



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 41

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker, in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the Town Manager from the Town of Clarendville, Mr. Angus Drover with councillors Mr. Norm Warren and Mr. Edward Carpenter, On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the House of Assembly and trust that your visit there is most interesting.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the names of students who have been awarded adult education scholarships for the past year by the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not very many, no. Grade nine scholarships valued at \$200 each were awarded to the following; Stephen Snow of St. John's; Judy Scott, Linda Scott and Bernadine Mercer, all of St. John's; Phyllis Hogan of Burin; Pearl Wells, Lillian White of Badger; Margaret Drake, Bernice Hodder and Marie Hodder of Port aux Basques; Margaret Payne and Sarah Reader of Corner Brook.

Grade ten scholarships valued at \$300 each to Jane MacDonald of St. John's, Hannah Joy and Jane Howe, both of Placentia, Ronald Sheppard of Burin and Anne Ezekiel of Corner Brook and Anne Reeves of Baie Verte.

And finally the grade eleven scholarships valued at \$600 each to Blanche Skoda of St. John's, Sterling Wells of Badger, Pauline Power of Placentia and Thelma Leamon of Port aux Basques.

These scholarships are awarded on the basis of academic achievement and are designed to assist students in pursuing further studies. I would like to point out the increased participation in adult education programmes during the past couple of years. For example the enrolment during 1972-1973 in adult education classes was 3,200, that is in 1972-1973, 3,200. In the present school year in the same adult education programmes the enrolment is 8,700.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sir, on behalf of my colleague

I would just like to rise and congratulate the winners in grade nine, ten and eleven of these adult education scholarships, Sir.

I do not think that anything else needs to be added simply to mention that we do indeed congratulate these students in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communication.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU, MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I may, give the House some indication of the meetings that we held in Charlottetown yesterday with the Minister of Transport and the other ministers responsible for transportation in Atlantic Canada. I have a communiqué which I will be reading which was released from the meeting. I will not be able to cover all the items but if honourable members across the House would like to ask anything after I have finished, because it would take too long and I have also scheduled at five after six in my office a press briefing if the press want any enlargements on it.

I thought it was an extremely good meeting. The last meeting was not as beneficial, in our estimation, for ministers as this one. This one was quite beneficial and what I will do is I will read the actual release that was agreed to by Mr. Marchand and the four ministers as well. I will give some indication or explanations along the way of additional things or enlargements of what happened.

The Atlantic Provinces Provincial Ministers responsible for transportation and Federal Transport Minister John Marchand met here today, that was yesterday, to review the accord reached last January, which was designed to ensure that the view of the Atlantic Provinces were incorporated in the development of the new transportation policies. Now for the information of the House, the federal government is now in the process of coming up with a new transportation act for Canada and it is quite a large job and, as I said previously in the House and I said to Mr. Marchand yesterday, it is a rather large job and a rather large undertaking but we do appreciate the fact that he has met with us and asked for the input of Atlantic Canada in respect to the new federal transportation act.

The Atlantic Ministers stressed that the new national policy initiative must recognize that different regions of Canada should be treated differently so that transportation is used as a positive instrument for regional economic development. Transport Minister Marchand stated he was in full agreement.

The four Atlantic Ministers, the honourable J.H. Maloney, M.D., Prince Edward Island, the honourable J. Rousseau, Newfoundland, the honourable L. Garvie, New Brunswick and the honourable G. Mitchell, Nova Scotia were briefed in depth by Mr. Marchand and his senior officials during the meeting on progress made to date and the development of new transportation policies, national transportation policies, new freight rate structures and the concept being considered for the management of Canada's major ports.

The Atlantic Provinces Ministers presented Mr. Marchand with a submission containing nine principles and nine recommendations. The major points were new federal legislation to specify that transportation be used as a tool for regional economic development, changes to the existing freight rate subsidy programmes to make them more effective instruments of regional development while protecting existing historic and statutory rights. That would be the freight rate subsidies that we are now receiving in Eastern Canada. And the establishment by the federal government of adequate inter-city passenger air service within their region, subsidized to the extent required.

Now there is quite a bit in there and I would hope that sometime in the near future, at some speech I may be making, when you have the opportunity, which I do not have today, to outline just where we are going. It would take a week or two to put it together but I think it is a very exciting field at this point in time.

The Atlantic Provinces felt Mr. Marchand's proposal on a new rail rate policy has merit. And I am going to stop here for one minute and say this does not effect the recent fifteen per cent and the other. This is a complete new policy in respect to freight rates right across the country. It is a policy rather than the individual specifics we are talking about now, about periodic increases.

The Atlantic Provinces feel Mr. Marchand's proposal on a new rail rate policy has merit especially the statement that the rate system must meet special regional economic needs. However, they need more information from the federal government to properly evaluate these proposals and I am recommending that they be given access to such information.

Transport Minister Marchand stated that it is the intent of the federal government to secure cost data on all modes of transportation through the introduction of a transportation information act and that this information would be made available to all the Province so that we will then see whether it is to our advantage or not. But from what we understand, and from what Mr. Marchand and his officials told us, that there will not be a uniform rate across Canada but more determined by the amount of traffic or passengers who end up in this system either terminate or originate in specific areas which would give the Atlantic Provinces certainly a plus in respect to these rates.

It was also recommended that not less than ninety days notice be given of any proposed change to rail rates and that the Canadian Transport Commission be able to suspend any rate where there is evidence that it violates any principles of the proposed rail rate policy.

The Atlantic Ministers stated that they were pleased to note that the Federal Scott Committee Report on Canadian port organization corresponds so closely with their own position on port administration. The report recommends more local control of ports, including establishment of local port entities. The Atlantic Ministers advocated local port authorities as well as a regional Advisory Board so that these ports would then be able to do more within the area of St. John's, for example, would have much more authority in governing their own affairs and would not have to worry about the National Harbours Board, a Crown Corporation.

It is envisaged that the new group would report directly to the Ministry of Transport and not to the Crown Corporation which of course would make it more acceptable and more accessible to the various governments across the country.

You remember, gentleman, that last meeting I made a few statements that we put the question of highways strengthening programme on the agenda and that Mr. Marchand was not at all prepared to discuss it. Now, I suggested since that, that we were very interested. Then on Sunday night we had a meeting of the Atlantic Provinces ministers and they supported Newfoundland's request for this next paragraph which I think is a significant success in the one day meetings. The Provinces and the Federal Government agreed to immediately enter into discussions to consider a jointly funded highway strengthening programme with the objectives of improving the Atlantic region highway system. This programme would permit more efficient use of highways by increasing truck capacity and lowering the unit cost. I think that is a matter which is one of the things that we have been fighting for since the last meeting and we are extremely pleased that Mr. Marchand views have now changed to agree that we are prepared to sit down and try and come up with some programme and we were really pleased with that and Mr. Marchand was quite receptive and we appreciate his receptiveness, co-operativeness on this special item that will hopefully improve the main highway systems we are talking about, the main highway systems across Atlantic Canada.

The ministers agreed that while many steps have been taken to reduce the transportation policy anomalies between the Atlantic Provinces and the rest of Canada, much more work was required in areas of freight rates, port development and the provision of regional air services and facilities. Now, there is one here about the P.E.I. minister and the recent daily Air Canada flight and I will not read that. It is in the release.

The next one is that the Atlantic ministers were extremely concerned by the recently proposed rail freight rate increases on a wide variety of products of importance to the Atlantic region coming on the heels of the across the board twenty-five per cent increases,

twelve and a half in January, January 1, twelve and a half in March. They requested Mr. Marchand to take whatever steps are necessary to see that these double increases are not implemented until the new policy on rail freight rate regulations is enforced. That is not one week or one month. That is until it is enforced. Mr. Marchand recognized their concerns in this area and agreed to discuss the matter with the railways. Now, I am hopeful and we are hopeful in Atlantic Canada that Mr. Marchand's ability and persuasiveness will result in the postponement of any rail rate increases that have been announced by CN. We are hopeful and Mr. Marchand cannot force them, they are a crown corporation, but certainly we have figures here, and we had them at the meeting, and Mr. Marchand or his officials were not aware of the actual impact of the increases. They are not fifteen per cent. They are as high as twenty and thirty per cent in some instances.

Now, I have the details here and we are not at all happy with it. Mr. Marchand offered to ask Mr. Bandeen, the President of Canadian National to meet with the Atlantic ministers. The Atlantic ministers refused. We did not want to meet with Mr. Bandeen or any officials of Canadian National and have they sit down and say here is why we are doing it with no agreement that they would change them. Mr. Marchand is the federal minister responsible and while we appreciate it is a crown corporation, we feel that Mr. Marchand would be the gentleman who should speak to CN and he agreed to do this. I am sure that he will do all in his power to attempt to roll back, or have these increases that were suggested for May 6 from outside of Atlantic Canada into Atlantic Canada, and June 1 within Atlantic Canada held until this new freight rate regulations are enforced. We were quite pleased with that. And Western Canada were successful last time, we hope we are successful this time. We leave it in Mr. Marchand's good hands and I am sure that this convincing matter will be able to show Canadian National that people in this Province just cannot live with it. If Canadian National - our position was this, you know,

if Canadian National needs another increase there must be something the matter with management. They have had about four increases in the past few months and still they have a deficit.

Now, there are parts of Canada, by the way, and one thing we do not have to do in Eastern Canada or in Newfoundland is hang our heads about the subsidy on railways. The rest of this country are getting a lot of subsidies as well. So we have nothing to be ashamed of and we are not prepared to accept these increases, the rapidity of them, the magnitude of them nor any prior notice that they are going in. We brought this point and Mr. Marchand was quite sympathetic. When we read out some of the figures to him I think he understood the situation and hopefully he will be meeting with the President of Canadian National in the next few days and hopefully some concrete results will result from that. Certainly, our hopes are with him in that.

Mr. Marchand said that while all transportation programmes initiated by the ministry were totalled Transport Canada was spending or had committed some \$250 million to the Atlantic region this year. We have got to give him his due too and that is fair. So, they are certainly doing their part.

On - I have to look at this first - on ferry services, and I should read this because it was a joint communiqué from the meeting, the Ministry of Transport is currently utilizing twenty-nine ships for its ferry services of which twenty-two are government owned and five are chartered and expects to take delivery of the new rail car ferry, built at a cost of \$14 million, this year. That is the Marine Atlantic which will be entering the Gulf service between North Sydney and Port aux Basques this year.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The second one.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The second one, yes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is she a sister ship -

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, she is a sister ship. So, we are quite pleased with that and that certainly is something that is good. The ferry

and postal services that are provided by the Ministry of Transport will require a subsidy in the current fiscal year of over \$100 million. This total does not include the cost of capital works and other improvements. We do not mind giving them a pat when they have been as co-operative as they have been.

A major reconstruction programme is underway at Port aux Basques which will eventually cost over \$36 million. Federal expenditures for the year are estimated at \$8.5 million and other improvements are being made at the Souris and Wood Island ferry terminals in Prince Edward Island, at Caribou in Nova Scotia and at Cap-aux-Meules. The cost of these improvements are estimated at some \$5 million.

Marine ports: In addition to the major project at Port aux Basques, major harbour improvements are being carried out at St. John's, Newfoundland, St. John, New Brunswick and Sydney, Nova Scotia at a cost of over \$46 million. Mr. Marchand said that implementation of sections of the Darling Report restricting Canadian Coastal waters to ships of Canadian registry appear to be going smoothly and could be an initial step towards the re-creation of a genuine merchant navy.

Air services: The Federal Government has committed over \$16.5 million during the current fiscal year towards the improvement of air services in the Atlantic Provinces. Improvements are being made to six terminals including that at Charlottetown at a cost of \$4 million. Air traffic control improvements are being made at three sites costing \$2.6 million and all-weather and navigational aids were being provided at five airports at a cost of \$2 million. Mr. Rousseau brought to the attention of Mr. Marchand, and this is in the release, the need to upgrade the air terminals at both Wabush and Deer Lake.

Rail and truck: The blanket subsidy of thirty per cent on rail and truck freight going westward, the westbound subsidy, from the Atlantic Provinces cost \$18.7 million in 1974. Additional grant brings the subsidy up to fifty per cent on selected items were

available on a selective basis. The minister said that selective assistance appeared to be a better way of assisting manufacturers and producers in the Atlantic region rather than blanket subsidies. Assistance could then be provided to those who really needed it rather than covering all shippers, including those who could readily pass on the full transportation cost to the consumer. The ministers generally agree that the exchange of views and information during the meeting had been extremely worthwhile and we are pleased that the wishes of the Atlantic Provinces would form an integral part of the new transportation policy.

In addition to that, we had a - unfortunately when we went to the meeting the agenda was not made out and the Air Canada and the EPA and the CN rates were filed. I am also pleased to announce that Mr. Marchand has asked Air Canada to reconsider the rate structure proposed and filed in Atlantic Canada, in Atlantic Canada. Mr. Marchand has asked them to re-evaluate the exaggerated rate increases for Atlantic Canada. We are very pleased with that. We would assume that as a result of that, EPA of course, if anything comes out of it concrete, that EPA would follow suit. It is our intention provincially to appear at the hearings that have been scheduled for the middle of May. I have talked to my other three counterparts in the other parts of Atlantic Canada. Nova Scotia likes the idea. New Brunswick and P.E.I. are waiting. But in any event, it is our intention either singly as a Province, or jointly, hire legal council and make representation at the federal hearings which will be held in Ottawa on the air increases sometime around the middle of May.

