Board, because, as hon. members know, we met with a large group of women a couple of days ago and one of the departments that they targeted as ignoring the rights of women on boards was the Department of Labour. They targeted that one, they singled it out. I remember I had some discussion with some of the women about that. I am glad to see the minister is now moving in the right direction to correct that particular situation and that more women will be appointed to boards that come under the

jurisdiction of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Alcock and Ms. Fagan have been recommended by the employers groups and the hon. gentleman tells us that Frank Taylor and Gonzo Gillingham were recommended by the Federation of Labour. Is it the Federation of Labour that makes the recommendations?

MR. DINN:

The Federation of Labour recommended Mr. Frank Taylor. Mr. Gillingham was already a member of the board; he moves up from and alternate to a permanent employee representative, and he was recommended by the Construction Trades Council years ago.

MR. NEARY:

I see. I suspected that, Mr. Speaker, which is why I kept repeating that Mr. Gonzo Gillingham was not recommended by the Federation of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

I will just remind the hon. gentleman that he was already on the board.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Cabinet has approved increases to be effective as of 1 January, 1985, to all long term benefits payable by the Workers Compensation Commission. The increase to be applied at this time will amount to 3.8 per cent, and will relate to all permanent disability pensions, survivors' benefits, and temporary benefits,

where these temporary benefits have been ongoing for longer than one year.

Each year for the past three years government has approved increases in Workers' Compensation benefits based on the average annual increase in the industrial aggregate index, as reported by Stats Canada. The industrial aggregate index is a method of determining the average wages of all working people in the Province. The increase in the industrial aggregate index from year to year is the best indicator available of the average increases in earnings for workers in all employment sectors, and, therefore, reflects as closely as possible what the injured worker could reasonably have expected to have earned if he or she had remained in the same occupation.

Long term benefits under the Workers' Compensation system are based on the average annual earnings of the injured worker at the time of the accident. Since Workers' Compensation is designed to compensate for lost earnings as a result of injury, the annual increases in benefits is adjusted as closely as possible to what the worker's actual loss of earnings is as a result of the injury.

The Workers' Compensation Commission provides a recapitalization reserve, to which an allocation of funds is made each year in an amount sufficient to cover the anticipated increases in benefits that may be approved by government. The cost of these annual increases, therefore, is already built into the assessment rates charged to industry, and is not an item which causes any further adjustment in the rates.

For the past three years, by using the industrial aggregate index formula, government has approved increases of 12 per cent for 1983, 5 per cent for 1984, and now 3.8 per cent for 1985. The use of the index and the policy of applying the appropriate increases at the beginning of each year is a progressive step forward from the prior years' methods of applying increases on an ad hoc basis, which were often not based on any rationale in respect to the worker's earnings loss.

Substantial progress has been made over the past three or four years in revising the system of workers' compensation in this Province, with the major effort being concentrated towards the new act and regulations which came into effect as of January 1, 1984. This method of an annual review of workers' compensation benefits is just another part of the overall extensive reforms that have been made in the system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, anything which helps the people who are on benefits from the Workers' Compensation Board to improve the amount they are receiving is, of course, a positive step forward and we are pleased to see this increase, modest though it might be. However, Mr. Speaker, this statement by the minister does not affect the many, many injured workers in this Province who have not been able to qualify either initially, or been able to continue on once they have initially been placed under the Workers' Compensation programme.

We have a problem now, Mr. Speaker, with the Workers' Compensation Board which is a financial one, and we understand that measures have to be taken to deal with the financial problems being met by the board. However, regrettably it seems that the approach taken by the board is to toughen up the procedures for determining who will qualify either initially, or who will qualify to stay on for the long term training and rehabilitation. And, unfortunately, there are more and more instances being brought to my attention if not the minister's, and I mentioned this to the minister and asked him earlier to check into this, there are more and more cases being brought to my attention where they say they are being placed under an impossible burden. In fact, and I would have to ask the minister to check this because I did not see the television interview myself, but I understand that at least one commissioner of the board - I would like the minister to listen, if he would - has indicated on television that the burden that is set out in the Workers' Compensation Act which says that the worker is to be given the benefit of the doubt, that the burden should be on the board, that that, the board concludes, is not a practical way of doing things and that, in fact, the board is now putting the burden on the worker, which is an impossible burden with respect to medical evidence and so forth. So I would ask the minister to look carefully at the actual practice of the board to determine whether the board is not now being unduly strict in terms of deciding who qualifies. Because unless a person qualifies, he does not get the benefit or the advantage of increases such as the one

mentioned by the minister today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, over the last day we have gotten some information from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with respect to his initial budget, and we have seen that the initial projected deficit has doubled in six months. Now, I would like to ask the Premier, seeing as the Premier has indicated that he thinks that the Minister of Finance is doing a good job, whether he has indications as to what the projected deficit on current account might be for this coming year. Does the Premier have the remotest idea what the projected deficit on current account might be, Mr. Speaker, for this coming year?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is what the statement talks about. Yesterday I thought I made it clear to the Leader of the Opposition that the \$64 million has to do with what we project the deficit to be at the end of March for the fiscal year 1984-85.

MR. BARRY:

What about 1985-86?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is like, I mean, a crystal ball. Mr. Speaker, we have to get predictions from the federal government as it relates to

equalization and established programme funding as it relates to personal income tax, because they do the assessments on that. We do not have a clue at this point in time. The equalization payments depend upon the buoyancy of the Canadian economy. If Alberta and Ontario are hurting, the amount of money we get in equalization is less. If their economies are buoyant, then the equalization payments are more, and a little blurb means \$10 million or \$15 million. And whilst that is not much in relation to the federal deficit of \$30 billion, or their budget, it is an awful lot in Newfoundland's terms and can either increase or reduce our deficit or our surplus by a significant amount. That is just one factor. The other factor relating to retail sales tax and how well our own economy is doing, it is very, very difficult to predict.

If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) looks at the predictions that we made on March 15, when the budget was brought down, and where we are today, whilst we are out \$30 million or so on \$2 billion, which is not a lot, that will give you an idea on how difficult it is to predict. And we are not the only ones in that category, all the Provinces of Canada are; the Canadian Government was out billions of dollars, the U.S. Government has been out tens of billions of dollars. The variables that are operative within the economy of Newfoundland and the economy of Canada are such that it is just a dangerous piece of business. As everybody says about economists, one will give you one prediction and one will give you another.

I notice that the Minister of

Finance (Mr. Wilson) took issue with the Conference Board of Canada's statement that interest rates were going to go up next year. Apparently the new Minister of Finance is saying that he does not go along with the Conference Board of Canada. And we have had, each quarter, the Conference Board of Canada, the Economic Council of Canada, we have had the Royal Bank and the Bank of Montreal, all of them doing their own predictions about interest rates, all of them doing their own predictions about the growth of the economy, and they vary and they are all experts. So, therefore, it is a dangerous piece of business, but you try to do the best you can given the premises from which you have to work.

But in Newfoundland terms, for example, the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the iron ore industry is a significant contributor to the economy of Newfoundland and, you know, who knows whether that will close down or stay open or increase or expand next year? The same way with the fishery - if there is a strike in the fishery. The same way with the pulp and paper industry. So this is an extremely difficult area. And for the Leader of the Opposition to ask such a silly question, I mean, he knows, obviously, that nobody can predict what the deficit or surplus on current account in Newfoundland will be from April 1, 1985 to March 31, 1986. It shows a lack of knowledge of economics for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to even pose that kind of a question. The evidence is overwhelming in all the jurisdictions of the OECD and the Western World that these kinds of predictions, with all the kinds of variables built into them, would mean absolutely nothing even if

one was given them.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I take it from that that the Premier now has exhibited complete confidence that the \$64 million deficit, indicated to us only yesterday by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), that that is it for this year, that is the best forecast at the present time that members opposite, the Premier and the Minister of Finance, can give us as to what the deficit is going to be 1984-85.

Now, I would like to ask the Premier whether he is aware that there have been certain other forecasting bodies doing some work and that at least one of those, which is the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, and this is drawing upon information from Statistics Canada which has been supplied, we understand, to Statistics Canada by officials of the Minister of Finance's Department, is the Premier aware that there is a projected deficit for Newfoundland for 1984-85, this year, of \$136 million? For 1984-85 there is a figure indicated of \$136 million in the August to September '84 Atlantic Provinces Economic Council newsletter, is the Premier aware of that? And does the Premier say that these figures are unreliable, that the figures of Statistics Canada as supplied by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) are unreliable, or is it that we are not getting the full picture from the Minister of Finance?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let us get straight which year the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is talking about. When I started talking about 1984 and 1985, a few of the hon. members opposite started saying it was 1985-86.

MR. CALLAN:

Both.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, both. How about 1990, Mr. Speaker? How about 1994? What do we have, a modern-day George Orwell here, do we? Yes, we have a modern-day George Orwell, it is called Animal Farm, Mr. Speaker, and it exists over on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the \$64 million, we are saying that based upon what we know for the last six months, that is what it will look like by the end of the coming six months. Now, we might have a different figure three months from now, because then we will be basing it on nine months rather than the six months that have gone past. As I have said in this House very often, Mr. Speaker, there are lies, lies and damned statistics, and to pick out the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, which, by the way, we have gotten out of for a whole range of reasons and now we have our own Economic Council of Newfoundland. So it is one person's opinion or projection against another's. I have another one here, Econoscope, or whatever it is called, from the Royal Bank of Canada, and the Royal Bank talks about - so how difficult it is now to predict what your revenues are going to be - 1984 where our growth rate is 2.5 per

cent, the Provincial Domestic Product. That is what we are predicting ourselves, as a matter of fact, for 1984. In 1985 our economy is going to grow 3.2 per cent per year, it is going up from 2.5 per cent to 3.2 per cent. In 1986 4 per cent. And there is going to be only one other province in Canada higher than us in growth in those two years, 1985 and 1986, and that is Nova Scotia, which is marginally ahead of Newfoundland, and every other province of Canada is going to be less. Now, if that kind of growth takes place, then the revenues that are going to be coming in as a result of that growth are going to see us in a much better position than we are today.

So to take the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, to take the Royal Bank of Canada, and take the Conference Board, they are just numbers, Mr. Speaker, and they are all based upon premises and on variables which may or may not come to be true. All we can say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is that based upon our performance from April 1, 1984 to six months beyond that, to September or whenever the second quarter ended, we project that based upon that kind of performance we should be into a current account deficit of around \$64 million at the end of the year. When we get it past nine months and see what the performance is for nine months, then we will do our best to make a projection, and then in twelve months we will be able to say exactly what it is.

But to use the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, or the Conference Board, or the bank of this or the bank of something else, they all have their premises

and it depends on what your premise is, where you start from. Then it depends on what factor you put in for this variable, what factor you put in for that variable. So you are into a field that is an inexact science, as we all know, and one number is as good as any in a debate of this sort in the House of Assembly.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier to answer the question which is, these figures coming from Statistics Canada based on information supplied officials of the Department of Finance, is the Premier saying that these figures are misleading?

DR. COLLINS:

He just said they are projections.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, they are projections. Okay, they are projections. Well, then, we would like to know whether these projections are to be taken as more accurate than the projections of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)? If I understand the Premier, the Premier is saying we cannot have a budget until the day after the period is finished. The idea of a budget, Mr. Speaker, is to do exactly that, to project and to project properly and to project well, and not to have a budget be off by 100 per cent six months after it is brought down.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier to tell us whether he says that Statistics Canada

figures are totally unreliable. Is there anything to the fact that there may be on a reasonable projection a \$136 million deficit by the time that this year is finished?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are not off 100 per cent on our budget. One component of the budget, which is the current account and the current account deficit - how much is the current account deficit off?