So we are quite pleased that Mr. Marchand saw fit to do that. We are quite pleased that he saw fit to only ask Air Canada to re-evaluate the excessive and exaggerated cost increases for Atlantic Canada. I think it certainly shows that he has an appreciation for the problems we have here in transportation in Atlantic Canada and we appreciate

that very much. Also, I might mention that Mr. Marchand, and honourable members of the House know that, many times they would phone me during the winter but icebreaker service has not been a good one and Mr. Marchand has informed us now that two new Class R icebreakers will be available on the Newfoundland service in the year 1977-78. So we are quite pleased to hear that. That will certainly assist many of the parts of the Province where the icebreaker services are needed and will certainly beef up our ice breaker service in the Province.

So gentlemen, there is a lot more that went on. I have not gone into it in detail because I think the ministerial statements should be short. I will be giving a press briefing on any questions they want to ask or any questions the Opposition would like to put forward to me in the House. I think the meetings were extremely useful. I think that Mr. Marchand was extremely co-operative and

the other four ministers. By the way as well the four ministers signed a joint letter yesterday to Eastern Provincial Airways and we asked Eastern Provincial Airways to meet with the Atlantic Ministers of Transportation every six months to review rates, schedules and other items of mutual interest to us. So, we hope that we will set up that meeting so that nothing will happen in the future that we are not previously aware of. So, it was a good meeting and I was very pleased to attend it. I have some copies of this for the press and for the House of the communique that was issued jointly by the four ministers and Mr. Marchand yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very pleased with the news and the good co-operation that the minister had from our federal transportation minister in Ottawa, Mr. Marchand. I am chiefly concerned about some of the remarks. I think one of the things that affect this Province—I know is very difficult on a one day conference to deal in detail with a national transportation policy so complex as the one in Canada.

One of the things that we felt over a number of years is the Maritime Subsidies Act that went into being, I suspect, sometime in 1927 that has not been updated and researched to any degree. There are a number of regions, not only in our Province but in other Atlantic Provinces that are suffering because of this, areas such as Labrador that has climatic conditions. We cannot get the extension of the CN service as they do on the South Coast of Newfoundland. Then because of the climatic conditions, they discontinue the service for a period of time, but then they apply that subsidy to another region on an annual basis whereas some areas get it for a part of the year.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is what we mean by historic and statutory rights.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes. So I think that is very important to bring this to the attention of the federal minister and see that somehow or other that that amount of money that they would normally save by not continuing the service year round should be applied in some other method, whether it is applied to an air freight subsidy or some other type of subsidy. But, I have repeated on a number of occasions, if by some act of God

that all of a sudden that the whole of the Labrador Coast and the Great Northern Peninsula and other regions throughout this Province were to have all year 'round water transportation, then they would be obligated to apply that particular subsidized service the whole year around, and they would do it.

There are regions that have come into being since the beginning of the Maritime Subsidies Act that are not yet taken in under that act. You are quite familiar with this as far as rail transportation is concerned in Labrador and the West. I think that that is one of the things that is very important and that should be changed. I think that our minister should have some input into seeing that it is changed. I think it is going to affect the whole of a number of regions in this Province.

The other area where I think I am concerned, and a number of other people are concerned, is the LCL cargo that is going to come off and we have not seen it yet but we are eventually going to feel the impact on LCL cargo coming from the Mainland, and then, only then, will we realize the terrific rates that are going to be paid. I had one person mention to me a couple of days ago that to ship a chesterfield suite from Montreal into St. John's at an LCL rate - well, when you go into the full express rate which they are applying now - it will cost in the are of some \$84.00 or \$86.00, which is a terrific increase. A lot of the individual people who are buying directly from the Mainland will not be able to afford to pay those rates to buy. They will be forced to go into buying locally whereas they have been buying in the major centers.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the few remarks that I want to make. I hope that the minister - and I know you could not deal in a broad way with transportation - did indeed approach the federal minister with regards to the Trans-Labrador Highway. We are thinking about the extension of our highways in the Atlantic provinces. I hope it did come up.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, just some information for the honourable member if I had leave.

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

The honourable minister would have to do it by leave. Does the

honourable minister have leave to make a reply, I understand a reply to the honourable Member for Labrador North. Is it agreed?

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is not a reply. It is not a reply. It is some information.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I am afraid I do not want it to get into a debate between honourable members. Maybe the same thing could be answered in the question period if the honourable Member for Labrador North would like to ask a question then.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I might say and this is not a - yesterday when we were -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I gather that the House has not granted leave to the honourable minister.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions in fact. The first petition is in the form of a letter, but as I read on you will see why it is a petition and not exactly a letter. This petition comes from the Fairbanks Improvement Committee in Fairbanks in my district. It is addressed to me. It reads thus: "As you probably already know the gravel road which runs from the main highway through New World Island at Hillgrade, commonly known as the Fairbanks branch, has been in deplorable condition since its inception. First of all it is a very narrow winding road with three very steep - and I might add dangerous - hills which are followed by ninety degree turns at their ascent. Secondly, during this past Winter over a two mile stretch there were three accidents resulting in two cars being completely demolished, one car and two trucks being extensively damaged and a school bus slightly damaged. The causes of these accidents were due to the following reasons.

"Number one, the extraordinarily narrowness of the road. Two, slippery conditions due to the lack of use of the sand and salt which had been allocated by the Department of Highways. Three, no roadside available for parallel parking of automobiles. Fortunately, I might add, there were no fatal or serious personal injuries incurred in those accidents although four people suffered minor injuries. And fourthly, over the past two weeks the road has needed extensive upgrading, as it has needed every Spring since the completion of its construction.

In at least eight places the road has become so soft that the residents have saved the Department of Highways a good many hours work and dollars by grading the road with the undercarriages of their cars much to the dissatisfaction of the owners.

"The Department of Highways has come to grips with the problem by dumping a few loads of clay over the misdemeanors to hide them for a day or two. But you know as we know that you cannot hide a cancer by cutting off the fringes. You must use the scalpel and sever it from the roots.

"Mr. Gillett, we present this letter to you so that you may present it to the House of Assembly in the form of a petition from the residents and the public who operate vehicles on the Fairbanks road. We the residents of Fairbanks have not made many complaints to government, but God knows there are complaints which should have been aired before. Today this is the one which concerns us most. We do not ask that you send trucks to cover our potholes. We ask some of the money we earn but do not see as placed before us in the form of a fully upgraded road that is widened, strengthened, hills lowered and paved. Since the distance is only approximately two and one-tenth miles, we feel that we have paid since Confederation enough taxes to cover the cost. Now, that we have our account squared, we would like delivery. Thank you."

This is signed by Junior Ames; Rod Woolridge, secretary; Harvey Gillard, executive member; Wilson Gillard, executive member; Bruce Hynes, executive member; Harry Gidge, executive member. It is also supported with 163 signatures, Mr. Speaker.

I fully support this petition, It is not the main highroad, nor was it ever the main highroad coming down the Island. When I say the main highroad I mean the road before it was paved. But it is a by-road and it serves quite a large area, as you know, two and one-tenth miles. The road has been neglected, I must confess the road has been neglected over the past three years. And I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly. I ask that it be laid on the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe we can take one petition at a time in case some honourable member would like to rise in support of it.

The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to accept it, As the honourable member knows I was down in the area on Saturday. I drove down through many of the by-roads, and I was in to Twillingate. I saw some of the side roads there. Of course, we need some work on about fifteen miles of the Road to the Isles, which is the main road down there. But I went through as many of the byroads to see what they were like, the Herring Neck, Cobbs Arm and Toogood Arm area, and I attempted down in the area as well of Manuels Cove and Gillards Cove. And certainly the by-roads down there need some work done on them. I appreciate the situation now that I have had the wonderful opportunity to go down and see first-hand instead of hearing things and not knowing what you are hearing, but to have seen them I would agree with the honourable member that there is certainly need for work there, and we will certainly attempt to give it every consideration. And there are a number of other roads down there probably in similar or maybe a little bit better condition. But we will certainly see what we can do and improve the roads in that area the by-roads and so on. The first one has to be, of course, the fifteen miles left on the main road or the Road to the Isles. The main road is very important and then the small roads, of course, will come as well in that. So we would hope that we will be able to do something to improve those conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, the second petition goes to the same department and to the same minister. This petition is signed by some eighty-odd residents of Bridgeport, and it reads as follows: We the undersigned residents of Bridgeport, Notre Dame Bay in the district of Twillingate do hereby petition the provincial government of Newfoundland through your Department of Highways to rebuild the by-road approximately one-quarter mile leading from the main road into Bridgeport, known locally as the Route. We are yours, ever praying etc. etc. Dated at Bridgeport this 19th. day of April, 1975.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, deals with a very short road and this road serves several homes, several residences there. It is very narrow. It is a most picturesque road. It has trees on either side, and as a matter of fact I believe one of the trees is going to have to be removed, and it is a pity it does present a barrier for a road when the road is widened, because it has to be widened. It was just a sort of a horse and dray road at one time. They do manage to get in there somehow sometimes. And they have much difficulty in getting, particularly, the fuel oil. This is the main problem now in many of our outports, Mr. Speaker, as you know, People have become prosperous enough, thank God, that instead of going into the woods and working very hard, spelling out wood on their backs and then getting it down, sawing it and cleaving it and whatnot, they are able to use oil. And for that reason they have to have access to their homes by oil trucks so that the road, this particular one, the Route, is not wide enough. I do not believe an oil truck can get up there. It can get part of the way, but I believe they have to roll their oil into forty-five gallon drums up the little incline. And I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that this petition will receive the full support of the whole House and particularly the action of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, and that he will see fit to do this little piece of road. I have been trying to get it done for the whole three years that I have been in the House of Assembly but to date I

have not been successful. I have great pleasure in supporting this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I certainly give the petition sympathetic consideration, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, you know, and I say it on this one, but this one is not intended to be, you know, every petition that comes in it is impossible to do them all but we will certainly take that, give it consideration, and with the other petitions to find out which ones we are in a position to do this year. Certainly it seems like an awful small distance, but we will give it the sympathetic consideration I am sure that the member attaches to it, and when we get the opportunity now when the House closes, Sir, we will get a half an hour or an hour to sit down and find out what we can do and so on. We certainly will give it the sympathetic consideration that the honourable member I know think it deserves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition to this honourable House on behalf of approximately - and I have four petitions here, Mr. Speaker, and the prayer of the petition is the same, and it pertains to the same project.- on behalf of approximately 100 residents of the Town of Burnside, 100 residents of the Town of Sandringham, 90 residents from the Town of St. Chads, and approximately 200 residents of St. Brendan's Island.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is that the government undertake to reconstruct and pave the road from Burnside through St. Chads on to Eastport.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: This, Mr. Speaker, is a very short piece of road, the total mileage would be approximately eight. This is a very narrow, hilly and twisty road, There are at least four very dangerous curves in it, and I have gone over it several times myself. The condition of this road is continuously bad, it is never in a good driving condition. And, Mr. Speaker, along this road goes all the traffic that travels on the ferry to the Island of St. Brendan's

and services that community.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the government can find the necessary funds to carry out this long overdue project, and I trust that if the minister stands to support this that he will give some positive commitment to the reconstruction and paving of this road. And I trust that when he comes up with his five year road programme that we have all heard about but have not seen yet that this road will be included in that five year programme. So, Mr. Speaker, I trust, I want to place this petition on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear! I second that now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable member knows full well, you know, that if my mother were sitting down there with a petition in front of her house that I could not give her a firm commitment, you know. I cannot give you a commitment on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: If she were on this side as well. Okay, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: we will certainly accept the petition, okay, and give it sympathetic consideration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The Hon. Member for Placentia East.

MR. F. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of the residents from Fox Harbour and the Dunville area. The prayer of the petition is that certain signs be erected on the road from Dunville to Fox Harbour. There are some dangerous curves on the particular piece of road in question, and the road is travelled by the students who attend Laval and other high schools in the area and they are compelled to, of course, travel to and from school over this particular piece of highway. So, Mr. Speaker, this does not

April 29, 1975

Tape 1890 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

involve any large outlay of capital, and while Mrs. Rousseau is not on this side of the House I certainly do hope that the minister and his department will find it possible to have these signs erected as promptly as possible. And I think there has been private correspondence with the minister's department indicating the required notations that the residents would expect on this sign, and in fact the exact location of the sign. While a small expenditure of money is involved quite an important matter is affected and that is the safety of everyone using the highway. And I ask that this petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition from the Hon. Member for Placentia West.