DR. COLLINS:

Off by less than 1 per cent.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Off by less than 1 per cent. Now, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was only off by 1 per cent back a few years ago, in March 1979, he might not have lost the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party, which made him go over to the other side of the House. I would suggest that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is off by more than 1 per cent very, very often, as he is again right now, today.

MR. BARRY:

We are getting there now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, we are getting there, Mr. Speaker. Now, the APEC people can predict what they want based upon their information, we will predict what we want to predict based upon our information. It is our prediction, based upon the experience of the last six months, two quarters, that our current account deficit will be \$64 million at the end of the year. That is our considered opinion at

this point in time.

MR. NEARY:

That is devastating to this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not devastating to this Province, Mr. Speaker. The credit rating agencies in New York have assessed us over the past year and while last year Nova Scotia got a downgrading, Quebec got a downgrading, British Columbia got a downgrading, Newfoundland remained -

MR. NEARY:

Do not be so foolish, you will need a bulldozer to get you up out of the hole.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, no. We have an 'A' from Standard and Poor, do not forget. We have an 'A'. That is not a bad rating for a small Province like Newfoundland and Labrador, I will tell you. That is not a bad rating. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has some nerve! He has some nerve! Where did the ratings go when he was a member of Government, Mr. Speaker? Where did the ratings go then?

MR. NEARY:

We never had a deficit in current account.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Unreal! Unreal!

MR. BARRETT:

Oh, no! Only in the Department of Social Services.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is right. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, APEC can make their predictions, the Conference Board of Canada can make their predictions, the Royal Bank of

Canada can make theirs, and we will make ours, and we are making ours based upon the last six months. And, as I have said, when the last quarter comes and we take a look at the performance of the economy, we will be in a position to give a further projection of what our deficit is doing. Mr. Speaker, it is the first time in the history of Newfoundland, talking about previous administrations, and the one that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was a part of, it is the first time that a government, every quarter, comes clean with the people of the Province and says to the people of the Province in a detailed statement where we think we are going. We are not trying to hide anything from the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, which the member for LaPoile's administration did when he was a member of a government. Oh, they had nothing then, no Question Period, and there were all these kinds of reasons for it. The member for LaPoile now better not have a short memory, let him have a long memory. Let him deal with the history of his political life from when he started, not since the days when we came into power. Mr. Speaker, what a big difference! To get back to the substance of the question, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows, there are all kinds of predictions by all kinds of organizations and you can go to another organization and get a different figure, where the experts are just as expert, and where their data is just as sound as what you get from APEC. If APEC wants to predict our current account deficit at the end of the year at \$136 million, that is up to APEC. Based upon the last six months we predict our deficit to be \$64 million, and we are not

going to suddenly bow down to APEC or anybody else. We have our experts and we do our analysis, and based on the last six months, that is where we think we are going to be by the end of March, 1985.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I will yield to my colleague for Fogo, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

You know, we have a difference in the House at the present time, we have the official Opposition and we have the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) got up and he was recognized -

MR. TULK:

Are you questioning the Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL:

No, I am not questioning the Speaker. - and the hon. gentleman says, 'I yield to the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). But there is the member for Menihek. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, or the hon. the member for LaPoile - You know, he still is the Leader of the Opposition to me, and he still is the Leader of

the Opposition in most minds in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I always liked him as Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

But I do not think it is competent, Mr. Speaker, in this House - Your Honour rules this House - for the hon. the member for LaPoile to get up and say, 'I will yield to the member for Fogo.' What about the member for Menihek?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I can fully understand why, after the questions that were just put, that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would not want another question put from this side, that he would want to recognize the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has to recognize that the Speaker rules this House, and what he is doing, in effect, is standing up and questioning the right of the Speaker to do that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the ruling of the Speaker, I never question the ruling of the Speaker. As a matter of fact, I think we should observe the fact that when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) got up to ask a question, who jumped up? Not the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) but the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to try to intercept the embarrassment that the Leader of the Opposition is currently causing them. So I am not questioning the ruling of the Speaker and who the Speaker recognizes, I am just pointing out the fact that because the member for LaPoile says, 'I yield to the member for Fogo' - we are interested in the rights of all members of this House, and I am quite sure the member for LaPoile is not the one to run this House - and if the member for LaPoile sits down and does not ask a question, then the next person his Honour sees, be it the member for Menihek or the member for Fogo, should be recognized.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

He spoke twice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It may be the time for the Speaker to speak now.

Perhaps the point is taken that it is completely up to the Chair to decide who is recognized in Question Period and that shall continue to be. If hon. members of the Opposition are recognized, or a member is recognized to ask a

question, perhaps it is incumbent upon that member, if he has a question, to go ahead and ask it rather than yielding to somebody else. But that is a decision, I guess, that the Chair will have to make and will not hesitate in making it.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie). I want to enquire a bit more about that company called FPI that Mr. Fraser says, and it is an insult to Newfoundlanders, has to have mainland clout, he has to have mainland directors so he can have some clout. My question for him is this, Mr. Speaker: On page 53 of Mr. Wilson's New Directions for Canada, that Tory book that must have been written a year ago, and which was tabled in the House of Commons on November 8, it says, and I quote: "The Minister of Regional and Industrial Expansion (Sinclair Stevens) has already indicated the government's intention to seek buyers for the holdings of the Canadian Development Investment Corporation, CDIC."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government's shares of FPI amounts to some 60 per cent of the total amount. In other words, the control of FPI is presently held by CDIC and Mr. Stevens hopes to sell CDIC in six months. My question for the Acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) then is this: When the sale is complete, will the minister inform the House what will become of the shares that are presently held by CDIC? In other words, I am asking him what is going to happen to the controlling interests of FPI and, therefore, to the Newfoundland

fishery?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Acting).

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the question discusses a hypothetical situation.

MR. TULK:

No, it is not.

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, it has not taken place yet, let me put it that way. So until something takes place, Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot give a definitive answer. I would also remind the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman representing Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that there is, relatively speaking, a new board in place to deal with the management of FPI, and a new Chief Executive Officer, and they are going to be addressing many, many issues, one of which, obviously, will be the structure as it exists now and as it may possibly exist down the road, so in my opinion it is a little bit early for a definitive answer on that particular question.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that the minister does not have any proposed plans about what is going to happen to those shares, what is going to happen to the controlling interest of Fishery Products International. So in view of his statement, I would like to ask him if the new

company, the new Board of Directors from Bay Street in Toronto, or from some other part of the world, or Fleet Street in London, are now going to be in control of the company? Is the minister now saying that that, in effect, is what is going to happen, that we are now going to see Fishery Products International, the Newfoundland fishery, controlled by interests in either London, on Bay Street, or wherever, outside of Newfoundland? Is that now the policy of the government, that they are going to allow Mr. Stevens to do that?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Acting).

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have no control over what Mr. Stevens does or does not do, that is obviously up to him and his colleagues at the federal level of government. Whether or not Bay Street or anyone else, London, or whomever, controls the fishery in this Province is not for me to decide right now, nor for this government, I would not think. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that the fishery of this Province will continue to receive the same type of attention from this government that it has in the past. As a matter of fact, in answering a question from the gentleman representing the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) last week, I indicated that I have requested a meeting with my counterpart in Ottawa, Mr. Fraser. A rather detailed list has gone to Mr. Fraser for discussion, with a great number of points raised in that correspondence. I am now awaiting a response from Mr. Fraser to find

out when it is appropriate to meet with him and all aspects of the fishery in this Province, gentlemen can rest assured, will be discussed, be it financing or otherwise.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

As I see it, it is very obvious that what we told the Premier and his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) last year was going to happen has now happened, control of the Newfoundland fishery, in particular, the deep-sea fishery has gone from Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, as I see it FPI is very vulnerable. Will the minister whose government talks about controlling our own destiny, and this has been the policy of the Premier and the policy of his government - 'through controlling the fishery', the Premier has said, 'we will control our own destiny' - will the minister admit to this House that the danger exists and that what some people would term greedy hands, be they domestic or foreign, seem now to be trying a backdoor approach to gaining control of the Newfoundland fishery and we may indeed be in danger of losing what we have gained since the implementation of the 200 mile limit, will he admit that that danger exists? And if he is willing to admit it, is he going to tell us what his government plans on doing against Ottawa now that he has his Tory buddies there? Will he now tell us whether they are going to be the lapdogs of Ottawa or are they indeed going to fight for the

Newfoundland fishery?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Acting).

MR. GOUDIE:

I obviously cannot control what the hon. gentleman opposite thinks about the fishery or anything else. As a matter of fact, I would just suggest to the hon. gentleman that during several election campaigns in this Province our plans as a government, as a party, for the fishery have been outlined clearly and that the electorate of the Province has spoken and obviously decided on who they want to champion the cause of the fishery and many other industries and resources in this Province. Just one other thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker. I am not admitting to anything suggested by the hon. gentleman this afternoon, but I will just point out to him and remind him that prior to very recently this government had very little real say in controlling the fishery, and it is only since we have been able to have discussions with Ottawa that a spirit of co-operation is more in place now than it has been in the last twenty or twenty-three years in terms of federal/provincial relations, and that speaks well for the fishery and other aspects of our economy in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. I understand that during the last few days there was an incident on the Quebec/Labrador border. Could

the minister confirm if an incident did take place in which a number of caribou were killed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there were about 400 caribou harvested on the Quebec/Labrador boundary a couple of days ago, allegedly by the Indian population of Quebec. This is not illegal activity if it is on the Quebec side of the border.

Our understanding is that it is pretty difficult to call whether it is on the Quebec side of the border of the Newfoundland side of the border. At the moment we have a wildlife biologist and a member of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary in the area. We do not think there is any illegal activity taking place, but we certainly are monitoring the situation and when I have more information coming to me, then I will supply it to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Premier a question concerning the Labrador/Quebec border a few days ago the Premier called it foolish and silly. It is not foolish and silly, Mr. Speaker, when 400 caribou have been slaughtered. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) if he would recommend to the Premier and to

his government, to the Cabinet, that this government immediately undertake to do a proper survey of the border that separates Labrador from Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, just let me say to the hon. gentleman that caribou do not know any borders, and the Native people hunt them as they migrate back and forth. So I think the legitimacy of his question, and trying to tie it in with what he asked the Premier yesterday, is still just as silly today as it was yesterday, Mr. Speaker. The other thing I would say to the hon. gentleman is that the hon. gentleman must be aware that it was this Premier and this government who fought the battle during the Constitutional crisis a couple of years ago to make sure that our Terms of Union were enshrined in the Constitution of Canada and cannot be changed without the consent of this Province and this Legislature. So the Labrador border question is not a question, it is constitutionally enshrined, and it was this government and this Premier who fought for that a couple of years ago. The hon. gentleman should remember that.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the marking of the Labrador boundary, I think all of us on this side of the House would like to see the Labrador boundary marked on the ground. However, that takes co-operation between the two Provinces. We certainly would like to see it, but whether it will ever come to pass or not I cannot stare into crystal balls

and speculate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was not sure that I was going to make it this time. My question is to the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs. I have had representation from some of the Native groups in Labrador who are concerned about the in-house study that is being done on the effects of low-level flying on both wildlife and on the individuals who inhabit the area. They have made representation to me and have asked that the study be expanded so that an independent chairman could be established with very broad terms of reference so that the effect could be examined on both wildlife and on the individual human beings in that area as well. Is there a possibility of that happening?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize to the hon. gentleman. I was reading a note that was passed to me a little earlier and I did not get the full context. Was he referring to an independent study? Is that what I am to understand?