I am sure that the minister will agree and maybe we should look at some regulations if they are negligent in posting proper signs for the safety of people travelling on our highway. And I am sure that the minister will agree to erecting a few signs. I am surprised that such a petition has to come before this honourable House requesting such a small sum of money. And I am sure that the minister must have in his department a number of signs that can be put up, safety signs more especially, that can be erected on our highways. And I am sure that the minister will see that the prayer of the petition is met.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (Minister of Transportation and Communications): I am surprised, too, Mr. Speaker, that there are no signs there but if somebody has not already gone down to look at the situation in respect to the letter, it was certainly brought to their attention. And this commitment I can give. I will give the commitment to the honourable member that we will certainly take a look at the requests. And if they are legitimate for something of that nature in respect to safety, signs on the road, certainly we will take a look at it. But I will give the commitment that we will have somebody go down, if somebody has not already been down to take a look at it, Sir. That commitment I can give.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I have the Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1974, which I would like to table.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The Gander Development Corporation."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. T. DOYLE (Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I undertook yesterday to get an answer for the Hon. Member for Labrador North relative to approximately 20,000 pounds of salmon which are in the freezer plant at Makkovik. This salmon was brought to Makkovik late last Fall by Labrador Services Division at the request of the people in Black Tickle. It had to be flown into Makkovik because it was too late, the last CN boats could not handle it because their freezers were full at the time. At the present time the plans are to bring the fish to St. John's on the first boat and the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation have undertaken to attempt to try and sell the 20,000 pounds of salmon on our behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions for which notice has been given?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to, I guess, the Acting Minister of Social Services seeing that the minister is not in his place. Could the acting minister tell us why a directive was sent to all the welfare officers in the Province requesting them to measure up lobster pots, herring nets and salmon nets of all the fishermen in the Province?

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge this was in connection with the loss of gear some months ago and certain field staff of the Department of Social Services were working with, in co-operation with Fisheries officials because there are not as many Department of Fisheries officials in certain areas would not have been there or would not have been available and, therefore, this was in co-operation with officials of the Department of Fisheries.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister tell us why this directive was sent out after the officers of the Department of Fisheries had already completed the work?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As I recall it the Department of Fisheries officers were not able to do all of the verification or survey which was necessary, which was required and, therefore, officials of the Department of Social Services in certain areas were assisting the officials of the Department of Fisheries in making this survey because the Department of Fisheries people were not in all the areas or were unable to get there or there were not enough of them and, therefore, some officials of the Department of Social Services did this on behalf of the Department of Fisheries and were requested to do so by the department because naturally the line of authority would have been through the Department of Social Services. So they were written and asked to do this and this was as an assistance to the Department of Fisheries.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Because of the extra workload put on the welfare officers, and they cannot really do the work that they are committed to now, does this mean that the department will be hiring on some new staff?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, whether the department are hiring on new staff or not, I obviously would have to check. Certainly this one specific assignment of co-operative endeavour by two departments of the same government, you know, this in itself is not regarded as creating a need for a hiring programme. Any hiring programme would be based on any needs within the area of Social Services itself, not on this specific instance-whereby officials of one department are co-operating with officials of another department, both of the same government, both paid through the same taxes and both in the same public service but in two different departments.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I wonder could I direct a question to the Minister of Energy. Would the minister inform this honourable House if his department or this government are going to oppose the increases that have been asked for by the Newfoundland Light and Power?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

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

HON. L. BARRY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Mr. Speaker, as I have told this honourable House on a previous occasion, I believe, in response to a question from the Hon. Member for Bell Island that until we have had an opportunity to analyze the evidence which is being presented in support of this application we will not be in a position to make a decision. I also mentioned that when the previous increase was applied for we understood from the company at that time that any further increase that it would be looking for to meet escalated operating costs would be five per cent, as I said last week. Now the amount requested is in excess of that. We will want to see the reason given for requesting an increase in excess of five per cent. We understand that the normal practice is for the Public Utilities Board to retain independent consultants to analyze the evidence, to go into the evidence presented by the Corporation and basically we will have to determine whether there is any particular reason. Even if we decide that the increase is not fully explained by the company, we would have to decide as government as to whether there was any particular advantage in our appearing when the function of the Public Utilities Board is to, as I have said, closely analyze any requests for increase and to turn down unjustified increases. But until we have had an opportunity to go into the evidence, which I just received a few days ago, we will not be in a position to give an answer to that question.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the honourable minister inform this House as to how much time he is going to need to look at this evidence and, you know, are you going to wait until after this increase is awarded or before it is awarded?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the way the last part of that question was worded, it does not merit an answer. I will give an answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, when I am in a position to do so as I indicated to the member.

MR. THOMS: In other words -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. THOMS: - in other words you approve the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question for the honourable minister, Sir. Is the honourable minister or the government giving any thought to provincializing the Newfoundland and Light and Power Company, taking it over and let the government, the Power Commission, distribute the power in Newfoundland as well as produce it and generate it?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, you know, I really find the honourable members opposite amusing. One day they are going on about the inefficiency, and the high spending of the -

MR. NEARY: Answer the question. Answer the question. You can make money here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - government owned public utility -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shut up!

MR. BARRY: One day they

MR. BARRY: are criticizing Newfoundland Hydro for engaging -

MR. SIMMONDS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the prize winning chipmunk to sit down until I have an opportunity to finish my question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The honourable Member for Hermitage has risen on a point of order.

MR. ROWE: He called you a chipmunk, by the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: Withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I shall ignore the schoolboy debating tactics of the honourable member, the Minister of Energy, but in the meantime I think Mr. Speaker, that it is fair to ask that he be required to obey the rule which relates to conciseness in answering questions that we are required to follow in asking the question. He was far off the topic, Mr. Speaker, I submit, and I ask he be directed to either answer the question concisely as put to him or else sit down.

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

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, now we have come to the ultimate in policy presented by the honourable crowd opposite. We have come to where not only are they going to ask the questions but they are going to direct how they are going to be answered. What total nonsense!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair will decide when questions are of a lengthy nature and when the answers are of a too lengthy nature.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying the honourable member for Bell Island is suggesting that Newfoundland Light and Power should be taken over and put in the same position that Newfoundland Hydro is in. Only a couple of days ago, Mr. Speaker, he was criticizing Newfoundland Hydro as engaging in certain inefficiencies or as paying officers of the Corporation too much in the way of salary and so on, total inconsistency again, Mr. Speaker, on the part of honourable members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Directly with respect to the question -

MR. SIMMONDS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage on a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I submit first of all that Mr. Speaker might have misinterpreted my point of order the first time, so I will make it now on behalf of the things that have been said subsequently. I was referring to Standing Order 25 which provides that questions may be placed, etc., etc., but further down in that paragraph, "but in putting any such question and in replying to the same, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same."

MR. BARRY: Exactly. Exactly.

MR. SIMMONS: And in answering any such question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: They should have read it before they set it up.

MR. SIMMONS: "And in answering any such question the matter to which the same refers shall not be debated." Mr. Speaker, when I rose first I was not saying the answer was long or short, I was making the point that it does not meet with the requirement of Standing Order 25 (a) in that the minister was engaging in a debate. He was replying to matters which were not raised in the question raised by my colleague from Bell Island and I ask Mr. Speaker to direct the Minister of Mines and Energy to direct himself directly to the question without getting into a debate on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point of order raised again by the honourable Member for Hermitage, his first point of order was in the Chair's opinion, at least, understood by the Chair. The Chair still maintains that it is up to the Chair to decide whether or not any honourable member in asking or answering a question is breaching that particular rule that the honourable member just said, just quoted. And in this particular instance the Chair feels that the honourable minister of Mines and Energy was quite in order in answering that question.

MR. SIMMONS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging the minister's right to decide but it is equally the right of a member to

draw it to Mr. Speaker's attention and that is what I have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is perfectly correct and the honourable member certainly has the privilege and the right to rise on a point of order and bring a matter which he feels is unparliamentary or a member not abiding by the rules of the House to draw to the Speaker's attention.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

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

MR. BARRY: So what? And so what?

MR. SIMMONS: Ramble on. Ramble on.

MR. BARRY: Specifically, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Middle man.

MR. SIMMONS: Ramble on.

MR. HICKEY: You are not supposed to refer to a member by his name.

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want to be quiet while I answer the question.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Do you want to keep quiet and let me answer the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: While it is the right of any honourable member to bring to the attention of the Chair any inconsistencies or members not obeying the rules of procedure, it is certainly the right of the Chair to remind honourable members that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence.

AN HON. MEMBER: I will have to remember that.

MR. BARRY: That is typical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Who was interrupting -

MR. BARRY: The honourable Member for Bell Island asks and suggests that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRYS: - suggests that Newfoundland Light and Power should be taken over by government and run by government. The honourable member must also then realize, of course, that the necessary capital for putting into the transmission facilities of the company would have to be then raised by government in addition to monies that are otherwise needed at the present time.

April 29, 1975

Tape No. 1892

NM - 4

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And as the Company has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, in this particular year it would amount to something in excess of \$30 million, I forget the exact amount, but in excess of \$30 million and

at this time, Mr. Speaker, government does not see any particular advantage that would be derived from making that particular utility a crown run or government owned utility.

MR. NEARY: shareholders

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with that answer, Sir, and I wish to debate this matter on Thursday afternoon during the late show.

Sir, I have a question now for - another one for the minister of Minister of Mines and Energy, the Acting President of the Treasury Board. Would the minister care to tell the House if there is any change in the strike of the employees of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission? When can we expect to buy a drop of stuff again?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are getting parched.

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

MR. NEARY: We are getting parched.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, knowing some of the other habits of the honourable the Member for Bell Island I am not sure whether he would be interested in anything that the liquor store had to offer, I thought his taste was something more exotic like shaving lotion or melted shoe polish -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: - which I hear is fairly good after being strained through a loaf of bread.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Specifically, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SIMMONS: What kind do you drink anyway?

AN HON. MEMBER: Formaldehyde.

MR. BARRY: Yes, a little formaldehyde would do wonders to for the honourable member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, specifically I have nothing further to report on the liquor strike. The parties are still at a difference. The picket lines are still up to my knowledge -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: - and this is the normal collective bargaining process -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: proceeding as it should. And I guess the universe is unfolding as it should.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P.S. THOMS: In the absence of the Premier I would like to direct a question to the Acting Premier, the Minister of Justice. Is it true according to the rumour, that this administration supports the increase that the Newfoundland Light and Power is seeking?

MR. BARRY: That is pretty clear.

AN HON. MEMBER: The truth.

MR. THOMS: The question is, Mr. Speaker, does this government support the Newfoundland Light and Power in its increase for power rates across this Island?

MR. HICKMAN: No. N-o.

MR. THOMS: Well, that is all I want to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. I believe the minister is aware that the Canadian National Telecommunications is closing up several of its offices throughout this Province. I am wondering if he plans to intercede on behalf of some of the offices, particularly those where the managers or the clerks have their homes there, and they have been in service for many, many years, as high as thirty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I had heard some indication of that previously, Mr. Speaker, and on Saturday evening when I was down to the honourable member's district I met a person down there who gave me more concrete results of it. We will certainly take the matter up with CNT. I do not know what stations are involved at this point in time but certainly we will take the matter up with CNT and find out just what their plans are. I understand there are some plans to phase out some of the smaller operations, which ones I do not know. But we will undertake to check and follow it through for the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Could the minister inform this honourable House if there are any late developments or if his department is considering awarding the necessary funds to the Terra Nova Integrated School Board for the construction of an elementary school in the area of Dark Cove-Gambo-Middle Brook?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable gentleman, I was going to say, probably knows, but perhaps he does not - certainly the honourable gentleman should know. In terms of capital expenditure the government votes a certain amount to the Denominational Educational Committees. Current expenditure goes to various school boards, on a current account, on operating account goes to various school boards so much per pupil. However capital expenditure is voted to the three Denominational Educational Committees and apportioned among the three in terms of their population percentage within the Province. The further apportionment which the various Denominational Educational Committees make is made by them, not by the government. There will be discussions between various boards and a particular Denominational Educational Committee but the further apportionment on capital funds, not current which go directly to boards, on capital funds is done at the DEC level and not at the Department of Education or government level.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: A question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Has the department received the report, that report that was being done on the possible environmental impact of the proposed expansion of Bay D'Espoir? I understood from the minister that a report was being done some weeks ago. Has it been completed and what is the result of that?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I should point out that it is not the consequences of the expansion of Bay D'Espoir, that the unit, the expansion of the actual Bay D'Espoir generating site, the putting in of the additional unit will go ahead regardless of whether the Lloyds River is diverted. The honourable member is referring to the environmental study in connection with the Lloyds River diversion. This report which is a preliminary environmental study and not a full environmental impact study has been received and is presently under active consideration by government. We hope just as soon as we can to have further information on this.

But the unit seven at Bay D'Espoir will go ahead regardless of whether or not Lloyds River is diverted. A decision will not be made with respect to the diversion of Lloyds River until and only if government is assured that it can be done without undue damage to the environment. I must say that there have been some fairly serious concerns raised in the initial environmental study. This is presently being considered by government.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No. Lloyds River will have to be diverted in order to get additional energy. But, we will need additional peaking capacity by 1978.

MR. ROBERTS: If we put in an extra generator, would we not get extra energy?

MR. BARRY: Yes, for peaking. They say it will save money that way because otherwise we will have to rely on gas turbines or the thermal plant at Holyrood. As you know, the thermal plant is not very adequate for peaking because you cannot switch it on and switch it off automatically. You can do this with gas turbines, but again gas turbines are very much more expensive -

MR. ROBERTS: If you divert Lloyds, you are going to have trouble.

MR. BARRY: - from an operational point of view.

We have already received - and apart from the environmental impact study, I have had discussions with people in the Buchans area, for example, who have expressed concern about the possible affect on Red Indian Lake. So, we are looking very carefully at this.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister just pursue that a minute though and - a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the minister just pursue it a minute further? Did I understand from him that the additional peaking capacity is not dependent on the diversion of the river?

MR. BARRY: That is true.

MR. SIMMONS: That is what he is saying, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In light of this conference in Charlottetown with the federal Minister of Transportation, I wonder if he can tell the House if they can see in the foreseeable future any amendments to the Maritime Freight Subsidies Act and what benefits if any will they bring to the Province of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. WOODWARD: It is good for two minutes "Joe".

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, just one minute. The first thing is you are talking about the subsidy programme, I presume. The honourable member is talking about that? It has gone from twenty to seventeen and a half to fifteen now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The federal act, yes.

Well, right now - let me put it this way to the honourable member - the whole thing is encompassed in the new rail rate policy. What the rail rate policy will do, we hope, in our opinion, the Atlantic Provinces is that we will retain the subsidies we have and that any further rail rate policy proposals, the normal rates that are paid for will give special acknowledgement to the fact that Atlantic Canada does not have the transportation

system and it is far away from the center, and that instead of paying what is now paid for a freight rate which is normally the variable cost plus up to 180 per cent, that they would have the variable cost with a much smaller, must less amount and a much smaller area so that in effect the normal rates that we would pay for freight would be decreased greatly, but that we would still retain - and that is what we mean by our historic and statutory rights, no matter what happens we still feel that we should maintain these historic and statutory rights.

MR. WOODWARD: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Boats as well.

the whole thing. Any rate subsidies that we have, the same as the Crows Nest Pass, they have it out West, you know, \$200 million a year, which is a lot more than we have. So what we have by historic and by statutory right we want to keep and any new policy would have to be stacked on that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, another question for the honourable gentleman from Labrador West to bring him from Labrador to the Western side of Fortune Bay and in the continued absence of the gentleman from Fortune Bay, could the minister indicate to the House what steps, other than his resignation, he has taken in response to the public requests made by the, well the telegram which I have which is the same as the honourable gentleman has, was from the Chairman of the St. Jacques to Coomb's Cove Council and also signed by the Mayor of Belleoram and the Mayor of Pool's Cove and the Vice-President of the Southcoast Regional Development Association? I think the minister is familiar with the telegram, Mr. Speaker, or otherwise I would be delighted to read it again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: My wife has it framed.

I wired the councils back. Right now it is on my desk for a decision and hopefully - I have been away for four or five days - a decision will be made. We have a cost estimate on Wreck Cove and Boxey which was not included, of course, in the original tender. So I would anticipate, well, if I can get an hour or so with the people down in the department, possibly within the next day or two, but under no circumstances would it be beyond the end of this week. But I have already wired and acknowledged it, the wire that they had, and I have the cost estimates on Wreck Cove and Boxey and by the latest, the end of this week they will have a reply.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The minister is saying then - this is a question, although it does not sound like one - the minister is saying then that he is going to decide by the end

of this week whether or not the pavement, the contract will be extended so that the contractor involved will be laying pavement as well in Wreck Cove and in Boxey. Is that the minister's position?

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is what the minister is saying and this time next year when the Auditor General comes up and says we have, you know, increased it. This is the sort of thing that we talked about in the Auditor General's Report, by the way. You know it is a small amount in a couple of communities and the plant is in the area and because the cost is as we suggested -

MR. WOODWARD: The Ombudsmen will fix that up.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Anyway by the end of the week, they will have a reply.

MR. NEARY: Ambrose Peddle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable gentleman, and I leave him to make his own peace with the Auditor General as best he can. A further supplementary, Sir. The minister talks of a small extension of the contract. The councils involved, Sir, are talking of far more than a small extension. They referred to the fact that about 5.15 miles had been contracted for. They are concerned with thirteen miles of road, some of which, I guess, would be the so-called main road, some of it would be the so-called secondary roads. Will his decision involve paving these secondary roads or the eight miles of road in addition to the portion which is in the communities of Wreck Cove and Boxey?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The honourable member's question - I think in the telegram I understood that it was just Wreck Cove and Boxey. We are looking at the situation. Mostly from a viewpoint I will have to say Wreck Cove and Boxey and whatever else is done or what will be done there will be decided, as soon as I can get an opportunity to sit down with the people. I think we have the cost estimates. That is what we were waiting for. We will have it by the end of this week, and they will be so notified then.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable gentleman. But with the telegram, Wreck Cove and Boxey were not the only points made. The telegram said, at any rate the 5.15 miles indicated in the tender seems to us to be insignificant in terms of the number of councils to be served in the aggregate mileage involved, approximately thirteen miles. So I will conclude this series by asking will the minister give consideration to paving the extra, roughly eight miles, 7.85 miles according to these figures, which the councils involved wish to have done?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that any council or any individual really in the Province who does write and whatever is contained in their telegram is something that I cannot recall, it is sort of one of those mind blocks, I guess, but whatever it was put in the telegram, whatever the request was made, the total request will be given consideration and whatever that might be, I do not know the details now, but I know I did wire them back last week to acknowledge it and now, like I say, it is on my desk. And as soon as I get the opportunity I will be able to make a decision.

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

MR. ROBERTS: His mind blocks are much like his problems with the Auditor General. He will have to work them out on his own. Would the minister indicate to the House why he has not, according to the telegram, the telegram, you know, which was made public, feels that it is intolerable and ignores completely the function of local government, the so-called and I quote again, "the blatant disregard of the minister" and all that refers to the alleged failure of the minister to consult with the councils concerned, could the minister indicate to us why he did not consult with the councils concerned before awarding this project?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, it is not abnormal that we do not consult with people in the area but as I mentioned in the telegram, by the way, and which they are welcome to make public if they want to, that some of the council roads were included. By mistake, if you want to use it that way, or by oversight or what have you and that I think is where the problem is. Actually we included some roads that were under their jurisdiction and that is what their beef is. At least that is the understanding from the officials in the department and I have wired them back as complete a reply as I could to their telegram and, as I say, if we have done something that they do not think is correct then we apologize for it. We certainly have no intention of offending anybody in the Province and if that happens I am genuinely sorry. But it is not our policy to, you know, anywhere you are going to pave a road to talk to people unless it is a road under a - no, I mean once the contract is called except if it is under a municipal or community council or so on then certainly we discuss it with them but normally the programme is drawn up at the departmental level, and, you know, with regard to the councils if they have any individual problems they normally approach us on them and we give them sympathetic consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the honourable Leader of the Opposition, Another question and that will end the time allotted for the question period.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will not get into a debate on the consultations except to say that obviously these community councils do feel somewhat offended and they have made the matter quite public.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the minister undertake to consult with the council groups involved before taking any further decision. I am not asking will the minister satisfy these groups, that may be another matter. It may be the only thing that would satisfy them is his resignation, so I would think eight miles of pavement is considerably better than even the minister's political head. But would the minister undertake to consult with these councils before any final decisions are taken?

MR. ROUSSEAU: The minister will undertake to consult with any councils under any conditions which include those. If a council wants to make representations and these two have, this group has, the South Coast Development Corporation, I should say, although I suppose it is safe to go down there, but anyway I certainly will, any time from the honourable member's district or from any other district. If any council wants to see me then I am available if I am given sufficient notice and certainly as a matter of policy we will want to do that. We certainly do not want, as I say, to offend any council or any group. They have that right as elected members to come to us and to give us their thoughts. If anything was done there, again I say I apologize. It was an oversight, but we certainly will consult.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 23, I ask leave of the House to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, Mr. Speaker, the failure of the government to take appropriate action and implement measures to deal with the alarming geometric increase in vandalism and serious crime in this Province over the past three years. In view of the obvious fact that the government, especially the Minister of Justice, is no longer capable of dealing with this major problem, the House as a whole is now forced to come to grips with this most unfortunate situation immediately.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that is not a motion that requires the urgency of the debate and for the ungeometric mind of the honourable Member for Bell Island, may I remind this House that the question of vandalism was very thoroughly debated in this House just two days ago and whilst the honourable Member for Bell Island cannot recall what he said, nor can I -

MR. ROBERTS: The minister said -

MR. NEARY: We want to get action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! As all honourable members, I am sure, are aware,

it is not whether the matter itself is urgent, it is whether it is urgent enough to warrant the adjournment of the regular business of this House to have this debate. The matter in question was basically debated some days ago. The Chair certainly does not feel that it is important enough now to warrant a debate at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before the minister calls the orders, could he indicate the schedule he proposes to follow for the rest of this week with respect to sessions of the House?

MR. HICKMAN: For this week only, Mr. Speaker, the plan is that the House will sit this afternoon, will adjourn at six o'clock until tomorrow, three o'clock, which is Private Members' Day, will sit on Thursday, in the morning commencing at ten o'clock and will adjourn at six o'clock until eleven o'clock or maybe ten o'clock Friday morning and sit Friday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: We have got to get some work done. There is too much talk. It is all talk, no work. Motion 3.

On motion of the honourable Minister of Justice, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act," read a first
time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill,
"An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act," read a
first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill,
"An Act Further To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act, " read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, a bill,
"An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Association Of Architects And
Governing The Practice Of Architecture In The Province," read a
first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Tourism, a bill,
"An Act Further To Amend The Wild Life Act," read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture,
a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands Act," read a first
time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Order (1) Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply. I think the last day the
debate was adjourned by the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.
The Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, when I closed the last day I had just
completed requesting the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable
members opposite to explain clearly to the people of this Province
whether it is their policy as set out by the Hon. Member for Labrador
North that if you expect to get elected or any of you expect to get
elected the next time around, the people of the Province will expect
certain explanation of policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And I want to have you clearly explain whether it is
the policy of the Liberal Party -

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not know what their policy is.

MR. BARRY: - that the people on the Island portion of our Province

should pay higher electrical rates than the people of Labrador. Now I want them to direct themselves to that question, Mr. Speaker. I want the Leader of the Opposition to clearly tell the people of this Province what his policy is as Leader of the Opposition, although leader is a word that I must say I have to apply with tongue in cheek to the honourable gentleman. I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of a political eunuch when I look at the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He knows what he would like to do, and he would like to do it but he somehow lacks the resources to be able to carry it off.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen up to now complete lack of policy emanating from the honourable members opposite. And I would not put this challenge to the Leader of the Opposition were it not for the remarks of the Hon. the Member

for Labrador North who has played a fairly active role in the Liberal caucus. He has put forth the concept that the people on the Island portion of the Province should pay more than people in Labrador for electrical rates.

Now, I would like to also know whether they, if they accept that principle as party policy, whether they also believe it should be extended to other parts of the Province and whether it is Liberal policy that people on the Great Northern Peninsula or people in Port aux Basques or people on the Burin Peninsula or people on the North East Coast should pay more for electricity than those people who are fortunate enough to be located where the generating sources are, whether it be Bay D'Espoir or the Holyrood thermal plant or what have you.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province would be very interested in getting the position of the Liberal Party on this policy because our government's policy is quite clear. We believe that there should be uniform electrical rates throughout the entire Province. That is our policy. That is the policy we intend to implement. We now find the Member for Labrador North questioning that policy and stating that it should be changed. We are not saying that it may not be necessary, Mr. Speaker, under certain circumstances, in certain particular locations around the Province, in whatever area of the Province, whether it be Labrador or the Great Northern Peninsula or the Burin Peninsula or anywhere else, that it may not be necessary at some time to grant some form of industrial incentive. But any such industrial incentive should be granted directly, Mr. Speaker, clearly, so that the people can see how much is being granted. It should not be done by hidden subsidies. It should not be done by a hidden subsidy of electrical rates which can then lead you to the ill-conceived to say the least, type of project with the costs outweighing the benefits to the Province such as we have seen, has been our experience with the ERCO plant at Long Harbour.

Now, I would like to get a clear statement from honourable members opposite if they have the courage on this particular point. Mr. Speaker, these are the only remarks that I care to address myself to as raised by honourable members opposite, but there are one or two general

remarks that I would like to take this opportunity to bring forth, one particularly, Mr. Speaker. When the honourable member opposite raised the amendment to the Address in Reply, which is in effect a vote of non-confidence and suggests that this government has not done things which it ought to have done, there immediately came to my mind, Mr. Speaker, one area where their federal counterparts, the Liberal Government in Ottawa has in my opinion fallen seriously down on the job in that, Mr. Speaker, we now a situation in Newfoundland where we have the administration of justice virtually grinding to a halt with respect to the Supreme Court, as far as the Supreme Court is concerned, because of the tremendous workload that the three judges are being subjected to.