MR. FENWICK

Yes.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, whether or not there is an independent study to take place I do not know, that is a decision that government will have

to make. Obviously we have concern about the effects of low-level flying on not just caribou but humans, etc., in the area. I understand that efforts are being made to look into that now, both from the wildlife point of view and from the human point of view. It is going to take a little bit of time I know, obviously. The aircraft are not flying at this particular time of the year, it is going to be next April or May before they begin again, and, obviously, that type of activity has to be in place in order for it to be studied. So we as a government are addressing ourselves to that concern and will be deciding in due course on what type of studies will be done, how extensive they will be, and exactly what form, whether they will be internal, independent, or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It seems now we have two organizations in Newfoundland called PAC and the one I want to ask the Premier about, the one that I am on, is the Public Accounts Committee, but the one I want to find out about from the Premier is the Provincial Advisory Committee to Mr. Mulroney, to the Tory Party of Canada. Could the hon. gentleman tell us who the members of the Provincial Advisory Committee are to recommend to the Government of Canada patronage appointments from Newfoundland? There are ten PAC committees across Canada that report to the National Advisory Committee. Now, would the hon. gentleman tell us as Leader of the Tory Party in this Province, who will be doling out the patronage in

Newfoundland? Could the hon. gentleman inform the House on this matter?

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

I have to advise that the time for Question Period has expired. If the House wants to grant leave to the hon. the Premier to answer the question, certainly that is quite in order. Does the Premier have leave to answer the question?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, that question is not in order. It is a silly, stupid question, the same type of question that the Opposition has been asking since the resumption of the session.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I do not know. I will have to check. It is not something in the jurisdiction of this House, it is the Federal Progressive Conservative Party, and the Federal Progressive Conservative Party and its Leader can do what it wants, I suppose, about appointing people in Newfoundland or Saskatchewan or anywhere else. But I think the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) might be a bit concerned that his name might not go forward and he has lost his chance to get in the Senate. I do not know if that is the reason, but the member for LaPoile will have to ask the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party who has made the appointments. I have not made the appointments and therefore I have nothing to do with them. Perhaps I might be able to try to get the information for the hon. gentleman if he will tell me who was on the Committee

over the last few years when the Liberal Party formed the Government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING
AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council Act, I table the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council for 1983-84.

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1984. Just to give a couple of brief highlights, Mr. Speaker, during the fiscal year 1983-84 approval of \$7.2 million in loans and equity funding for projects in the resource based and manufacturing sectors of the provincial economy. This level marks the highest approval level in the eleven years of operation of the corporation. The financial activity of the corporation: Assisted the creation of 985 full-time and twenty-six part time jobs. Mr. Speaker, the corporation in concert with the Department of Development has established a -

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:
It is a foolish point of order, Mr. Speaker, the same as you ruled on a couple of days ago.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, we have evidence before us to indicate that what the hon. gentleman is doing now is making a Ministerial Statement, and our evidence is that the hon. gentleman came across the House and gave a copy to my colleague, and it is headed 'Ministerial Statement to the House of Assembly by the hon. H. Neil Windsor, Minister of Development.' Now, Mr. Speaker, we have argued on a number of occasions that what the hon. gentleman - and the hon. gentleman is the only one who does it, by the way, I believe - is doing when he is presenting reports is making Ministerial Statements. But now the hon. gentleman has gotten caught in his own trap. He is losing his memory. He forgot. He is getting a little bit absent-minded. He forgot that he had a Ministerial Statement typed and when the time came for Ministerial Statements the hon. gentleman did not stand in his place and make the statement, and now he is trying to make it while he is presenting a report. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the whole thing is completely out of order, and I would like to send the document to Your Honour to illustrate just what we mean. This was intended

to be a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker, and it was typed in the hon. gentleman's office who gave instructions to his secretary to type a Ministerial Statement. And we think it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman should be directed to table his report and sit down and if he wants to make a speech let him do it under some piece of legislation or in Supplementary Supply, or let him be awake and not asleep when Your Honour calls Ministerial Statements at the beginning of the session.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, the relevant order reads not tabling, but Presenting Reports by Standing And Special Committees. All the hon. minister is doing in tabling a report is giving a few explanatory sentences with respect to the nature of the reports so as to give full and complete information to this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER :
Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair called for Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committees, and subsequently recognized the hon. Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who rose to present a report. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) rose on a point of order and produced a document which clearly says it is a Ministerial Statement. Now the Chair has some difficulty with having a document in its hands saying it is a Ministerial Statement if the minister is attempting to present a report.

It has been the custom in this

House that when ministers are presenting reports they are allowed a minute or two to express some brief highlights. So maybe the minister would like to present his report and I will give him about one minute to clue it up.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The corporation continues to assist in the delivery of various federal/provincial programmes to small business. These are the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Programme, Federal/Provincial Tourism Incentives Programme, Secondary Fish Processing, Interest Subsidy Programme, and additionally arrangements with National Research Council to enable the small business community to be fully aware of and have access to the technical and advisory programmes of the National Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, in the notes to the corporation's financial statements, the previous federal government's position regarding participation in NLDC is outlined. Hon. members of the House will recall that on April 3, I gave a detailed statement in this House on the federal intention to conclude its interest in the corporation over a three to six month period to -

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour directed

the hon. gentleman to table his report and make a few comments. He is continuing to read from his Ministerial Statement. And, Mr. Speaker, if he does not follow the ruling of the Chair then are we entitled to a rebuttal? Are we allowed half the time the hon. gentleman is taking to make his Ministerial Statement?

Your Honour knows the hon. gentleman is completely out of order. He is completely ignoring the Chair, completely ignoring the rules of the House. They are taking the House on their backs over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

All the hon. gentleman is doing is trying to obstruct proceedings in the House. All the Minister of Development is doing is tabling a report. He is not making a Ministerial Statement, he is just making a statement to give an outline of the details of the report itself.

MR. NEARY:

This is his third time he has done this.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the Chair did make a ruling earlier and asked the hon. Minister of Development if he would take approximately a minute to finish up his report and I have to advise him that minute has now expired.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is obviously an abuse by the hon. member opposite but in accordance with the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, since I quoted from this

document I will table it.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act". (No. 58)

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have another petition, and Your Honour has to rule on a prior petition from yesterday. Now today I had sent to me another petition. Again I have not done any chemical analysis, and I am still not sure if the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) might want us to go back to the quill and make sure that it is quill and ink as opposed to ball point pen. But, Mr. Speaker, rather than appear to be presenting something that is out of order, and before Your Honour has had to make a ruling and I be taken as being in contempt of Your Honour, I would rather for your Honour to look at this. Some of my colleagues opposite have been kind enough to have affixed their signatures, Mr. Speaker, so we now have four handwritten signatures. It was not in quill, Mr. Speaker, I think it was ballpoint pen. If Your Honour would take a look at this before I present it, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) may not have me brought

out of the House in chains for daring to present the concerns of the people of this Province by petition.

MR. PATTERSON:

You will get the quill if you run against me in Placentia next time.

MR. BARRY:

I do not think my good friend from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is going to be able to run next time. I do not think he will find anybody to nominate him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

As I understand it, the petition presented by the hon. gentlemen - I am subject to correction - is probably signed, as he said, by three or four of his colleagues, and if that is so, Mr. Speaker, it is the same one as was ruled out of order yesterday. All it represents is a very, very crass attempt of the hon. gentleman to circumvent the rules of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS"

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentlemen will allow me, 91(a) reads, "A petition may be either printed or written and if more than three petitioners

sign it, at least three signatures must appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition." And the signatures should be of people who are involved in the petition itself. Well, what the hon. gentleman is doing -

MR. BARRY:

Where does it say that?

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman keeps interrupting. The hon. gentleman is an abject embarrassment to his colleagues on the other side of the House. We see that, Sir, in Question Period. Every time the hon. gentleman tries to pop up you will see the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) trying to circumvent him. And the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is just a subterfuge on the part of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. He was sorely embarrassed yesterday because he was caught out, despite the fact that he had been Deputy Speaker of this House at one time, in flagrant violation of the rules of this House, in flagrant ignorance of the rules of this House, so now he brings in that petition signed by the people there opposite. Now, it is supposed to be signed, Mr. Speaker, by residents of this Province, and I would doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether any of these hon. gentlemen there opposite would qualify for residency or bona fide citizenship in this Province as a result of the stands they have taken with their former masters in Ottawa with respect to the offshore resources, and with respect to the rights of the people of this Province. But that aside, what the hon. gentleman is doing - and if Your Honour accepts it it is just purely on a technicality and I can appreciate

the dilemma Your Honour is in - represents a very crass, ignorant, stupid, juvenile, asinine way in which the hon. gentleman is trying to save face when the hon. gentleman has no face in this world to save.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Prior to a point of order being raised, the Chair recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on petitions. I have had a chance to examine this petition. Rule 91 says a petition has to be signed by three petitioners. The rule does not say that they have to be from the community or the district from which the petition comes. So there are four original signatures on the prayer of the petition and therefore the Chair is prepared to accept the petition.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is always very much aware of the need to make sure that the concerns of the electorate, the concerns of those who put us here are always able to be brought before this House by members who rise on a petition. Mr. Speaker, this petition has to do with the matter of the cutbacks in the hours in which post offices will be open in various parts of this Province. Specifically the petition comes from the community of Port Anson and it is supported by the community council of Port Anson. And, we have, Mr. Speaker, the names of, I would say, just about everybody in the community affixed to that petition. There are a goodly number of names, Mr. Speaker, I will count them later for the member. I realize he will need some assistance and would not be able to do the job himself, but

I will count them for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) afterwards.

The petition reads: 'We the undersigned do hereby protest any reduction of hours of service by the Canada Post Corporation in our community. We request that the present hours of service be maintained.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, as members know it is not within the jurisdiction of this House or of the Province to determine the hours when Canada Post will keep the post offices open. However, as has been the tradition, Mr. Speaker, it should be accepted that this is a petition for government to intervene with the Government of Canada to ensure that these cutbacks do not go into effect.

Now there are going to be many jobs threatened as a result of this, severe cuts in income, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask members opposite rather than trying to bar the concerns of the people of this Province from coming before this House by rising on technicalities that we have seen the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) rise on, I would ask members opposite to give careful consideration to the very real concerns of members of this Province and to act upon those concerns. And I hereby table that petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I will yield to my hon. colleague providing I do not lose my turn the next time, back and forth across the House. Would

that be alright?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). This government is always alert where the concerns of the citizens of this Province are concerned. And I think the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) a little while ago brought up this point and I told him I would endeavour to look into the matter and I am continuing to do that.

I think the issue is are the hours more than sufficient to supply the needs of the individuals in those particular communities? Now obviously if the hours are longer than are needed it is wasteful of public funds because the funds that keep open post offices come from citizens, including the citizens of this Province, and it is an elementary duty of all governments not to waste taxpayers monies. If they waste taxpayers monies they are almost criminally culpable. So the federal government has to make sure it is not wasting taxpayers money.