Since the unfortunate death of Mr. Justice Higgins, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for an appointment by the federal government of a fourth judge to the Supreme Court bench, forgetting for now about the three Appeal Court justices that we are also awaiting. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the very least that the federal government should have done by now is to have appointed this fourth Supreme Court judge. I have had people tell me, lawyers and others, about the problems that are developing in the court, about the tremendous workload, and the tremendous inconvenience to clients, to people. This is not just referring to convenience for the legal profession or to the judges, but I am talking about the fact that people have to wait months and months and months longer now because either they are waiting for appeals or they are waiting for trials to be scheduled. The

people of the Province are not getting the service that they should have in the field of justice, Mr. Speaker, because the Federal Government has delayed, unduely delayed, in appointing the fourth Supreme Court judge. I must point out as been brought to my attention that since Mr. Justice Higgins died, and I have not checked this out but I am told on fairly reliable authority, that there has been at least one judge who has died in Ontario and almost within weeks after the death of the Ontario judge there was a new appointment to the bench of Ontario. Now, I ask if the Federal Government can move with this rapidity in Ontario, if they can have another judge appointed within a reasonable time in Ontario, why can they not do it in Newfoundland? Why are they not doing it in Newfoundland? What is the problem? The people of the Province here deserve to have this situation clarified, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve to have proper consideration given to the administration of justice in the Province and I would like within the next short time, Mr. Speaker, to see some action by Mr. Lang. I understand - yes, that is another point - I understand the Law Society of Newfoundland sent a telegram to Mr. Lang inquiring as to when he would be prepared to appoint the fourth judge and the reply that they got back was very curt, I would say curt to the point of arrogance almost. The reply basically was to the effect that, I am neither prepared nor ready to tell you when the appointment will be made. (Period, full stop, the end). Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. We have judges down there, I would submit, whose very health is being endangered because of the workload that they are being subjected to and they have no choice, Mr. Speaker. They have to try and deal with the, not only their ordinary routine increase in workload which every year has been increasing, which is why we now all agree that there should be an appeal court for the Province, but they have also, Mr. Speaker, had to take on the workload left by Mr. Justice Higgins when, as I say, his unfortunate death took place. The cases that he had left uncompleted,

the appeals, the decisions that he was bringing down, other judges have had to take these on and it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we saw action from the Federal Government to correct this situation.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few general comments on, not in my particular field of expertise but a topic on which I know I have occasional concern raised, and I suspect other residents of the Province do as well, and that is with respect to some statements that we see emanating from policemen across Canada, not just here in Newfoundland, although some very outspoken statements we get here in Newfoundland as well but right across Canada. Mr. Sid Brown, I believe, who is the President of the Police Chiefs Association is well known for some of these statements. But I would like to submit a couple of propositions, Mr. Speaker. First, I would submit that anything, that any existing policy or law which endangers the lives of the police of our Province, of our nation, then it is understandable and reasonable that we should have police statements and police lobbying to get such policy or such law changed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is a point where the line should be drawn, and I would submit that there is no place for the policeman in making law, in forcing policy upon the people of a Province or of a country. That is what happens in a police state.

Mr. Speaker,

and I am a bit concerned about some of the developments that I have been seeing over the last year or so where, well naturally enough we are getting a more militant police force here in Newfoundland, right across Canada because of the fact that, and rightfully so, that this government saw fit to grant certain new and improved rights to the Police Brotherhood with respect to bargaining for their wages and with respect to bargaining for their working conditions and so on, and for too long had this particular part of our society been ignored and had certain rights taken away from them unnecessarily so. So we have had increased participation by the police in collective bargaining and as I say I support that completely.

We have also seen, Mr. Speaker, what I submit to be an unsettling trend and that is where we see the police coming out and criticizing not specifically, you do not often hear them doing it specifically, but criticizing both decisions of the court, particularly with respect to sentencing, the usual submission being that the judges are too lenient, the judges are too soft, and also, Mr. Speaker, criticism by members of the police force of the elected representatives, members of government, with respect to their policies on certain matters relating, not always I submit, solely to the police force or solely to the protection of the life and limb of policemen.

We have a number of areas here. We have the lobbying, and I think that is what it is, lobbying on the part of the police force for the bringing back of the death penalty and this is not just with respect to the enforcement of the death penalty for the killings of police guards and prison guards and policemen, but we have a very strong lobby by police forces on the premise that the bringing back of the death penalty will get rid of a lot of the criminal element get rid of a lot of crime, and the main objective or the main rationale for this step, or this is the way it appears to me, this will make the policeman's job easier and it seems to me that this is the same rationale that is given for the criticism of various sentencing procedures carried out by our courts, criticism that the judges are too lenient in sentencing and then people are back on the street too soon and then you have

got possibly an earlier involvement by the same people again in criminal activity.

Well I submit that the main objectives of our criminal law are not to make the jobs of the police force easier, Mr. Speaker. And I would submit that it is taking a very simplistic approach to law and order to say that bringing in harsher sentences right across the board, or bringing back the death penalty, is going to improve respect for law and order, is going to see fewer criminals in society.

MR. NEARY: What about if a plebiscite was taken?

MR. BARRY: If a plebiscite were taken, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure how it would go right now. But I would submit to you it is something that would vary from day to day, and I would submit that it is a very emotional issue, and I would submit that it is not something that necessarily should be subjected to a plebiscite say the day after or two days after you had the unfortunate slayings of the two policemen in Moncton. I would say if you had a plebiscite the day after or a week after that incident that there would be a fairly significant number of people in favour of bringing back the death penalty, an emotional response. But I think

people, when they have an opportunity to approach this in a rational, sane manner, most people realize that apart from the fact that if you got a mad, psychotic killer who if he gets back into society is going to be a danger, a threat to society, or in other words apart from the restrictive factor, that the death penalty is seldom, in my opinion, a deterrent. It is not a deterrent to the crimes of passion, Mr. Speaker. It is not a deterrent to the criminal who goes out and in the course of an armed robbery, when he is spraying around with his machine gun, as we see happen more and more in our larger cities, he is not really thinking as to whether or not he is going to be apprehended and executed. He is thinking about whether he can get away with his loot.

MR. NEARY: How would the minister hope to apprehend him?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in giving my views on the death penalty.

MR. NEARY: How would you go about it?

MR. BARRY: I would be very interested in having a debate on that should the issue arise, or should it become necessary, but that is not the point. It is not relevant to what I am saying. I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, my views have changed from time to time on the death penalty. I have one particular view right now that I have not always had during my lifetime, and I am not sure that I always will have it. It is one area where I have had to agonize at various times as to what is the proper view. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of people agree that there should be very restrictive rules with respect to release of people who have been convicted of murder. I would think that many people would ask the federal government to take a hard look at the length of time that these people must remain incarcerated before they again have an opportunity to get out into society. I do not think anybody could object to that position being taken. But I object, and object strenuously, Mr. Speaker, to the position being put forth and particularly, Mr. Speaker, by policemen who naturally enough

will tend to have a certain bias or a certain viewpoint from their own perspective in this matter, and they will be looking at it from the perspective of how to do an effective job of policing, how to most effectively carry out the police function. Now, as I say, my main objective, or government's main objective in the area of criminal law should not be to make the job of a policeman easier. We could do that by requiring everybody to report twice a day to the police station, to carry around identification cards, or to carry around tatoos on your forehead with your numbers on them.

Mr. Speaker, we got to avoid people jumping to the conclusion that if we do something that makes it easier for policemen to carry on their job, therefore, that is going to improve the situation with respect to law and order.

MR. NEARY: The first thing we have to do is to admit that there is a problem.

MR. BARRY: The honourable members says the first thing we have to do is to admit that there is a problem. Well, you know, again we see the police force, some members anyhow, not all the police force, advocating very strongly that we should have policemen carrying guns in Newfoundland, the Newfoundland Constabulary. Mr. Speaker, I am very leery about that. I am not saying that they should not have gun training. I am not saying that they should not have access to weapons when these are needed in special emergency situations. Mr. Speaker, I will say that if the experience in Detroit, for example, in the United States has shown us anything it should be that supplying police with guns does not do anything for law enforcement, it does not do anything to cut down the number of policemen injured in the line of duty.

AN HON. MEMBER: Self-defense.

MR. BARRY: Self-defense. It does not desist police in avoiding being injured or killed in the line of duty. And let us not kid ourselves. A policeman's job is a difficult job, and we have to be very sympathetic to the suggestions that are made with respect to facing an intolerable situation developing, and they put that point across, and we had to listen to it, sure.

MR. NEARY: Just remember that the R.C.M.P. carry guns.

Well, Mr. Speaker, again the R.C.M.P. carry guns all the time. I do not know if it is absolutely necessary for the R.C.M.P. to carry guns in Newfoundland. I am not sure that it is. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I go down - again it is easy for me to sound smug. I think it is easy for all of us to sound smug at times when we, as Canadians, point to some of the problems that they are having in the United States. We forget many of the benefits that we have gotten by being closely associated with the United States.

I tell you, one area where I have great relief every time I get back to Canada after a visit to the United States, and that is with the fewer guns that I see floating around. Good heavens, you get off a plane in Chicago airport or LaGuardia airport, O'Hare airport in Chicago, New York, any of the larger cities, and the first thing that strikes you is all these types going around, these forty-fives hanging off the hip. I mean, even the R.C.M.P. in Canada, you know, they have their holster and they have the flap down, and they have the gun. It is there. It is on them. But they are not always ready for the quick draw.

Now, Mr. Speaker, even the - I do not know why I should say, even the women, which is what I was going to say. We have to ask, should women in this area be considered any different than the male? But, I have to confess maybe it is because of my pre-conditioning. But I was shocked the first time I experienced a lady security guard at an airport walking around, and she had the forty-five hanging off one hip, and she had the truncheon, and the belt, and she had a little tin of mace, and she had the belt, Mr. Speaker, with the bullets. I do not know but she had a few hand grenades concealed on various parts of her person. But, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not the sort of society that I want to see develop in Canada. I do not think it is necessary. I do not think it has been shown to be necessary.

The honourable Member for Bell Island has not shown me anything that makes it necessary either.

MR. NEARY: Were you watching television last night? The F.L.Q. situation?

MR. BARRY: I saw the F.L.Q. situation, and again I would submit that that is a very good example, and that film should have gone on a little bit further and should have gone into detailing the numbers of people who

were picked up when the police were given these unrestricted powers, the numbers of people who were picked up and the numbers who were actually charged with anything, the numbers who were actually found to have done anything wrong.

You recall yourselves, you probably recall, Mr. Speaker, when this War Measures Act was proclaimed and you had police chiefs over on the Prairies and probably around here too - not in Newfoundland, I have to confess. I did not hear any statements in connection with the War Measures Act - but you did have a reference I think by one member of the constabulary somewhere in the Prairie Provinces and by the mayor of British Columbia, that here is our chance to get rid of all these long-haired hippie freaks, Here is our chance to get all these guys that we have been having our eyes on for some time. Let us round them up now that we have the authority. This is what happened in Quebec. The numbers of people that they rounded up in Quebec, and the numbers they charged would frighten you.

MR. NEARY: They did not agree with the War Measures Act -

MR. BARRY: They charged very few people after taking them, hauling them, rousting them out of their homes in the dead of night, bringing them off and locking them up. In many cases the families did not know where they were. They were held incommunicado for days.

MR. NEARY: They did not agree with the War Measures Act -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that if anybody took an objective and a balanced perspective on the day, maybe with hindsight, but he did it at the time, and that was Mr. Tommy Douglas who set out -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Trudeau shone. Trudeau was the shining light for us all, that saved Canada.

MR. BARRY: Yes. The Prime Minister shone, Mr. Speaker, and I have to confess that I was swept up myself for a couple of days. I was swept up with the need to get these vicious bandits, these cowardly murderers. I confess he got to me, or events got to me, and I was right behind him. But, then, Mr. Speaker, when I saw it it was not the implementation of the War Measures Act that caused the problem, it was the lack of follow up, the lack of supervision as to how these broad powers were being applied

April 29, 1975

Tape 1902 (afternoon)

TB-3

throughout the Province of Quebec. We saw the police in Quebec turned loose. We saw how they roused out hundreds and hundreds of people, and it turned out later that they could only lay charges against one or two people if that many.

I submit that is not the type of society that we want to see develop in this country.

MR. NEARY: They picked up bombs, grenades, guns, dope -

MR. BARRY: But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: There was one dope they did not pick up.

MR. BARRY: if I could point out - yes, there is one dope they did not pick up, they missed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two. Two and -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I submit -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - I submit that in this area of law enforcement honourable members opposite, and particularly the Hon. Member for Bell Island tend to put forth black and white solutions, extreme solutions to very complex issues. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask ourselves, do we cure the problems of our society merely by lashing out for the sake of revenge or our own satisfaction by either bringing back the death penalty or imposing harsher sentences when the experts cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, that there is any deterrent affect, any deterrent affect at all even in the death penalty.

MR. NEARY: Well who is talking about the death penalty?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are the who brought that up.

MR. BARRY: No, if the honourable member -

MR. NEARY: I am only talking -

MR. BARRY: If the honourable member happened to -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: If the honourable member happened to listen to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - items that were the subject of discussions -

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: - between the various police representatives and

Mr. Allmand, I guess yesterday -

MR. NEARY: You are linking me to the death penalty.

MR. BARRY: I am not linking you. I am not linking the honourable member to the death penalty. I take that back, if that inference is

there. But I am submitting that, and there is just one small point that I want to get across, that is, that we have to be very careful and we have to scrutinize very carefully the involvement of the police in policy making and in the making of law. Because if you have the police both making the law and enforcing the law you have a police state.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And we have to help the police, we have to analyze if they say they are having problems in particular areas of law enforcement then we have to look at them, and maybe we will have to say to them, that is too bad you are going to have to keep those problems because we do not believe that the measures to change, to remove those problems are ones we are prepared to accept. We may have to say to police, we realize your job is difficult, so are many other jobs but this is the law, this is the policy that we believe should be implemented. Now if you do not like it, you have two choices, either live with it or go find another job. It can often get down to that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No, I am not prepared to say, and I would like to hear the honourable member if this is his position, I am not prepared to say that we should accept every suggestion put forth by a police force here in this Province or across Canada with respect to law enforcement and with respect to the treatment of criminals or with respect to any other social problem in our society.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice and the government -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, these are all of the remarks that I would like to make at this time other than -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: - just in one other area - I am sorry, there are two other areas.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The honourable member has three minutes.