Now if they determine that hours are longer than required for the efficient operation of the post office, it is their duty to say it and not waste taxpayers money. On the other hand, they have no right to cut down the level of services in any community below what is needed to perform the mail and post duties in those communities, and that is one question I will be putting to the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) when he visits this Province, as he promised to do and as he has taken quick action to arrange for

December 5. Then he will go over many of the concerns that have risen in our minds concerning the necessary approach that the federal government is taking to cut down on the horrendous deficit left by the previous administration, a deficit that is weighing heavily on the economy of this country and is weighing heavily on the taxpayers of this country. He has a duty to cut that down, but we will be asking him if he is doing it in such a way as not to bring unnecessary harm or inequitable harm to the citizens of this Province. We will be very alert to test that. But we will certainly want to ask the question are dollars owned by the taxpayers of this country being wasted by unnecessary hours in post offices, or conversely, are there any plans to cut down postal services in this Province below levels that they should not be cut down? In other words, will there be an inequality for the citizens of this Province compared to any other province. We will be very alert to do that and I can assure that any information that arises out of that representation we will bring to the citizens of Port Anson or to any other community that is so affected.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, we can see now what the new spirit of cooperation is all about. The hon. gentlemen now will go up and lick the boot straps of the ministers in Ottawa, they will approach them in a way that will not be embarrassing to the hon. ministers. Before September 4 they were over there

to a man demanding this, demanding that and demanding something else out of Ottawa. Now they are going with cap in hand, Mr. Speaker, 'Please, Sir, yes, Sir, three bags full, Sir. Yes, Sir, we do not wish to offend you, Sir.' But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that whoever is responsible for that policy of cutting back the post offices in Port Anson - and I might say Port Anson, by the way, is in the district of Green Bay and the people did not have confidence enough in their own member to give him the petition, they gave it to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). We have similar problems in my district. For instance, in LaPoile and Grand Bruit and Petites, the post masters are being cut back, Mr. Speaker. Whoever developed this policy does not understand rural Canada or rural Newfoundland and the hon. gentleman should go up and pound his fist on the desk and demand that these services be reinstated because, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously does not understand rural Newfoundland or the hon. gentlemen would be pretty annoyed and pretty irritated about this. Because of the coastal boat services you have people getting their old age pension cheques, their family allowance cheques, their unemployment insurance cheques at all kinds of weird hours in the night. They come in on Friday night, but now they will not be able to get their cheques on Saturday. That is what it means, Mr. Speaker. It means that you have two classes of Canadians now, one being the Canadian who has to wait for the cheques to be delivered an extra day or maybe an extra weekend if it is a long holiday weekend, Mr. Speaker. This is Ontario urban thinking and, Mr. Speaker, it is going to

create all kinds of inconvenience and anguish and suffering to people who live in rural Newfoundland and in rural parts of Canada. The hon. gentleman gets up in his wishy-washy, weaselly way and says, 'Oh, I am going off and if I can persuade the minister that he is not wasting any taxpayer money' - Mr. Speaker, it would almost make you puke to listen to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, when these things happened before September 4, was almost a separatist, making anti-Canadian statements. Now he is up wringing his hands, with pain on his face, crawling on his hands and knees to the federal ministers, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who is that?

MR. NEARY:
The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I am talking about.

Crawling up and kissing his boot straps and when he is leaving the office he will genuflect to the minister and say, 'Thank you, Sir, for getting me into your office. It is nice to get in to see your nice carpet and your nice office. Now I will go back and see if I can straighten out the natives.'

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. I support every community, including LaPoile, Grand Bruit, and Petite that are up in arms over this decision, a decision of the Tories up there in Ottawa, aided and abetted by the lapdogs, the handmaidens of Ottawa here in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who do not have the courage to stand up for their people.

They might think it is a small thing losing ten hours in the post

office, they may think it is a small thing, but it is a big thing to rural Newfoundland and the communities that I mentioned. And it is going to affect their lives, Mr. Speaker, and anything that affects their lives should be protested. Of course, this is the urban thinking we have, the Bay Street thinking.

MR. MORGAN:
This was all planned by the Liberal Administration.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The time for the hon. member has expired.

Before I recognize the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I would like to take the opportunity to welcome to the galleries Mr. K. Ward, Vice-Chairman of the Norman Bay Development Committee from Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Norman Bay, and the prayer of the petition is: 'We the residents of Norman Bay petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to install a diesel generator in our community. At present we have to rely on small individual generators, which is not only inconvenient, but we feel that we are being discriminated against by this government. Our children have to study by oil lamps, as well as any of us who want to do any reading. It is extremely difficult to maintain

proper sanitary conditions with a lack of electricity. It is a major accomplishment to go and get water to do the family wash. Our children cannot avail of proper teaching aids, for example, tape recorders, films from the National Film Board, or any other educational film. We, the residents of Norman Bay, feel that with all the waste that goes on at both levels of government, surely there should be enough to give us the basic necessities of life, including electricity. We hopefully pray that this government will listen to our modest request.'

Mr. Speaker, I presented this petition before in the House. I presented it also on behalf of the residents of Pinsent's Arm. I know members will get up and say if we had the money from Churchill Falls, etc., then we would be able to give people of Labrador, including Pinsent's Arm and Norman Bay, electricity.

I also know, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will say you must have fifteen families to qualify for the programme. In Pinsent's Arm they have over fifteen families now and still they are basically told no. And as I said myself with all the waste that we have, with all the redundancy, and now with all of the co-operation between Ottawa and Newfoundland and Labrador, surely we should be able to find the necessary money to have a generator for the residents of Norman Bay.

There was an article in Atlantic Insight on that, Mr. Speaker, and it said that Pinsent's Arm and Norman Bay were basically back in the 18th. Century because of these conditions. We were talking about

petitioning with regard to reducing post office hours. These residents of Pinsent's Arm and Norman Bay have to go twenty-two miles by boat or skidoo to pick up their mail. There is no such thing as a courier or a post office. And we have a tendency, when we live in St. John's with all the conveniences around us, to forget the people of Labrador and the reason why we have Labrador. I have said many times before we have Labrador because of the Wards and Roberts and the Moores and other people who have settled Labrador for generations upon generations, and it was awarded to us as a result of their settling along the coast. I think this is discriminatory. It think it is immoral to continue to treat the residents of Pinsent's Arm and Norman Bay in the way that this government is treating them. We can find the money to put an Arts and Culture Centre in Labrador West, to pay the rent on an apartment for the Premier, to expand the Cabinet, to pay for more parliamentary assistants, but when it comes to basic things like supplying electricity to our fellow citizens, somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to do that.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when I table this petition it will be given to the appropriate minister and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will have progress on this so that residents of Norman Bay and Pinsent's Arm can see some benefit of the new era that is going to be ushered in with the prospect of development, and with various ministers coming back and forth to Ottawa. Whereas before it was one of money, it should not be one of money at the present.

Mr. Speaker, I table this petition

and ask that it be directed to the appropriate minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we will certainly accept the petition and we will certainly give the petition very careful and sympathetic consideration. The hon. gentleman, I can assure him, has no monopoly on the concerns of the people of Pinsent's Arm and Norman's Cove.

MR. HISCOCK:

Norman's Bay.

MR. MARSHALL:

Norman's Bay. Well, Norman's Bay, Norman's Cove.

MR. HISCOCK:

There is quite a difference. One has electricity and one has not.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is all very well and fine. The hon. gentleman may want to be the merchant of sarcasm in this House but I do not wish to get involved in the same kind of thing. I have as much sympathy for the people in that community as the hon. gentleman has. The hon. gentleman can get on with all this business of the Premier's apartment and this, that and the other thing, but it just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned that is the measure of the hon. gentleman that he would get up and mention such things.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this Province is very sorely put for funds and in particular the basis and the reason why we are in the position that we are in today is the very basis of the petition that the

hon. gentleman has brought up. Whether the hon. gentleman likes to hear it or not, if development of this Province some twenty or twenty-five years ago had been addressed in the way in which it should have been, these people would be able to realize what we would earnestly desire to be able to provide for them.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman's petition touches upon the matter of electrical generation, which is a necessity in this twentieth century, and it is ironic because the hon. gentleman represents a party - and there is no use saying one thing and meaning another - that gave away the wherewithal in this Province for the very provision of these essential services which are enjoyed by so many people in this Province.

If we, Mr. Speaker, today had the \$600 million, \$700 million, \$800 million, going to \$900 million and \$1 billion per year, not for once in a lifetime, per year, that is flowing Westward into the coffers of the Province of Quebec, that was given by the Liberal Party of this Province to the people of Quebec, these people would be serviced in the way which we earnestly desire to service them.

The hon. gentleman wants to heap sarcasm on this government, which is so easy for an Opposition hon. gentleman to do by making these statements. Certainly I will concede to the hon. gentleman what he does not concede to the Premier and the rest of the government, that he is no more concerned about these people than we are. As soon as we can get the wherewithal to provide these basic needs they will be in the forefront of our considerations. But in the

meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman spend some time in sober reflection over the party which he supports. He has the consummate gall to allude to the offshore revenues that will now accrue, which we hope will be able to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of these people, will accrue no thanks to the hon. gentleman or the hon. gentlemen there opposite, who slavishly, lapdogishly, in a handmaiden fashion, were prepared to join hands with those people who were prepared to lead this Province to complete economic disaster.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Eagle River on a point of order.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, is all well and fine for us as members of the House to go back and forth and make our political points and sarcasm, but it is not doing the residents of Norman Bay or Pinsent's Arm any good. You are supposed to support a petition. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, feel that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is waylaying the point and he should state whether he is supporting the petition or not. If he is, when can the residents of Norman Bay and Pinsent's Arm see some light at the end of the tunnel for their community?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what a statesman. I am sure Sir Winston Churchill, if he could bestride this earth today, would be very proud of the hon. gentleman for his

statesmanlike statement. The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman can get up in this House and make all sorts of allusions. I just say, Mr. Speaker, that certainly I support this petition. I very much regret that today, largely as a result of the people that the hon. gentleman emulated and idolized and supported in this Province, who raped the resources of this Province for their contractors and all the rest of it, we are not in a position to be able to respond. But I tell the hon. gentleman, we are concerned about these communities, and as soon as we get the wherewithal to respond, Mr. Speaker, we will respond. We are equally concerned with the hon. gentlemen. I at least do him the service of saying we are no more or no less concerned.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has expired.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the petition presented by my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). Mr. Speaker, there is a difficulty, and we accept that government has a difficulty in terms of deciding where it will provide additional generating facilities. Obviously if there is one person who decides to move out on the Funks the government cannot be expected to go and provide a generating source there. But we are not talking

about this here. We are talking now about established communities in Labrador and we are talking about communities that, as I understand from speaking with my colleague, Norman's Bay may very well fall within the criteria laid down by the Newfoundland Hydro Corporation in deciding where to provide these facilities. Now my recollection is that there had to be fifteen hookups - now not necessarily fifteen residents, but fifteen hookups. Those were the guidelines that were in place when I was Minister of Energy. If a community could come in and show Newfoundland Hydro that there would be fifteen hookups - and that might include a school, a church, a store - then the residents, Mr. Speaker, were treated as being entitled to a hookup as a right, they were entitled to a generating facility as a right and it was a matter then for government to provide dollars for it in the next budget of the Hydro Corporation.

MR. HISCOCK:

They have probably changed.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am learning from my learned friend that we have had some change. I am told by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that even though a community might come and show that they have now reached a point of having fifteen hookups that the minister and his department and Hydro are saying, 'Well, it is only a general guideline.' Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the position that is being taken since at least 1972 has been that if a community has the fifteen hookups then that community is entitled to a source of generation and it is not a matter then of debating whether it should go or not, it

was just a question of providing the funds. Mr. Speaker, in a community of this size the expenditures we are talking about are not that large. There are not that many communities left which do not have generating facilities, I say this in all seriousness and not to be critical of the minister because I know they have to try and economize, but I would ask the minister to go back and talk to Newfoundland Hydro and consider whether Norman Bay, Pinsent's Arm and any other community that falls within this fifteen hookup criteria, whether the funds cannot be provided this coming year to see that they are hooked up.

MR. HISCOCK:

They are the only two left in the Province.

MR. BARRY:

They are the only two left in the Province - I think there were a couple of others with smaller numbers, just three or four families - but those are probably the only two that qualify under the fifteen criteria.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Before calling Orders of the Day, there are two matters that I would like to deal with. Yesterday the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was recognized to present a petition and there was some discussion as to whether or not it was an original. Subsequently, the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) rose on a point of privilege. I have to rule that the hon. the President of the Council did not establish a prima facie case for a point of privilege, but I certainly feel that I should bring to hon.

member's attention that the Chair feels it is incumbent upon individual members when presenting petitions or anything else in this Legislature that they be responsible to make sure that the documents are in order and meet the procedures and the regulations required to present them. If there is any doubt, of course, they are more than free to consult with the Table officers or the Speaker's office if they need any assistance. I would ask hon. members to be responsive in that kind of a way.

The other matter that I would like to refer to was notice of a point of privilege, or maybe a point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on Monday, I believe it was. It referred to some comments that may have been allegedly made by the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) during the debate on Friday morning. There was no ruling made at the time since both the hon. member for LaPoile and myself were waiting to get copies of the transcripts to see exactly what was said. Two points I would like to make, and certainly refer the hon. member for LaPoile to Beauchesne on page 25, "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity." The hon. member for LaPoile was in the Legislature when the alleged remarks were made and certainly should have raised the matter at that time. The member for LaPoile was given a copy of the transcripts yesterday afternoon and if he felt that strongly about it maybe should have raised it as soon as the House sat today. So in any event I have to rule that the hon. member for LaPoile did lose his opportunity to raise it. However, I have read the transcripts and

the comments that were made and there is one comment there that certainly the Chair feels is unparliamentary. It is the comment made by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) with reference to another member of this Legislature when he said, 'You are not fit to be in the House of Assembly and I will prove it in two months time.' Certainly I think that is unparliamentary and I am going to ask the hon. member for Bonavista South to withdraw those comments.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I abide by your ruling and withdraw the comments.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Gander Development Corporation Act, 1975," be now read a second time, (Bill No. 14). The hon. member for LaPoile, I think, adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, last day when we commenced debate on this bill hon. gentlemen will remember that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) merely shrugged it off as not very important. He told us it was not very important. I think I spoke for sixteen minutes showing the House, Mr. Speaker, how this administration have blundered, how they have made mistakes, how they closed down not only things that were opened by the Liberals but they start things up themselves and then close them down ten years later. Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the debates in this House are not recorded in the media except The Evening

Telegram. I have to say that they carry some of the debate. But apparently what is happening in the Parliamentary Gallery is they come in for Question Period and they think that is the extent of the House. After the Question Period is over they all go off with their microphones and their cameras and they ignore the rest of the proceedings of the House. And, as far as I am concerned, the most important items of business in this House is the legislation and the debates that take place. There was a time, by the way, I believe when the hon. gentleman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) first came into this House, that the debates were carried extensively, the interviews that were done in the House were done around the debate, but now the Parliamentary Press Gallery have it spoiled. Now it is a race for Question Period and whoever gets the trickiest, the neatest, and the slickest little question in during the Oral Question Period -

MR. DINN:

The most sensible one.

MR. NEARY:

Sometimes not the most sensible one, but whoever can start off the biggest controversy or whoever can arouse the imagination of the television reporters, who sometimes are not even there but will come in afterwards and say, 'What happened during the Oral Question Period today?' And somebody will say, 'Well, here is what happened.' But it is tragic, it is unfortunate that the great debates that take place in this House are completely ignored, except by The Evening Telegram, and I have to congratulate Pat Doyle on that. He is following the tradition that was established

by himself and other reporters from The Telegram who report the debates, and not only the debates, they even report the Late Show. But, listening to the other media, you would swear that the House ends at 3:30 p.m. every day.

MR. SIMMS:

Bill Callahan was good.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, Bill Callahan was good, the late Len Walsh was good, and Bren Walsh. But you would swear that the House ceases to exist after the Question Period when the great news of the day is in the debates.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

This is a bill to repeal the Gander Development Corporation, it is not a bill to establish The Newfoundland Bulletin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I did not know that the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) brought in a bill for the purpose of the hon. gentleman reading a lecture to the press of this Province. We are talking about the Gander Development Corporation, the repeal of that act and the necessity of same, and I do not think the hon. gentleman is being relevant to it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, I do wish to remind the hon. the member for

LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing the repeal of the Gander Development Corporation Act and, although the points that he raised may be very important, they are not relevant to this particular debate.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

They are important, Mr. Speaker, because the point I was about to make when I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman, who should be suing his face for damages, what I was about to say was this, that anything that I say from now on in connection with this debate will be ignored by everybody except The Evening Telegram probably, who might carry a bit of the debate. But, in the meantime, I am going to do my duty and I am going to carry on with the debate.

The other day, if hon. members will recall, the minister who brought in the bill could not even tell us why the Gander Development Corporation was established in the first place, and I had to point out to the hon. gentleman that when Senator Doody, who, according to the share list of Wolfe's Subocean, is now a director of Walter Wolfe's company along with being a Senator -

MR. TULK:

Who is Walter Wolfe?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Wolfe is the man who provided the money to undermine Joe Clark and to get Brian Mulroney elected leader of the Tory Party, and that matter is being investigated by the RCMP.

I just wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Senator Doody, who

has gone on now to greater things, including Mr. Wolfe's company, told us, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Could I have silence, Mr. Speaker? I believe I am entitled to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Doody told us on June 19, 1975 that this bill was being introduced in the House in an attempt by government 'to set up an apparatus to cure the persistent problems with the Gander fuel supply, primarily.' And I gave various other quotes from the Hansard, from the report of the second reading of that bill, which I have here in my hand. I do not have to go through that again, Mr. Speaker. I merely want to say that the Gander Development Corporation, which was supposed to be the saviour of Gander, turned out to be one of the biggest flops of this administration, one of its biggest failures. This bill that we have before us today is nothing more than an admission of failure on the part of the administration. Ten year ago they told the people of Gander they were setting up this corporation to save the economy of Gander and ten years later they repealed the act setting up the corporation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened in that ten year period? Did they solve the fuel problem? No. Mr. Speaker, did they get the training centre for EPA in Gander? No. Is the economy of Gander declining? Yes. Is EPA moving its operations

to Halifax? Yes. I might ask this: Where was the Gander Development Corporation and where was the member for Gander and where was the minister when the Nova Scotia government was providing tax concessions, providing land to Eastern Provincial to locate one of the most modern training centres in Canada in Nova Scotia? Where were they then? And that was the first sign, the first indication, the first move on the part of EPA to shift its operations to Halifax.

Mr. Speaker, did this administration lift a finger to stop that? No. But later on we saw the results of that negligence then they started squabbling and fighting and getting personal with the owner of EPA. They goofed, they were acting like children. The goof was made when this government here, this administration here, would not compete with the Government of Nova Scotia and they let the training centre go to Nova Scotia by default. The Nova Scotia Government rolled out the red carpet, they provided assistance, tax concessions and property, and neither this government, the Gander Development Corporation nor the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) raised an objection to it.

So we have seen Gander, Mr. Speaker, in that ten year period slip and slide downhill. The latest example that we have of that is the great deal that was supposed to be made with the Russians, Mr. Speaker, a deal that was supposed to be consummated with Gander Aviation. Now what has happened to that deal? What did the Gander Development Corporation do about that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say,

before I get to the deal itself, a couple of things about the Russian presence in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Russian presence in this Province is a source of great concern to our American friends, to the United States. As a matter of fact, I do not think it, I know it. Mr. Mulroney is down now trying to make friends, trying to make peace with President Reagan and with the United States.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is out of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a former member, I understand, in the galleries of the House and I do not want to discourage him from his possibly ambitions of re-entry. What the hon. gentleman is doing is wasting the time of this House. We are talking about the repeal of the Gander Corporation now but he wants to get into a debate on international affairs with respects to President Reagan, etc.

MR. NEARY:

Sit down, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before I rule on that point of order, I am sure you will all like to join with me in welcoming to our galleries the former member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, I do remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing the repeal of the Gander Development Corporation Act, 1975.

MR. WINDSOR:

He does not know what we are discussing.

MR. NEARY:

I understand, Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing. As I said to the hon. gentleman he should go out and sue his face for damages -

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would be about the only client I have left.

MR. NEARY:

- for looking so nasty, and his party should sue his face for all the damage he does when he appears on television.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this does have to do with the Gander Development Corporation. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened? The Russians presence in this Province, in my opinion, is of great concern to the Americans, their presence in Gander.

DR. COLLINS:

What about St. John's Harbour.?

MR. NEARY:

And in the Harbour too, Mr. Speaker. And I would submit to this House that that is why the American Consul came into this Province a few months ago to establish a sub-office of the American Consul here in Newfoundland, because of the Russian presence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Russians were very active in this Province before the Korean jet got shot

down.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some silence, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Before the Korean jet was shot down by the Russians, Mr. Speaker, they were very active in this Province. And then the Canadian Government decided to curtail their operations temporarily as a punishment for shooting down that plane loaded with innocent people. But now they are starting to come back in again. And one of the deals they were going to make, Mr. Speaker, was a deal in Gander with Gander Aviation and that deal was heard as a great boost for the economy of Gander. But did it turn out that way, Mr. Speaker?

Well, before I get into the deal again, let me ask this: Is the Russian presence, is our getting in bed with the Russians, the administration there opposite with their socialist thinking, their communist thinking, is it worthwhile getting in bed with the Russians in this Province with the trouble that we are causing NATO and our American friends, Mr. Speaker? Is it right that this administration there opposite should climb in bed with the Russians? Mr. Speaker, I know they have socialist thinking and they have communist thinking and their Marxism, but is it fair to the United States for the gentlemen there opposite, for the sake of a few paltry dollars, and they are very few -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Rubles.

MR. NEARY:

- these rubles that we get from the Russians, Mr. Speaker, is it right?

MR. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER:

We do not pay any attention to the hon. member because he is usually speaking through his hat, but it may somehow get leaked into the press and I think what he just said was an insult not only to this party but to this House. I do not think there are any Marxists here and there are no Russian sympathizers here, and there are certainly no Communists here and I think he should be directed to withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the points made by the hon. member could very well be correct but I did not understand the hon. member to say any particular member to is a Marxist. I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

If there are Russian sympathizers on the other side I would say shame on them. But the administration seems to have climbed in bed with the Russians on the Gander deal and on the synchrolift, Mr. Speaker.

Now this deal with the Russians that I am talking about, that was promoted as a great boost for the economy of Gander, but what did it turn out to be, Mr. Speaker?