MR. BARRY: Three minutes?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BARRY: Well, two other main areas that I would like to touch on briefly, Mr. Speaker, One is as any honourable members might have noticed this - and I believe The Daily News carried a story on it, this is the potential problems with respect to pollution arising from various industrial activity in Placentia Bay. Now I think that is an example of again lack of foresight, lack of planning by a previous administration that honourable members opposite supported, and it is shameful, it is shocking -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is terrible.

MR. BARRY: - it is terrible when we have to now engage in studies, base line studies and other studies to find out just how much pollution is going into Placentia Bay when this should all have been done before these industrial activities were installed there. Mr. Speaker, this group at Memorial who is researching the problem arising from pollution from Long Harbour, from the Come By Chance Refinery and so on has my support as a member of government. They are now in the process of attempting to obtain funds to carry on this work. There is co-ordination being developed between the Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment and the federal government in this area. And, Mr. Speaker, I hope to see the work of this group at the University receive support from both federal and provincial governments to ensure that we avoid these problems, potential problems of pollution whether it be from fluorides or mercury or phosphorus or whatever, that these are discovered before they do irreparable harm to the ecology of Placentia Bay area.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The honourable member's time is up.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment so ably moved by my colleague from Labrador North, Sir. Sir, I hesitate to get up to speak today because of my condition with the flu, Sir. I am rather sick and tired and depressed and distraught, demoralized and listless, very little energy, Sir. Sir, I guess my physiological condition resembles the political condition of the present administration at the present time. But, Sir, I would like to get back to something a little closer to home. We have seemed to have ranged to the F.L.O., the War Measures Act, capital punishment and what have you. But, Sir, in essence, what this amendment, this vote of non-confidence says is that the government, putting it in other language, it says that this government have done things that they should not have done and have not done things that they should have done. It is as simple as that. It is a biblical quote, Sir. This House regrets the failure of the government to do those things which they ought to have done and further regrets that they had done those things which they ought not to have done.

Sir, the Premier, I think, Sir, will be one of the first persons to get up and vote in favour of this amendment. The Premier of this Province I would expect, would expect will get up and vote in favour of this amendment. Now, Sir, why do I say that? Because the Premier without even having spoken in this House of Assembly on this amendment, Sir, has publicly declared that there will not be an immediate election and that he will be putting the election off for quite some time in order that his government may stand on its record with some hope of success. Sir, to my mind and the mind of every person that I have spoken to outside of this House is that this has been an admission on the part of the Premier that his record to date, Sir, has been a dismal record indeed and he has publicly declared that his administration's record up to this date is not fit to stand on and that he needs another year or so in order to try and do something so that at least the record

looks reasonably good before the people and the electorate of this Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Probably so. So, Sir, the Premier has admitted and confessed that his administration to date has been a total and utter failure and therefore I would expect that the Premier will be one of the first to support this particular amendment. Sir, I am sorry the Premier is not in his seat today because, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is listening.

MR. ROWE: Well, I hope he is listening, Sir, down there in his office with his speaker on. But yesterday when the intellectual genius and political wizard from Burgeo got up, Sir, he said something to the effect that there was a great relationship between the Alberta Government, Premier Lougheed and the present administration in this Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No way. No way.

MR. ROWE: And, Sir, he indicated, I wish I could get his exact words and I am not quoting the member exactly but this is what he said, something to the effect that the Alberta Government is likely to be assisting this Province in the development of the Lower Churchill.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you not hear that before?

MR. ROWE: Now, Sir, we certainly have heard it before.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We were the ones who said it.

MR. ROWE: We were the ones who asked questions of that very thing and we had it denied by our very Premier in this House of Assembly.

MR. ROWE: Well, Sir, what is going on over there? Has the Member for Burgeo become the new Minister of Industrial Development? Is he now the spokesman for the Premier or what? Because time after time, particularly my colleague -

MR. EVANS: - never get in in the next election.

MR. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, is the same courtesy extended to this side of the House as was extended to the other side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The mad dog from Burgeo.

MR. ROWE: The fact of the matter is, Sir, that my colleague from Bell Island especially has been asking questions day in and day out of the Minister of Industrial Development and the Premier, asking whether there is a deal or an agreement with the Alberta Government to help to finance the development of the Lower Churchill and Sir, the government had been silent on this matter until the Member for Burgeo sneaked it out yesterday or accidentally let it slip out.

MR. EVANS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that we had had a deal made. We had an offer from the Premier of Alberta, an offer. Do you not know the difference?

MR. ROWE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order but at least the Member from Burgeo has said now an offer has been made. That is very interesting, Sir, because when the Premier returns to his seat we are going to be most interested in asking him, the Premier, what offer has been made by whom, and what is the nature of the offer.

MR. EVANS: The offer -

MR. ROWE: I am almost ready to yield, Mr. Speaker, to the Member for Burgeo in order to find out what the magnitude and what the exactitudes of that offer are. It is as simple as that.

MR. NEARY: The Member for Burgeo said there was an offer made to the government by Alberta, would the minister care to -

MR. ROWE: I hope the press caught that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Sir, what has this government done in the last few years, that

which it ought not to have done. Well, Sir, in one thing alone, we look at the budget that has been brought down, and we see the Minister of Finance getting up and talking about his \$1 million budget, \$1 billion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: \$1 billion.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The mad dog is at it again.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please! When any honourable member is speaking from his seat, he has the right to be heard in silence. It not only applies to members to my left but also members to my right.

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance comes in with his \$1 billion budget which upon analysis turns out to be nothing but a \$1 billion bluff. Nothing but a \$1 billion bluff, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Phoney budget.

MR. ROWE: Sir, there is nothing in the Budget Speech whatsoever about tax increases, the government said no tax increases this year. Well, Sir, that is obvious because since this administration has come in power they have done that for every year since they have gotten in and now they are taking credit or trying to say that they are great heroes because of the fact that they have not increased the taxes this year. The people of this Province have already been taxed to death, Sir.

The government did not mention the fact that 53.4 per cent of the revenue of this Province comes from Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who cares?

MR. ROWE: Who cares? Precisely! The government certainly does not care, Sir. It does not take government very long, Sir, to criticize the federal government in Ottawa every chance that they get. Sir, they did not quote or they did not cite or they did not emphasize the \$1.6 billion debt that this Province has.

Sir, in their \$1 billion bluff they neglected to point out that they were making use of government agencies, Memorial University and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and this sort of a thing in order to crawl up through this \$1 billion level.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Sir, as I repeat, this budget was nothing more than a \$1 billion bluff when we analysed it and we will be analysing it in greater detail at a later date on the - are we finished the budget speech yet?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, we have.

MR. ROWE: We have finished it. Well, probably I did not get my licks in on that one because I had a few notes taken on it. But, Sir, the debt of this Province has risen tremendously since this administration has taken over. Sir, this is the very administration that in 1969, 1968-69, 1970 and 1971 during campaigns and during press releases, the P.C. Party when it was not an administration claimed that this Province was approaching the \$1 billion debt - that is the direct debt, indirect debt and the guaranteed debt of the Province - and that the Province was verging on bankruptcy. These were the exact words of every Tory in this Province, even the ones who had crossed the floor from the Liberal side, Sir. Some honourable ministers now sitting in the present administration claim that this Province was on the verge of bankruptcy.

Now, Sir, what do we have? This year we have a \$1.6 billion debt. The 1975-76 borrowings will amount to an excess of \$200,000.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: \$200,000?

MR. ROWE: \$200 million, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. CFLCo, Sir, \$160 million and Sir, we are talking an order of magnitude of \$2 billion in debt carried by this Province within this present fiscal year. This is incredible, Sir. It took twenty-three years with all the progress to build up a billion dollar debt. It took three and a half or four years to build up a \$2 billion debt with next to no progress. That is an achievement if ever I saw one. That is in fact the biggest achievement of this administration, is the debt -

MR. NEARY: Record unemployment, highest cost of living in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Now, Sir, we all know that this government has taken over

the responsibility, the financial responsibility for the development of the Lower Churchill at the Gull Island site and of course we also are going to have the expansion of Bay D'Espoir. Sir, I would suggest that before it is all over, within the next year and a half to two years, and this is not just a wild guess, this has been worked out on the basis of what it is going to cost to develop the Lower Churchill without even taking the inflation factor into consideration over the next two or three years, I would suggest, Sir, that before it is all over that this administration before it is booted out of office would have handed back to the Liberal Party and the Liberal administration of this Province a \$4 billion debt when you take the expansion of Bay D'Espoir and the development of the Lower Churchill and all that sort of thing into consideration.

As I mentioned before in previous speeches, Sir, ownership of natural resources is something that you cannot argue against. It is motherhood. But ownership of developed natural resources and ownership of undeveloped natural resources are two different quintals of fish. Sir, what have we done? We have taken ownership of an undeveloped natural resource and I think that government acted a little hastily.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are against it, eh?

MR. ROWE: No, I am certainly not against it. You see, there you go, Mr. Speaker. I have taken pains to point out that there is a difference between, there is difference between ownership of a developed natural resource and an undeveloped natural resource. When you take ownership of an undeveloped and unexploited, yet to be developed natural resource you have to act very cautiously and very carefully and you have to know a couple of things, Sir. Number one, how much it is going to cost, when it is going to be developed, what is the tech -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No problems.

MR. ROWE: Oh! No problems. What markets, what markets have this government got for the electricity that is supposedly brought to this

April 29, 1975.

Tape 1906

RH - 3

Province?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: There has not even, Sir, been any indication of the money to develop the project, let alone an

indication of the markets on this Province. As a matter of fact, Sir, I will go out on a limb and predict that this administration will never live to see the day of a substantial, a reasonable, a real start to the development of the Lower Churchill. There will be a few preliminary drill holes on either side of the Straits to find out what the stratigraphy of the rock is. There will be a few holes dug. There will be a few guys up there with chain saws clearing the clearance for the transmission line, but, Sir, there will not, I predict, be a substantial start to the development of the Lower Churchill, the bringing of the electricity to this Island portion of the Province and market for that electricity within the lifetime of this administration.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: It is as simple as that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well said. Well said.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Sir, this -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: My point is proved and you are stunned.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, this is a subject I did not really intend talking about.

MR. WILSON: Rocks in your head.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: I would hate to think of what is in the honourable member's head, Sir.

Now, Sir, we are talking about what ought to have been done and what ought not to have been done. Sir, I have here in front of me a total list of 170 - 169 to be exact. But, Sir, there are fifty promises, fifty things that this government ought to have done that they have not done. Sir, they are the master misleaders of this Province, this administration. They have, Sir, conned the people of this Province. Sir, I will admit one thing, at the present time, and it will be short lived, they appear to be political geniuses because they knocked off or they tied an election with a political genius in the former Leader of the Liberal Party. Sir, I choose my words very carefully so I will not be unparliamentary. They are political geniuses or they think they are political geniuses because

they have conned the people once.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

The word conned is not in order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes, Sir, it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): It is not in order.

MR. F. ROWE: I will quote you the citation, Your Honour. It is parliamentary. We have used the word a long time.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The word con is to deceive, to take, to lie. It can be interpreted as such, and the Chair is interpreting it as such and would ask the honourable member to withdraw that word conned.

MR. F. ROWE: I withdraw the word conned, Sir, and I will say that the administration have misled the people of Newfoundland and they have fooled the people of Newfoundland and they have tricked the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

The honourable member is withdrawing and replacing with another unparliamentary word. Mislead is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. F. ROWE: Withdraw what?

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Mislead.

MR. F. ROWE: I did not use it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we wish to appeal Your Honour's -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I appeal that order because it has been used consistently by the Minister of Mines and Energy for the last two or three days --

MR. NEARY: We wish to appeal Your Honour's ruling, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: - consistently, and we brought it to the Speaker's attention.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we wish to -

MR. F. ROWE: I refuse to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: We wish to appeal Your Honour's ruling, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The motion is, Sir, that we appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld. Those in favor "Aye". Those against "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): The Hon. Member for St. Barbe South.

MR. F. ROWE: North.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): North.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was about to point out the fact that this administration appear to be political genuises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order. I realize, Your Honour, is at best confused but three members stood -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

MR. ROBERTS: - and according to the rules of this House, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

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

MR. ROBERTS: - we requested a division, and we are entitled to one, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What has happened to the Leader?

MR. NEARY: The House is in a shambles.

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

MR. NEARY: Get the Speaker back.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

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

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): I would like to remind the honourable gentleman for White Bay North that the Chair is not confused.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the records will speak for themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Sir. We have asked for a division.

According to the rules, we are entitled to a division, Sir, and, Your Honour,

then, Sir, recognized the gentleman from St. Barbe South. If Your Honour feels that Your Honour is not confused, I will accept Your Honour's word that Your Honour is not confused, but could we go ahead with the division?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. There was a request for a division. Three honourable members stood in their place and obviously whenever that occurs a division is allowed and not only allowed but required. But before the Chair had an opportunity to even ring the bells the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North rose to continue his speech and was recognized.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was very confused.

MR. HICKMAN: The fault dear Brutus lies with the confusion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Yes .