After kowtowing and catering to the Russians, after upsetting our American ally, our American friends, after forcing them to open a sub-office of the United States Consulate here in this Province, after all kinds of surveying that is going on around our Coast, Russian planes coming within sight of the Coast of Newfoundland, being intercepted by NATO planes and so forth and so on, after causing almost an international incident by encouraging the Russians to come in, by basing our economy and the economy of Gander and St. John's on whatever we are going to manage to suck out of the Russians, which will be very little, after all of that, what kind of a deal did Gander Aviation get? Well, Mr. Speaker, according to the information that I have which is quite up-to-date and quite authentic, never wrong, Gander Aviation, with whom the Soviets signed a binding contract, did not end up with the contract, it was given to a company called I-M-P, Imps was given the contract, the IMP of the Russians. IMP is an agent for Shell Canada and the storage tanks whereby they will get the fuel to refuel their Aeroflot aircraft comes from Shell.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this happened after Gander Aviation signed a binding contract with the Russians. Gander Aviation, as far as I can ascertain, was unfairly dealt with by Aeroflot. There will be no spinoff benefits as a result of bringing the Russians into Newfoundland and letting them do what they like at the expense of world peace and at the expense of falling out with our neighbours to the South.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the contract that was signed with

Gander Aviation would have provided for two large storage tanks, in Lewisporte and at Gander Airport, and a separate delivery system by trucks to service the Aeroflot planes that were supposed to bring the crews from the fishing boats back to Russia.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was supposed to be what the agreement was, but Aeroflot achieved what they wanted to achieve for themselves by violating their contract, and consequently the town of Gander is not going to benefit as much as they thought they were when their hopes and expectations were built up by gentlemen there opposite and by the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook). Aeroflot, Mr. Speaker, went to Shell and IMP, and that is a good description of that company for doing business with the Russians, IMP. There was a memorandum of understanding between the Government of Canada and the Soviet Union allowing Aeroflot to use the services of Gander on the condition that they would have an agent based in Gander to supervise the facilities, etc. This was to be done by a local service company. IMP, Mr. Speaker, is not a local service company. It is a branch of Shell which is a North American Company. The Soviets only brought in partial loads of fuel, as was reported in The Gander Beacon there a couple of weeks ago. Aeroflot had originally agreed to ship in 96,000 barrels of fuel but now only 40,000 barrels of aviation fuel is to be shipped in. Mr. Speaker, the spinoff benefits that the people of Gander were told they were going to get have not materialized. They were told that there was going to be new fuel tanks built in Lewisporte, new fuel tanks built

at Gander Airport, the number of refuelers to put fuel in planes would be substantial, a dozen or so or fourteen, and would have grown. If this agreement with Gander Aviation had been followed there would have been spinoff benefits for the Newfoundland Dry Dock, Mr. Speaker. Gander Aviation, so I am told, even went to the trouble of issuing a tender call for construction of these facilities that I just outlined that would provide, Mr. Speaker, for \$1.9 million into the economy and Gander Aviation received three tenders from three Newfoundland companies. My source says that the Soviets have gained but a local service company did not get the contract, it was lost in favour of a Mainland company. Gander Aviation, according to my information -

DR. COLLINS:

Who is your source?

MR. NEARY:

My source is reliable.

DR. COLLINS:

I know who your source is.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. the gentleman does not know who my source is and never will. I would rather have my two hands and feet cut off than to tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, Gander Aviation would have provided jobs for twelve permanent employees but to my knowledge, according to the source, only two and maybe one and a half employees have been hired as a result of this deal. Two employees, maybe less, hired by Kara Services, the company that provides food for the planes. There would have been property taxes both in Lewisporte and at

Gander Airport and there would have been additional monies for both of these towns. Gander Aviation no doubt would have had to hire additional personnel, Mr. Speaker, but none of these things happened. Where was the Gander Development Corporation, where was the member, where was the administration when these things were happening? Gander Aviation would have hired additional custodian personnel, so I am told. The fuel that is currently stored at Lewisporte to service this contract is stored in Shell Oil tanks that already existed. Now, Mr. Speaker, where are the spinoff benefits that were supposed to be forthcoming from this great Russian/Canadian deal. It has turned out to be a gigantic bluff and a farce, Mr. Speaker, and the sad and tragic part of it is this, that because of the Russian presence in this Province, Mr. Speaker, our American friends, our American neighbours spend an uneasy time. NATO officials have an uneasy time of it, and many a restless night, because of the Russian presence in this Province where they can almost do what they like. And what do we get in return for all this uneasiness that we are causing throughout the world? What did we get in return for causing our American friends to open a suboffice in this Province?

MR. ANDREWS:

No friends of Mr. Trudeau, though.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman is not a Russian sympathizer because this is pretty serious stuff. I know the hon. gentleman is probably not. He does not know enough about the doctrine but in his simplicity you never know what the hon. gentleman might

be thinking, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, here we are sitting on a powder keg in this Province with the Russian presence here. If we have to depend on the Russians to keep the Dry Dock going, I say God help the employees down at the dry dock. The Russians were booted out after they shot down the Korean jet and killed so many innocent people, and now we have an administration in this Province rolling out the welcome mat, the red carpet, to the Russians. They even contributed to the synchrolift. The reason they backed the loan to build a synchrolift was to get the Russian business. Now the Russians are gone off sulking because they got the boot from Canada after they shot down that Korean jet, and they have not since come back in. Now they are coming back in, they say, with minimum requirements. And so, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to belabour this particular point but I cannot help but get angry and irritated about it when see the way this administration is rolling out the red carpet and the welcome mat and kowtowing to the Russians, telling us the Russians are going to be the saviour of the synchrolift and the Dry Dock, the Russians are going to be the saviour of Gander. And what are we seeing?

MR. HODDER:

And at the same time they are complaining.

MR. NEARY:

And at the same time they are complaining, that is right. At the same time, by the way, while they were trying to entice the Russians into Newfoundland, they were demanding of the Liberal administration up in Ottawa that they kick them outside the 200 mile limit. They wanted it both

ways.

MR. ANDREWS:

I thought we were knowtowing to Mulroney, not the Russians.

MR. NEARY:

Do not worry, if it is to Mulroney's advantage he will give the fish stocks to the Russians or any other foreigners that he can get in to buy Fishery Products International. And so, Mr. Speaker, in this ten year period that I am talking about, from the time they brought in the Gander Development Corporation which was supposed to be the saviour of Gander, until they are repealing it in legislation and getting rid of it and disbanding it, throwing it out, you could write a book about what happened to Gander in that ten years. And if it were not for the initiative and the enterprise of Newfoundland businessmen who have made Gander a major distribution center for the surrounding areas, if it were not for that, Mr. Speaker, you would only have a very small population, you would have a caretaker staff in Gander. That is what you would have.

MR. TULK:

Did the Liberal government bring in TOPS?

MR. NEARY:

The Liberal government brought in TOPS, of course it did. The businessmen, through their own initiative, of their own volition, no help or assistance from this administration, if they had not taken the initiative and made Gander a major distribution center for goods and services for that whole Central Newfoundland area, you would have a caretakers staff right now in Gander, Mr. Speaker. When they bring in this bill to

repeal the Gander Development Corporation, the minister tells us that this is nothing. Ten years wasted, ten years of neglect, ten years they turned their back on the people in Gander, ten years Gander has been slipping and sliding down that slippery slope, down the economic tube. It turned out to be a blunder and a flop and the hon. gentlemen there opposite were warned about it by Roger Simmons when he spoke in the debate, when he told the administration who brought in this concept that it was going to fail because they were not given the scope, they were not given the necessary financing to be independent. It turned out to be a political gimmick. They put it up as a showpiece, Mr. Speaker, and as it turned out Mr. Simmons was right when in the debate he pointed out the weaknesses in this corporation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

All they were interested in was PR work, that it sounded good for the public.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

As I say again, Mr. Speaker, I am not one elected representative in this Province who is laying his hopes on the Russians, I am not skulking and crawling to the Russians like hon. gentlemen there opposite are doing and telling the people of Gander the Russians are going to save you, the Russians are going to save the Dry Dock. We have Mr. Burgess over in Moscow right now.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the

member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Immediately after Confederation this country was flooded with Germans. Who brought them in here? Were they supporting us from 1940 up until 1945, I would like to ask the hon. member? He supported the Liberal party then, he supported Mr. Smallwood when they brought in here and they ripped off the government and went to jail for it. I am sick and tired of listening to this trash about the Russians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I must rule that is not a point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

At least we beat the Germans and made peace with them. We have not beaten the Russians yet and the hon. gentleman is in bed with them already.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ch, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that what this administration there opposite is saying -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who entertained Mikoyan when he

was here? What government entertained him when he was in Argentia in 1968? Was it not the Liberal Government of which you were a member?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule again there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I started to say that Mr. Burgess, the Manager of the Dry Dock, is now over in Moscow at the door of the Kremlin asking, begging the Russians to come back into Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am all for the Dry Dock surviving and their synchrolift and expanding, but are we depending on the Russians to keep it going, are we depending on the Russians for the survival of Gander? Are the hon. gentlemen there opposite not a little bit concerned about the Russian presence in this Province? Mr. Speaker, since when do we have to enter into sweetheart deals with the Russians? Since when does the member for Gander have to be quoted in The Gander Beacon and on radio and television saying, 'Oh, this is going to be a great thing for Gander.' Did it turn out to be a great thing for Gander after the hon. gentleman cuddling up to the Russians, to the communists? Did it turn out to be any benefit to Gander? Did it?

MR. WINDSOR:

It is some benefit to Gander.

MR. NEARY:

It is some benefit to Gander. What benefit? I just told the hon. minister what benefit it was to Gander. And is it worth it, Mr. Speaker? Is it worth

befriending the Russians for what we are getting out of it at the expense of our neighbours and NATO, our American neighbours? We are very concerned about the Russian presence. Mr. Speaker, are they using Newfoundland as a stop-off point to get into Central and South America? Is that why they are using Newfoundland? Does anybody know?

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) would kowtow to them the same way as he does with his federal counterpart.

MR. NEARY:

I would say for what we have gotten out of the Russians, Mr. Speaker, in Gander and in St. John's and in Newfoundland and in Canada, I would say give him them the boot. Get rid of them. They are only a nuisance. Get rid of them. They are of no benefit to us.

Now the hon. gentleman may get up and say we need the Russians. He may get up and support them, I have no doubt that he will. He will say I do not know what I am talking about. The member for LaPoile, I can hear him now, does not know what he is talking about. We want the Russians. The hon. gentleman will get up and say we want the Russians. Well, let him go and kiss the Russians. Go in a communist country and do it, not in a democratic country like we are living in. We do not want our future threatened. And we do not want, Mr. Speaker, them to use Newfoundland to get at Central and South America. The Americans have their troubles down in Nicaragua and down in Central and South America. And here we are in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker - just listen to this - here we are

rolling out the red carpet, the welcome mat to the Russians. 'Come on in,' we say while the United States and NATO are trying to get them out of North America, trying to boot them out. They are a bad influence. And the future economy of Gander is depending on that and the Dry Dock is depending on that kind of business. Is that what you are depending on over there? And then we are not suppose to get up and say anything about it because 'How can you knock progress,' they say, 'How can you knock Aeroflot flights going through Gander and how can you knock all these spinoffs that we are going to get from this fuel deal?'

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas)

Order, please!

May I interrupt the hon. member for a moment?

There is one question for the Late Show tonight. It is from the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He is not satisfied with the answer given by the hon. Premier to the question re the Labrador boundary.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, after ten years the administration finally admitted their failure. They finally admitted defeat. The Gander Corporation might have been a good thing. It may have, if it had been given the scope, if had been given the financing, if it was independent of government. The other day they wanted to go off, by the way, they wanted to send off a marketing team to see if they could attract more landings in Gander. The hon. gentleman would not approve the

expenditure to allow them to go and try to attract more business to Gander.

So, Mr. Speaker, would my hon. friend say what kind of a track record the Gander Development Corporation has? And, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not criticizing the personnel who have served on that corporation, it is not a criticism of them at all. They were probably well-meaning people. Their hearts were probably in the right place. But they did not get the backup and the support from the administration who wanted to play politics with everything they could lay their hands on.

And so here we are, Mr. Speaker, today, ten years later, we have arrived at the stage where now they have to turn around and disband one of their own projects. They closed down everything they could lay their hands on after they formed the administration in 1972 starting with the steel mill down at the Octagon, and they have closed down just about everything else that was good. And now they have started to disband and close down their own projects.

MR. TULK:
They have got a close-down mentality.

MR. NEARY:
Yes, they have a close-down mentality, there is no doubt about that. I would not mind the odd little mistake or the odd little blunder if you are trying, if you are working hard at it, you got your sleeves rolled up, you are trying to do something but, Mr. Speaker, when you base your hopes on the Russians, what have we come to in this Province? Russian

sympathizers, Communist sympathizers, that is what we have come to in this Province.

MR. WINDSOR:
Now you are stretching it.

MR. NEARY:
No, I am not stretching it. If the hon. the gentleman does not like the heat he can get out of the kitchen.

MR. WINDSOR:
You are looking for headlines.

MR. NEARY:
What we have, Mr. Speaker, are Communist sympathizers. They do not even get their little caviar, Mr. Speaker. That is the mentality of the administration, Mr. Speaker. It is very sad to me.

MR. WINDSOR:
You are against this bill, are you?

MR. NEARY:
No. The bill is to disband the corporation that was supposed to be set up to save Gander, but I am explaining to hon. gentlemen what happened in that ten year period, from the first time the bill came into this House, was introduced by Senator Doody, Mr. Wolfe's friend, and hailed as one of the greatest things that ever happened in this Province. Mr. Speaker, ten years later we see the death of the corporation. Ten years after a minister presided over the birth of the Gander Development Corporation, they now bring in a bill to disband it, dismantle it. It is gone, Mr. Speaker. Students at the university who will be researching matters fifty years or one hundred years from now will find some references to it for their research. It is a sad thing, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime, real estate values have

gone down, jobs have been lost, the economy is not in very good shape in Gander. All these things have happened because of the negligence of the administration there opposite in their rush to sympathize with the Russians, in their rush to keep the Russians inside our 200 mile management zone, in their desire to keep the Communists in Gander and in St. John's and sending off the manager of the synchrolift, Mr. Speaker, to Russia. You know, I have often heard it said that you take money from anywhere, including the other side of the Iron Curtain, but I think it is desperation on their part. So, while it appears to be a very simple little bill and the hon. gentleman got up and shrugged it off as nothing, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but send for Hansard to look at the second reading of the debate on the principle of this bill and considering all the things that happened to Gander in the interim, in that ten year period from 1975 up to 1985 and the pain and suffering and anguish being caused to the people of Gander. The Gander Development Corporation was supposed to address itself to all of these problems and they did not get the scope, they did not get the support to do it from the administration who were blinded by their desire and thought they could see a few rubles coming from Moscow so they said, 'Let us have the Russians.' A great deal, ten or twelve or fourteen jobs which turned out to be a job and a half, the contract was given to IMP, a branch of Shell, which is not even a local company, the IMPs of the Russians.

So, Mr. Speaker, I did not mean to take up as much time as I did but when I see these things happen, when I see the con job that was

done on people like the people of Gander, it annoys me, it makes me angry. They can bluff and put up all the window dressing, Mr. Speaker, they want in these kinds of corporations, but unless they are prepared to give the corporation a free hand and the scope it should have and the financing, leave it alone and let it be independent, stop meddling into its affairs, stop trying to turn it into a political gimmick for themselves and that is why I submit, Mr. Speaker, that is why the Gander Development Corporation failed. The hon. gentleman in having to admit failure on the part of the government of which he is a member, should hang his head today in shame.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I have never heard any hon. member waste as much time of this hon. House and say so little since I have been here in my almost ten years as the hon. gentleman opposite said today and the last day.

I should tell you right off, Mr. Speaker, that there is one thing he said that I agreed with, that The Evening Telegram indeed did a good job. He attacked the media, but he did it a little too quickly. Because he attacked all the media except The Evening Telegram. He should have read today's paper first, Mr. Speaker. On page 40 of The Evening Telegram today there is a headline that says, "Gander Corporation praised by Windsor." He might not be so happy now, Mr.

Speaker, that they quoted what I said in the House, not what the hon. member said. So I agree with him that The Evening Telegram did indeed do a fine job. They did not bother to report anything the hon. gentleman said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Gander Development Corporation far from being a flop is probably one of the most successful development corporations that this Province has ever seen. They have had a very competent staff. They have had a extremely dedicated and hard working board of directors, and as I said the other day I want to compliment everybody who has served both on the staff and on the Board of Directors of the Gander Corporation over the years. They have certainly made a tremendous and a meaningful contribution to the Town of Gander, the Gander Airport, and to the Central Newfoundland area generally.

What this piece of legislation does, Mr. Speaker, is recognize the importance of that development corporation, recognize the tremendous contribution that they have made to the area and broaden its mandate so instead of serving now just the Town of Gander, now the regional office of the Department of Development has a much broader, a much more powerful mandate, have more resources of the Department of Development directly available to it, has direct liaison and contact with the various other personnel in the Department of Development, various other departments of government, direct access to various government programmes, and no doubt, Mr. Speaker, can do a much more effective job of serving the people of all of Central Newfoundland and not just the

Gander area, although it obviously will still and will continue to serve Gander and serve it well.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question at all that the Gander Development Corporation has done a tremendous job. I will not waste the time of this hon. House as the hon. gentleman has, but I could. I could tell you all of the positive things that have been done by the Gander Development Corporation. I tabled the final annual report of the Corporation two days ago, Mr. Speaker, and I will not insult hon. members of this House by suggesting that they are not capable of reading it. The hon. gentleman opposite obviously is not. But I am sure other hon. members are quite capable of reading the Gander Development Corporation Annual Report and see there the accomplishments of the Corporation since it was incorporated back in 1969, I believe it was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made a number of points that have to be addressed, some of them are not worthy of addressing. I think it is incredible that an hon. gentleman opposite would stand up and trace out Hansards, Mr. Speaker, from ten years ago, and insult the House by reading from Hansard. I know that he did not table them even though the rules of the House require anything that he reads from should be tabled. I will not insist on it, Mr. Speaker, because all hon. members have access to it already. He wasted about twenty minutes of the House's time in reading out what was said ten years ago, and, Mr. Speaker, he read out a great portion of what Mr. Simmons said ten years ago, and I know that is important information for the House to have

I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman spent a great deal of time talking about the Aeroflot contract. Now I do not know where he got his information but he should spend a little more time doing his research if he is going to bring this kind of information before the House. He is obviously not interested in information, Mr. Speaker. We saw that today when I was trying to table reports of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. Of course, I saw two days ago when I tried to table this report, he did not want me to give any further additional information to the House, so we know what he thinks about information.

He obviously did not take any time here, Mr. Speaker, to research. Now he talks about the Government of Newfoundland, how we did everything in the world to attract the Soviet Union, the Aeroflot company here to doing this and signing all kinds of agreements; then he contradicted himself a little later, Mr. Speaker. He did not even know it because I am sure he did not read the notes that he was quoting from before he came into the House. He finally contradicted himself because he said, and he said himself, Mr. Speaker, that the memorandum of understanding is between the Government of Canada and the USSR, not between this Province. And it was his party, Mr. Speaker, because it was in September of 1983 that this understanding was actually signed. It was a party that he supports, when they were the Government of Canada, that signed this agreement. So it was the Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that obviously was co-operating with the USSR and

signing this understanding that allows this contract to take place.

Now let us look at the contract. The contract, Mr. Speaker, is between two commercial entities, in this case, Allied Aviation and between Aeroflot, which is a Russian airline. It is not between two governments. It is not between government and industry. It is a straightforward business commercial contract, a commercial proposition. He was also, Mr. Speaker, grossly misinformed when he says that Gander Aviation had a firm contract with Aeroflot. They indeed did not. There was a tentative agreement, an intent. And the hon. gentleman should know, he does not obviously, but he should know. If he had done his research properly he would find out in dealing with the Russians until you have a firm, formal signed contract, of course, nothing is binding, and they will not necessarily honour it.

MR. ROBERTS:

They do honour a signed document?

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes. But this was simply a letter of intent, it was not a formal contract.

MR. ROBERTS:

I understand once they do sign they are honourable.

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, absolutely. Very honourable in that regard. But there was no formal contract signed in this case as the hon. gentleman opposite would have us believe.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman relates to Gander Aviation. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Gander

Aviation in order to fulfil the letter of intent that they had signed with the Russians requested from this government and would have required from this government, in addition to \$1 million of financing in order to allow them to build the facilities that this other company already has in place and did not require any assistance from the Province on, so they are able to fulfil this contract, they were able to participate with Aeroflot and provide the service to create the employment, and, Mr. Speaker, let us not fool anybody, the hon. gentleman tries to say because Gander Aviation did not get the contract we lost all of that employment. What foolishness, Mr. Speaker. The work is proceeding. It takes just as many personnel for Allied Aviation and Kara to service the Aeroflot flights as it would take for Gander Aviation and Kara to service the Aeroflot flights. So, Mr. Speaker, that is just a red herring, utter hogwash and bears no truth. The matter of the matter is that Gander Aviation were not able to fulfil the terms of the tentative agreement that they had signed with Aeroflot. And indeed Allied Aviation were able to come in and provide this service together with Shell who had surplus tanks in Lewisporte. So in fact what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, is employment being created at Lewisporte at the storage facilities there, and employment being created by tanker trucks that are taking the fuel from Lewisporte to Gander, and obviously tremendous amounts of employment being created in Gander. Now the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, let the record show very clearly that the hon. gentleman wants the Russians out of Gander. He does not want those Aeroflot flights coming in. He does not

want all these jobs that have been created in Lewisporte and in Gander and the trucking in between. Neither, Mr. Speaker, does he want the revenues that are gained from the Aeroflot flights. He says they are insignificant. Well, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time we have about six flights a week going through Gander, six Aeroflot flights a week, each flight brings in about \$20,000 to Gander. Now that is \$120,000 new dollars a week into the Town of Gander, \$6.25 million a year, some 300 flights a year through Gander, \$6.25 million a year. And we predict that over the next year or two that will indeed double to 600 flights a year, and almost \$13 million a year going into the economy at Gander. That is just from Aeroflot, Mr. Speaker, just from this one contact.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman says that there is no benefit to Gander, and this is a contract that we do not want, I mean, what utter foolishness.

And the hon. member also talked about the shipyard. Mr. Speaker, once again the Liberal Government, the Liberals in Ottawa showed what they thought of the shipyard in St. John's when they refused to put the syncrolift in place, and this government, Mr. Speaker, had to step in and guarantee funding for a federal Crown corporation which at that time was put in control by the Liberal Government in Ottawa. We had to step in and ensure that that \$30 million project proceeded so that now the security of the shipyard in St. John's is all but guaranteed, and that we were able in fact to continue with servicing the Russian ships.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that shows I

think what the Liberal Administration thinks of the shipyard. Once again now the hon. member is suggesting that we do not need those crew changes through the shipyard in St. John's, we do not need the economic benefits to take the place of that. So let the record show very clearly, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman opposite thinks of the shipyard in St. John's and what he thinks of the employment that is being generated in Gander by the Aeroflot flights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he also mentioned, by the way, just before I leave that particular topic as it relates to the marketing trip for Aeroflot, that I would not approve the funding for a director of the regional office to participate in a marketing trip that was planned for this Fall. That is absolutely untrue, I did in fact approve it. There were other reasons why the marketing trip was cancelled. Because the hon. gentleman once again makes statements that he cannot support and he cannot back up. I want to correct the record because the funding is certainly in place and a director of the regional office certainly was authorized and quite prepared to participate in that trip.

Now, Mr. Speaker, returning again to the Gander Development Corporation itself. As I have said they have fulfilled very, very many very worth-while functions, not the least of which was promotion and marketing of Gander Airport, assisting in the development of the plans for the industrial park, assisting in the Aeroflot flight and the whole Tops programme, and various improvements to the airport itself which has made it now very

attractive particularly for executive aircraft travelling Trans Atlantic, and we are building up a very big business in that regard. Again, as I said earlier, I will not go down through the whole list. By the way, Mr. Speaker, the company that is involved, IMP, has some thirteen employees in Gander and has some seventy employees, in fact, in Newfoundland. So to suggest that that company is not making a significant contribution to the Province, of course, does not hold any basis in fact either. So, Mr. Speaker, let me simply close by saying the Gander Development Corporation has played a real role. And what we have done here is not simply disband the Gander Development Corporation, we simply have not wiped out all we have done over the last ten years. We have built up a very strong corporation, we have built up some very good staff there, we have some good records and facts and statistics and base line data on which to do further work. What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is broadening and expanding it. We have now created a full department, a full office, a regional office of the Department of Development that has a much broader mandate, that can much better serve the people of Gander and the people of the whole Central Newfoundland region. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman to go out to Central Newfoundland and talk to the people that have been dealing with the regional office of the Department of Development and he will soon find out, Mr. Speaker, that this change has been very much welcomed both in Gander and outside of Gander. Grand Falls is very happy with it, Buchans is very happy with it, and many other communities. Lewisporte and other

major communities in the area are now receiving services -

MR. SIMMS:

They are receiving services that were never there before.