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was in the Chamber, and the Hansard will clearly reveal that my colleague said to Your Honour shall I proceed, and Your Honour indicated that he should proceed. I said the Speaker was confused. That is not unparliamentary. The word, mislead, has been used a hundred times in this House and all of a sudden we now in midstream get a ruling. Next we are going to be told that we cannot say that the government are incompetent. You know, there must be a consistency, Your Honour, and that is why we appeal this ruling. The word, mislead, Sir, has been used in this Chamber time and time again and it has been ruled parliamentary. Now if we do not have consistency, Sir, then there is no hope in us.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): There was a beginning for members to stand on the division, which they did, and they immediately took their seats. And since there was no division or no reaction from the members opposite the member for St. Barbe North took his seat or at least stood in his seat and was recognized to proceed. Now if there has been an error here in procedure, then we can proceed by having the division.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank Your Honour. Could I in all seriousness make a suggestion that perhaps we might adjourn for a moment and Your Honour might wish to consult with the clerk on this word, mislead. Now that term, Mr. Speaker, has been used in this House many, many times and has never been objected to. It has been used by members on both sides and, you know, the rules are the rules and if Your Honour makes a ruling - now we had one unfortunate experience with the Deputy Speaker where he made a ruling that was as wrong as wrong could be and because of stubbornness and foolishness on his part the ruling has not been corrected.

MR. HICKMAN: Your Honour -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on a point of order and the honourable the gentleman from Burin should take his seat until I am finished -

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable gentleman from White Bay North -

MR. ROBERTS: - on this point of order.

MR. HICKMAN: is rising while I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I am speaking on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Chair has ruled and was upheld on the remark by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) flown in from Ontario (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, you know, I am rising on a point of order and we are appealing the ruling, and I do not challenge it in any debate. I merely ask, Your Honour, and I suggest - otherwise, Sir, what is happening is that debate is being cut

down whether deliberately or not I know not, but it is being cut down and circumscribed and words that have been parliamentary, Sir, for a long time, and have been accepted are being - and all I am suggesting, Your Honour, is that this is an important matter and that Your Honour may wish to take advantage of the Chair's prerequisite and privilege or prerequisite and privilege to adjourn the House for a matter of five minutes or so, so that Your Honour would have the opportunity to consult with the Speaker and to consult with Your Honour's advisors so that when the ruling is given - you know, I do not want to embarrass anybody but, Sir, the term mislead has been used time and time again in this House. And all of a sudden now it is being thrown out. Now, Sir, if we cannot follow precedent in this House, Sir, what is the point of having all of these rulings from the Chair, what is the point of having a series of rules and a body of precedent. This is a very serious matter indeed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The Chair has already ruled. It is the Chair's interpretation of the word mislead, when you mislead the House you lie to the House, and that is unparliamentary.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: I did not say at any time that any member or any minister had misled or lied to this House, and I want to make that quite clear. I clearly stated that this government has consistently since it has gotten in power have misled the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: And I will not withdraw that.

MR. HICKMAN: The Chair has made -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: The Chair has made a ruling.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, the Speaker has given way to him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please! The Chair will now adjourn the House for ten minutes to consult and advise.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please! The Chair has consulted with the members at the table here. After some discussion possibly the Chair at the time felt that there was some insinuation in the remark misleading that it might have been deliberately misleading. But since the word deliberate was omitted and the member's uses, and I understand it, has been used in the House from time to time but not in a deliberate sense though, so it will be ruled in order. The Chair now recognizes the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Sir, the point that I was trying to make is that this administration over the past three or four years, before their term of office and since have made 169 promises and I was going to try and refer to 50 of them, but obviously I will not have enough time to complete the

list, but Sir, I said that since they were successful in being elected upon the promises that they have not kept that they appear to be, the present administration appear to be political geniuses or had appeared to be political geniuses, and I choose my words very carefully, Sir, on the scale of intelligence, according to a book of psychology and Sir, although they appear, the administration appears to be, they appear to be political geniuses at the present time and have appeared to be, Sir, they have proven to be administrative morons and imbeciles as far as the administration of this Province is concerned. Sir, they have bungled action in practically every single case, in the rapid development of the Lower Churchill, in the second oil refinery, with respect to the employment situation, with respect to trying to increase the revenue of this Province. Sir, the government have shown that they are only capable of bungling action, bungling action.

MR. NEARY: Bill Mullaly and Dick Greene.

MR. ROWE: And Sir, they are skillful only at inaction. Because, Sir, with reference to education alone, they have not grappled with the major problems confronting education in this Province and I have spoken at some length on the situation with respect to school tax authorities and I have said practically everything that can be said about that, but the government refuses to move on that particular issue.

Sir, the government promised in the 1973 Throne Speech to produce that very year an outline to further develop plans in education and human resources. We have been consistently asking the Minister of Education where Dr. Harris' report is. Sir, it has been promised, it has been promised by the Minister of Education. He stated in the last session that he would table the Harris Report on Education and Human Resources during the last session of the House of Assembly and he has not done that Sir, and he is giving the wishy washy answer with respect to the tabling of that report during this session.

Sir, the minister and the administration after making a statement concerning offshore manpower needs said that they would have a great

conference in January 1973 in that Throne Speech, said that the Department of Education would sponsor in the Spring of 1973 a great conference to study the offshore manpower needs of this Province and Sir, in this very session in answer to a question directed to the Minister of Education, he confesses that the government does not see any need for any great conferences any longer and there is no evidence, Sir, that anything is being done in our vocational schools and in the College of Trades and Technology to make sure that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are the ones who will be employed when we explore and exploit the offshore mineral, gas and oil resources of this Province.

My friend from Labrador North mentioned that during the current exploratory work off the Labrador Coast that one Newfoundlander was employed, one Newfoundlander,

Yet this government, Sir, have been conspicuous by their lack of emphasis and direction and leadership in insuring that our young Newfoundland people in a Province where we have the highest unemployment rate in Canada. They have shown complete lack of leadership with respect to making sure that the vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology and indeed the high schools, Sir, have curricula or curriculum, the current phrase is, which contain material to help our young Newfoundlanders to gain employment in this kind of exploration and exploitation.

Sir, we heard in the 1971 campaign speech that this government was going to instigate or institute a Province-wide educational T.V. system. Not a word has been heard about that, Sir, since this administration has taken over. Regional colleges, one in Corner Brook, Sir, that is all we have heard. But this government, Sir, intended to establish regional colleges in various sections of this Province. This promise was made in 1971. This is 1975, Sir, and the government have not defined what they mean by regional colleges or community colleges or extensions of universities. They have not defined the institution, number one. Sir, they have not outlined where in the Province they intend to place, if indeed they intend to put further regional or community colleges throughout this Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A great college at Corner Brook. -

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we will see just how great that college is in Corner Brook. I sincerely hope that it will be a tremendous success and it will help the people of the Southwest, West and Northwest Coast. But my understanding, Sir, is that the college is not without its difficulties at the present time. The Minister of Justice knows that as well.

Sir, the present administration for three years reduced the amount of student aid to young Newfoundlanders in order that they may attend the university and they brag and stick out their chests in 1975 for increasing the amount of the student allowances. Sir, to what has it been increased to? The same amount that it was when they took over, the same amount of dollars is going into student aid

this year as went into student aid during the time when this administration took over. This is one of their great battle cries, Sir, that they would reinstate student aid and they did the exact opposite. Sir, I can go on in the field of education with many more examples.

Sir, another promise in the area of finance that this administration made, S.S.A. tax exemptions for low income people or rebates. We heard this one being tossed around during the October, 1971 campaign. Premier Moores, Sir, said that the P.C.s plan to look into the possibility of devising a method to give higher basic exemptions to low income groups or to give them a rebate on some S.S.A. taxes paid. Sir, if that is not misleading the people of this Province what is it? Because, number one, the Province, no Province has any jurisdiction whatsoever over taxes, income taxes or exemptions on income taxes. They do not have jurisdiction over it. This is a Federal Government thing. Well, it got something to do with the S.S.A. taxes, Sir. But the point is, Sir, what has this administration done about this promise made five years ago?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Ordinarily the forty-five minute period would have expired for the honourable Member for St. Barbe North but the House was recessed for approximately five minutes so the Chair is prepared to let the honourable member continue for approximately five more minutes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Five more minutes.

MR. F. ROWE: How much was taken up. About twenty minutes of it. Is that all was taken up?

MR. HICKMAN: It is called injury time.

MR. F. ROWE: That is injury time, Mr. Speaker, right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, the Premier again or, Sir, at least the Throne Speech - The Premier through the Throne Speech in March, 1972 said that the goals of his government are to have not the highest unemployment rate in Canada but to reach full employment, and to have reasonable price stability, full employment and price stability. Well, Sir, what have we got five years later or four years later? The highest cost of living. Eight recommendations made by Mrs. Plumptre, eight recommendations that our provincial government, recommendations - or that are aimed at the provincial government that the provincial government has failed to act on -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Fall under provincial jurisdiction.

MR. F. ROWE: - fall under provincial jurisdiction completely, and we have the highest unemployment rate. The government is still floundering around with the Lower Churchill, with cement plants, with aluminum plants, with Bay D'Espoir, with the oil refinery.

MR. NEARY: Once in a while the third paper mill surfaces.

MR. F. ROWE: As my friend from Bell Island mentions every now and then we hear the third paper mill suffering once again. Sir, this government has not done one single thing that it can claim credit for in itself. They have continued on with a few Liberal policies. Sir, when this - I have to laugh at honourable members opposite when they get up and point out the errors of the Liberal years. Sir, the only reason there were errors and there were mistakes during the Liberal years is because things were being done.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: This government may not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - ever make a mistake, may not even make an error for one simple reason, because they have not tried anything on their own since they have come into office.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the reason why honourable members are presenting, honourable members on both sides of the House are presenting petitions for better roads after twenty-three years is that there are a few thousand miles of roads to be constructed in this Province still, to be upgraded still and to be paved still. I would submit that in twenty-three years time no matter who is in power that there will continue to be a flow of petitions if not for pavement for sidewalks or lights or anything like that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, if the honourable members opposite think that everything can be accomplished in twenty-three years or in three years, they are quite wrong because it will not. But, Sir, it was this administration, and I want to re-emphasize this, that made 169 promises that have not been kept. That is a record, Sir. That is a record, 169 promises. They have raised the expectations of the Newfoundland people beyond all levels. They misled the people. They made promises in federal government jurisdiction, got into power and then turned around and have been three and a half years to four years blaming the federal government for certain things that they have been unable to fulfill in the way of promises.

Sir, if that is not politically hypocritical, I would like to know what it is.

MR. SIMMONS: Misleading the people.

MR. F. ROWE: So they have placed a moratorium on progress. Whether they are doing it willingly or not I do not know. I think it is just a simple case, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have got her in reverse gear.

MR. F. ROWE: - of the administration being sick, tired, listless, leaderless,

April 29, 1975

Tape 1912 (afternoon)

IB-3

actionless -

MR. NEARY: Brotherless.

MR. F. ROWE: Brotherless.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And she is in reverse.

MR. F. ROWE: It is as simple as that, Sir. We have had nothing but a catalogue of procrastinations. There has been a moratorium on progress. Any action that they have attempted, they have bungled.

MR. NEARY: The Moores Moratorium.

MR. F. ROWE: They are artful only in the skill of inaction. So, that is the history of this administration. Sir, I hope that someday it will be written into the record, just a simple little list -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Here, I will challenge the government in the next election to do one simple thing, something that was done in 1966, what was promised and what was achieved by this administration. I challenge this administration to list what they have promised and what they have achieved. I submit, Sir, that the next two years this government will never have enough time to straighten out the record as stated by the government in order that they may be re-elected.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Never mind, "Charlie", I am in favour with you, boy.

MR. NEARY: Here they come to get the Member for Trinity North.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, before the question is called on the amendment there is just a few things I would like to say. I have already moved an earlier amendment. The words were different but I think the essence was the same. I am not nearly as poetic or as briefed in scriptures or the Book of Common Prayer as my colleague from Labrador North because as I say the words were different but very good taste in music which I cannot say for -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Very good taste, yes, tremendous taste in music. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help if the Minister of Mines and Energy cannot appreciate good music or if his T.V. reception that day was not good. I heard it. I heard it well and enjoyed it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: That was the problem.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, as my colleague points out, it was not the music that was there. That was the problem that day. It was not the music that was the problem that day. The delegates loved the music.

Mr. Speaker, before we move on, perhaps I will say just a few words on the motion. I was about to say I presented a similar

amendment earlier which was defeated by the oppressive government majority but at that time I did present a number of -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I particularly disappointed my colleague from Burin. I fully thought he would support me on the amendment. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying in that debate on that amendment I said most of the things I wanted to say but there are two or three, I hope, new items that I want to introduce. First of all, just make a reference to the matter that the Minister of Mines and Energy raised in replying to my colleague from Labrador North. I was not in the House yesterday for the whole of my colleague's address or even for that part of it which related to the incentives which he advocated for the Coose Bay area. So, I have talked to him to see exactly what he did say and in addition to that, of course, I am aware of what our particular policy is on this matter and I would like to state it for the record and in response to what the minister had said. Indeed, if I understood the minister correctly we are perhaps not that far apart but be that as it may the important thing is that we feel that something has to be done.

MR. BARRY: You are bringing him back in line are you? - - going to change it.

MR. SIMMONS: Doing which?