MR. WINDSOR:

- my colleague reminds me, that they have never had available to them directly before, they either had to travel to St. John's or we had to send somebody out from St. John's and obviously we could not do that as directly and as frequently as we are doing it now. Obviously we could not have timely information provided to the central office in Gander, Mr. Speaker, and now we have staff who are there, who are totally plugged in with their main office in St. John's, The expertise in the department is available, all government programmes that are administered through the Department of Development are directly available and being administered by the regional office. Answers are coming very, very quickly, information is available, expertise and assistance is available through the regional office to various businessmen and business groups and trade associations, development associations and so forth in the Central Newfoundland area. All of these services are provided so, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is not disbanding the Gander Development Corporation but greatly broadening its mandate, giving it much more resources to work with. The same staff that were with the corporation have all been, by this piece of legislation, transferred to the employ of the Department of Development so we have the same personnel in the same office but with many, many more tools to work with and a much greater

opportunity to serve the people of Central Newfoundland and to help develop some of the tremendous resources, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in administration totally ignored for too many years.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Gander Development Corporation Act, 1975," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 14).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 6 Bill No. 4, which is of very great interest to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), "An Act To Amend The Livestock Act." Perhaps we may be able, Mr. Speaker, to get that through before the Late Show.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Act." (Bill No. 4)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE:

An Act To Amend The Livestock: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, a very minor amendment to the act which hopefully will lessen the number of animals roaming at large throughout various communities on the Island part of the Province

specifically during the Summer months - perhaps not eliminate the number of animals roaming, but certainly give property owners who, on quite a number of occasions during the Summer months receive damage to their property by animals that roam at large, a little stronger chance, shall we say, to claim damages, assuming that the animals can be identified.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS:

The answer to the problem is brand them.

MR. GOUDIE:

Brand them, exactly.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the hon. gentleman can call this a minor amendment. It is a major amendment, Mr. Speaker. Do hon. gentlemen take the time to do their homework, take the time to read the legislation? Because, Mr. Speaker, this is a major amendment to the livestock act. Mr. Speaker, previously people had to put up fences to keep the cattle out, but what the hon. gentleman is trying to do now is force the owners of the livestock to put up fences to keep them in.

The hon. gentlemen is changing our whole lifestyle, our whole tradition, our whole heritage. I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, that when I read the act I had mixed feelings about the bill. I sympathize with people who have their property damaged, who have their crops damaged by cattle, by

livestock that is roaming at large where the owners are not responsible for the damage. I have sympathy with these people but I also have a great deal of concern and sympathy for our tradition and our way of life. For instance, in the Codroy Valley that I drive through twenty and thirty times a year, cattle are put out to pasture. Sometimes I run into cattle right along the road.

So what kind of a hardship is it going to create for the beef cattle producers and the dairy producers in this Province? And what about all the horses? As I say I have sympathy for people who have their property damaged. I believe the onus of responsibility now is going to be put on the livestock owners and when property is damaged within three feet of a fence. In other words, if a cow gets his head in through the fence it will be allowed to destroy anything within three feet.

MR. ROBERTS:

They cannot reach further than that.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. Beyond three feet any damage that is caused will have to be paid for by the owner of the livestock. Now, Mr. Speaker, we introduced in this Province a few years ago a community pasture concept that was supposed to take care of this; people could bring their cattle down there, bring their livestock down there in the Summertime to graze, and put their horses in there and, Mr. Speaker, that was supposed to be the answer to the problem of cattle and livestock and horses roaming at large. But who destroyed that concept, Mr. Speaker? Who shifted the

emphasis? Who downgraded that programme? The administration there opposite. Instead of encouraging and expanding and building on what the Liberal Government, the Liberal Administration had done, because we were the godfathers of the community pasture concept in this Province -

MR. TULK:

And it was a good thing.

MR. NEARY:

It was a good thing. - instead of expanding and enlarging and building on the foundation that they inherited from the Liberal Administration, they have tried a couple of other things. And they are trying to regulate everything. Urban thinking again. City thinking. They are trying to impose city thinking on rural Newfoundland. If they had fostered and cultivated and nurtured, Mr. Speaker, if these are the right words -

MR. TULK:

That is right. You are dead on.

MR. NEARY:

Perhaps the experts, the scholars, the honour students in English could confirm that that description is correct. What they should have done was expand the community pasture concept. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if they had paid attention to the community pasture concept we might not have needed this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I have had complaints, by the way, I had one this morning from the hon. gentleman's district about cattle roaming on the highway.

MR. DAWE:

It was not my wife, was it?

MR. NEARY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

She was talking about that too.

MR. NEARY:

So I have to say that I have mixed feelings but I know I have a few other thoughts on this matter, Mr. Speaker, so I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It is noted that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate. There is one question for the Late Show, the question asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to the Premier pertaining to the Labrador boundary.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I asked the Premier a question concerning Labrador and Quebec and I think the next day the front page of The Evening Telegram stated, "Bored: Premier Peckford, tired of silly questions." I believe the Premier realized today that there is a problem concerning the border between Labrador and Quebec. In fact, yesterday, on a radio programme in Corner Brook Raymond St. Jacques was interviewed. He is the owner of the Hamilton Inlet Bay Company of Quebec, who has to this date spent \$2.5 million on various actions in trying to convince people that Labrador belongs to Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Premier received headlines in The Evening Telegram, and I remind the Premier that on October 20, 1980, he went on Newfoundland-wide

television and one of his topics then was the Labrador boundary. It was our Premier who, back in 1980-81, was going to carry a flag and place it on the border between Labrador and Quebec. It was such an issue at that time that the Premier got scared. The people in Labrador City and Wabush told him to stay out of it, do not come near us, and the Premier got scared and did not go there with his flag. The only flag the Premier has taken into Labrador City so far is the little one in his lapel. He was lucky to do that, Mr. Speaker, and get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eric Jerrett, the President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Surveyors Association said in 1980 that the first step to solving the dispute is to have the two Provincial Surveyors Associations, that is of Quebec and of Newfoundland, recognize the dispute exists and say we want to something about it. Now when it was convenient for the Premier to fight Mr. Trudeau during the constitution debate about the Labrador/Quebec boundary, it was not silly then. No, it was not silly, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier was doing it. But it is silly when somebody in this House asks the Premier a question, and it was a very simple question, why does not the Department of Justice intervene? Today we heard from the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) that a problem does exist and it will exist until the boundaries are clearly defined, boundaries that can be recognized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jerrett also says there are areas, including populated areas like Labrador City/Wabush and other places, where neither government knows

where the boundary is. Now the Premier can get up in five minutes time and he can still say it is silly. I do not care what he says. But the people in his government cannot and do not know where the border exists. And Mr. Jerrett of the Newfoundland and Labrador Surveyors Association says the same thing. Just to give an example, Mr. Speaker, when the Newfoundland Department of Highways plows the road from Labrador City/Wabush to Fermont, they do not know where they are supposed to stop. They probably could go on into Fermont, or they could be a half mile away from the border.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to respond to the hon. member any more on this question.

MR. SIMMS:
Who does?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, given all of the issues that have to be dealt with in Newfoundland and Labrador today, pressing matters, this matter of the delineation of the boundary on the ground is not one of those priority ones to be concerned with at this point in time.

At the time when we talked about putting the flag down there, that was a Newfoundland flag. From a

legal point of view and a constitutional point of view, these fringe groups in Quebec who are making these points about Quebec owning Labrador are just that, they are just fringe, silly, foolish attempts that are going to go nowhere, and everybody knows that. But the question of the ownership of Labrador per se, in the way that we conceptually think of Labrador, the hon. member's district, and the hon. member for Labrador West's (Mr. Fenwick) and so on, everybody knows that was settled in 1927, and here it is 1984. So from a constitutional, legal point of view the question has been answered and it is over and done with, and all the research in the world by these people is not going to change that. Forgetting even 1927 and the Terms of Union, squatters rights almost, all the areas that we have lived in, they have not taken taxes from the minerals and the trees and the fish and all the rest of it. It is just beyond question. That is the constitutional, legal thing and that is what these people are on about. It is not a question of putting the boundary on the ground you see that I was addressing to the hon. member and the hon. member misunderstood, they are questioning the ownership of Labrador, and that the boundary of the Province of Newfoundland is at the Atlantic Ocean. That is the silly part of it. That is foolish, that is silly. That is silly because it had been decided in 1927, and everything since then, including the Terms of Union and all of that, gives substance to that, so that even if the 1927 decision was not there, by de facto now they have lost by default because of all the rest of it. So that issue is dead and that is silly and that is foolish

by that group. I was not saying the hon. member was silly or foolish, I would never say that, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the groups that are petitioning to get back into the whole question of the ownership of Labrador are silly. That is one issue. The second issue is the question of putting the boundary on the ground. We now put the boundary on the maps at the high land mark. So the issue becomes one for the surveyors to determine: What is the high land mark, is it fifty miles West or East of where we now put it on the map?

Now for the hon. member's edification, I do not know if he is aware of it, but I am glad I had this opportunity to inform him if he is not aware of it, in order for two provinces to finalize the boundary on the ground as opposed to on the map, as opposed to the ownership of Labrador as we conceptually understand it to be and it has come to be since 1927 because of Labrador West and all the taxes and all the rest of it, there is the tribunal under the Constitution where you have the federal government which is the Chairman and the two provinces. Now the problem with trying to put the boundary on the ground is that one of the members of that so-called tribunal that would have to be established does not recognize that the problem is one of putting a boundary on the ground, what they say is "We own all of Labrador." They are back to the constitutional legal question. You cannot solve putting the boundary on the ground until the three parties to the tribunal under the Constitution agree that there is some ground to put the boundary on, and right now one of the members of that tribunal says that the boundary is

determined at the Atlantic Ocean and that Nain and Makkovik and Davis Inlet and Hopedale and Postville, and all of Labrador right on down to Blanc Sablon and West, that is all Quebec's. There are two parts to the question: One is the conceptual, constitutional and legal one of ownership which is silly, because it was decided by the Privy Council and all the things that have flown from there to 1984.

Secondly, to try to put the border on the ground one of the parties to the tribunal under the Constitution does not recognize that there is a boundary to go on the ground, it is to go at the high water mark at the Atlantic Ocean. So to get the boundary on the ground you have to have everybody agreeing to it. It is no good to sit down and argue with a fellow over a piece of land in your back garden which both of you lay claim to, if one of them says you have no claim. So you cannot have a tribunal getting on like that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have clarified the situation. Number one, the matter that was brought up by the hon. member the other day was foolish and silly because the group in Quebec are talking about the ownership of Labrador which has been decided. Anybody in his right mind knows that that is silly and foolish. Secondly to try to get the boundary on the ground, we cannot do it under the Constitution because one of the parties that has to come to the table in the tribunal to decide it says, "It is not going on the ground, it is going at the Atlantic Ocean."

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Thursday it is deemed

that a motion to adjourn has been made. Those in favour "aye", those against "nay", carried.

I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.