MR. BARRY: You are bringing the honourable Member for Labrador North back into line.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh! Oh! I see. Oh, the Minister of Mines and Energy wants to misconstrue this too. He suggests I am bringing the Member for Labrador North back in line. No, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Labrador North is well able to speak for himself except he is, I believe at this moment, one, on the way to Gander to keep a commitment and secondly, has already spoken in the debate and therefore is unable to correct any misimpressions any misconstruing which the Minister of Mines and Energy did. So I among other things would like to get into the record in case the minister

has managed to mislead the public on the matter. I would like to get into the record exactly where we stand on it. It will not be the first time we have been into the record

5560

0782

on this one but the minister using his usual tactic manages to apply the red herring approach as well in this instance as he does in others. We are for special incentives, direct incentives for industry in the Goose Bay Area. I recognize particularly that it is more difficult to attract the industry to Labrador because of the particular transportation problems, the additional expense of transporting your product to the market, the other problems that relate to Labrador, which I will not go into now, but I believe most members of the House will be familiar with. These particular constraints, as they apply to Labrador, make it very often not a competitive situation insofar as the Labrador part of our Province is concerned. Very often if a company is faced with a straight choice of establishing on the Island or in Labrador, if the attractions are all equal, then chances are they will establish in Newfoundland, on Newfoundland Island. Sir, we see the particular need to have some special incentives, direct incentives, which would help the industrialist to make up his mind in favour of establishing in Labrador if there are other reasons for him to go there. I do not believe in -

MR. BARRY: Do you agree that the people on the Island should pay the full cost of the transmission line?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the minister wants to write a speech for me, I invite him to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: And I hope he does a better job for me than he does for himself. But in the meantime I shall pursue the notes I have -

MR. BARRY: You are not going to -

MR. SIMMONS: - and if the minister wants to ask me some questions along the way or wants to slip me a few notes, I will be prepared to indulge him, quite prepared. If he wants me to answer the one he just raised about the transmission line -

MR. ROBERTS: Where is John Crosbie?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, where is John?

MR. NEARY: - with a nervous breakdown.

MR. SIMMONS: Where is John now that we need him?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did they not send Leo to Japan?

MR. NEARY: If he has had a nervous breakdown, he is not out of Japan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Well, actually -

MR. BARRY: That will land you on a sticky wicket.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: If they sent him to Placentia East it would be a change.

MR. BARRY: Let us see you get -

MR. SIMMONS: The minister, as usual, engaged in wishful thinking and dreaming, Mr. Speaker, like he dreams about the results of his election the next time around, Let him dream. Let him dream about sticky wickets.

MR. BARRY: Why not Placentia?

MR. SIMMONS: If he wants to talk about sticky wickets -
I cannot go to Placentia, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: He will not go now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: You are not going there.

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot take the member up on his invitation. I have already agreed to go - I believe the Premier invited me to go somewhere and run against him and being a man of my word, I cannot run in two or three constituencies as much as I would like to. If the member for Placentia West was in one of those constituencies, I would love -

MR. THOMS: You are just as good as two or three of them anyway.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last weekend -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Leo, what St. John's seat are you taking?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He is taking neither St. John's seat. He might try and run in one.

MR. THOMS: He is going to try and run in one.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that is different, and he is not taking either one.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Good for you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members both to my left and to my right seem to insist on talking across the House to each other and paying little or no attention to the honourable member who has the right to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair finds it rather difficult to follow some thirty-odd conversations all at the one time.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was about, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a very delightful meeting I had over the weekend. I actually had two delightful meetings but it would be straining the rule of relevancy somewhat to discuss the second meeting here, but the first one was on Friday night. It was a meeting of community councils. I had more people, Mr. Speaker, and I could only invite the community councillors in the area and there are only four councils and some of them are, one or two are short some members and others were away at work but with only four councillors to draw on, an eligible twenty-seven people who could attend altogether, allowing for those who had to work and who were out of town, I had more people at that meeting than the Minister of Mines and Energy had at his annual meeting of his association in Marystown last Fall. So let him tell us -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - about how solid he is in down in Marystown.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: And we will take it with the same grain of salt we take everything he says in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: More and more people -

MR. SIMMONS: I had more -

MR. F. ROWE : - at your big rally.

MR. SIMMONS: I had more for the community councils meeting than he had for his annual meeting. And I had twenty-five times as many as for my annual meeting in one-half of my district as the member had in his whole district. That is another story.

MR. NEARY: He had his meeting at the telephone booth down in Marystown.

MR. ROBERTS: Even then it has to be a collect call.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. And only then - I will not say it. It is too unkind for this hour in the evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to make a point or two on our position insofar as Labrador industry is concerned, the minister is dearly afraid we might make the point.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not afraid of it.

MR. SIMMONS: I am not at all afraid of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I am not at all afraid of it, no. No I am not afraid of the point I am going to make. The Minister of Mines and Energy is afraid of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Even though the amendment or the non-confidence motion itself is worded in a rather vague way, I must insist that the Hon. Member for Hermitage is still being irrelevant to the amendment.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I respect your ruling. I do not understand it, Mr. Speaker, but I respect it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sounds like the FLQ.

MR. SIMMONS: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, without questioning your ruling that the matter of incentives to industry in Labrador is very relevant. And at the point of interruption I was speaking on that point, I was talking about incentives to Labrador. If I am not going to be permitted to speak on that subject, well, I withdraw from the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: We feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that there ought to be some special incentives to industry to establish in Labrador. I understand that - I was not in the House at the time - I understand my colleague said essentially that. He should have said that. Because, one, that is our policy, and, two, it is the very -

MR. BARRY: He said much more than that.

MR. SIMMONS: - two, it is the very item on which he and I had a discussion only yesterday morning just two or three hours before he spoke in this particular debate. I know his views on it. And his views coincide one with mine, and, two, with the party view on this particular matter. On this one, Mr. Speaker, we are more consistent.

MR. BARRY: ... paying for the transmission line now.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to use the notes in front of me and I will address myself to the subject -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, that is the paragon of virtue who was upset because I was interrupting him during the question period.

MR. BARRY: Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MR. SIMMONS: Ah ha, exactly, exactly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name him -

MR. SIMMONS: And you are the gander in this particular one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not disgrace the gander ...

MR. SIMMONS: No, you are the goose. You would know -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Call -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, am I going to be harassed by -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - harassed by the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is the custom when the Speaker stands the member who is speaking takes his seat. Some honourable members to my left insist on interrupting the honourable member. The honourable member who does have a right to speak is not being relevant at all. If he is provoked by members opposite he may feel like responding to their comments but still procedurally he does not have the right to do so.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am going to need a ruling. Is Mr. Speaker saying that the transmission line and energy in Labrador and incentives is not relevant to this debate? If so I give up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair did not say that. The Chair said that comments being made back and forth by honourable members at this particular time were not relevant. And the member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: What would you call him?

MR. THOMS: A shrew! A shrew!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: An unpleasant shrew! He looks like -

MR. SIMMONS: Good!

AN HON. MEMBER: Go down to the Governor -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh well, here we go.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us call it -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines invites me to talk about -

AN HON. MEMBER: Talk about the ice and cool off.

MR. SIMMONS: - the transmission lines. That has been ruled irrelevant, so I shall not talk about transmission lines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: The matter of incentives to Labrador we are very strongly in favour of. We will do as a government, we will see to it that special incentives are designed and are publicized so that industries which would be contemplating, establishing in the Goose Bay area or other parts of Labrador would have that additional incentive to do so. The issue of transmission lines, the issue of differential of differing electrical rates are two issues that I would like to have the time to go into insofar as the differing rates is concerned. I believe that if we are going to get into incentives, they be direct incentives, they be not hidden subsidies but rather very direct and open ones so that we can know exactly what a job is costing us.

Speaking, Mr. Speaker, about the cost of jobs I come to another item which I submit is very relevant to the charge contained

in the amendment, that the government has certainly done somethings
it should not to have done.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, it should not have paid out in loans in the last two or three years under the Rural Development Authority \$40,000 to start funeral homes.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. SIMMONS: That is one of the things it should not have done.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: He should not have done it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: \$40,000 to create four and a half jobs, that is appropriate considering the subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Funeral homes.

MR. SIMMONS: Not five jobs but -

MR. NEARY: That is the death blow.

MR. SIMMONS: Not five jobs but four and a half jobs they created, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOMS: If the Tories cannot beat Newfoundlanders they might just as well bury them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: \$40,000, an average of \$9,000 to create each of these jobs, Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it, that is a resource based industry.

MR. SPEAKER: They are digging their own graves.

MR. SIMMONS: Or is it? I cannot find - I went over the rules which the minister gave out today and resource based industries, Mr. Speaker, I ask you is it resource based, this funeral home, or is it manufacturing and processing? Or is it service industries?

MR. ROBERTS: Truth is a further criteria.

MR. SIMMONS: Or is it, is it Mr. Speaker, and this is the only remaining category so it must qualify under the rules because I can tell you a number that did not qualify, I can tell you that this authority has refused to lend money to men who want to get involved in the trucking of logs, for example,

because they were told it did not fall into these categories, So is this funeral home a resource based industry, is it manufacturing and processing?

MR. NEARY: Using Newfoundland lumber?

MR. SIMMONS: Or is it service industries? Or, this is it, I missed this one before, I should read these things more carefully before I get up, it is a tourist based industry.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, that explains it.

MR. CROSBIE: Fine Newfoundland products.

MR. SIMMONS: That explains it, a tourist based industry.

MR. NEARY: Self help, build your own casket. Self help - job creation.

MR. SIMMONS: \$9,000, Mr. Speaker, \$9,000 per job for four and a half mind you, not five, four and a half jobs in the funeral business. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know what is the average number, what is the average cost of those jobs? What is the average cost? Well we could work out some of the other figures, some of the other -

MR. ROBERTS: After all the honourable gentlemen opposite -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Aw, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines has just given me the bit of information that I was missing. Sometimes his interruptions are kind of abrasive and harrassing but more often than not he gives you a bit of valuable information and I have now figured out, now figured out who it is got the half job, who it is got the half job.

MR. EVANS: It is not the Member for Hermitage, is it?

MR. SIMMONS: Now then the Rural Development Authority let the word go out that the Rural Development Authority is subsidizing the occupation of the Minister of Mines and Energy. They had the discretion and the good sense, Mr. Speaker, not to subsidize it to the tune of a full job, because they make wise decisions and so they subsidized a half job for the minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the honourable member move that the Committee adjourn?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the mortuary, the funeral business - \$9,000 a job. The average for all the loans that had been approved to a total of 922 firms altogether creating, according to this here, three thousand fifty-three and a half jobs, You know what the half job is, I cannot name him

in the House, it is not parliamentary. Three thousand jobs, the average per job is not \$9,000 as in the funeral business, but \$2,084, in other words to create those jobs which actually have no reference to the rules, and I charge again Mr. Speaker, as I did a year ago that the government is breaking the regulation on this business of Rural Development Authority, once again, Mr. Speaker, once again Mr. Speaker, the government is not only breaking the rules here but in this cockeyed scheme is laying out four time as much money to create those jobs.

MR. ROBERTS: To lay people out.

MR. SIMMONS: To lay people out, as it does in some of the more lively occupations that I could mention. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. NEARY: I think Premier Moores just stepped in.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes. I now move the adjournment of the most unproductive day in the history of the House of Assembly in Newfoundland. I move that the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: I move that the Standing Orders, the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock, carried.

I do now leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday.

CONTENTS

April 29, 1975	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Ottenheimer announced the names of winners of adult education scholarships for the past year. Mr. F. Rowe responded.	5481
Mr. Rousseau reported to the House of Assembly on meetings of Atlantic Provinces Transportation Ministers with Jean Marchand, Minister of Transportation for Canada, in Charlottetown the previous day. Mr. Woodward responded.	5482
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Gillett on behalf of the Fairbanks Improvement Committee asking that the Fairbanks branch road be upgraded and paved. Supported by Mr. Rousseau.	5493
By Mr. Gillett on behalf of residents of Bridgeport, N.D.B. asking that the road known locally as the Route be upgraded and paved. Supported by Mr. Rousseau.	5496
By Mr. Thoms on behalf of residents of Burnside, Sandringham, St. Chads and St. Brendan's Island asking that the government pave the road from Burnside through St. Chads on to Eastport. Supported by Mr. Rousseau.	5497
By Mr. Aylward on behalf of residents of Fox Harbour and Dunville asking that certain traffic signs be placed along the road linking the communities. Supported by Mr. Woodward, Mr. Rousseau.	5498
Reports of Standing and Special Committees	
Mr. Maynard tabled the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1974.	5500
Notice of Motion	
Mr. Hickman gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The Gander Development Corporation."	5500
Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given	
Mr. Doyle responded to a question asked the previous day concerning storage of some 20,000 pounds of salmon at Makkovik and plans to try to sell it.	5501
Oral Questions	
Directive to Welfare Officers asking them to measure lobster pots, herring nets and salmon nets. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Ottenheimer, Acting Minister of Social Services.	5501
Query as to why the directive was sent. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Ottenheimer.	5501
Query as to whether this extra workload means extra staff will be hired. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Ottenheimer.	5502
Government opposition to requested rate increases by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Barry.	5502
Query as to the amount of time government will need to study evidence submitted by the company. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Barry.	5503

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page	
Query as to whether government is considering taking over Newfoundland Light and Power. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry.	5504	
Mr. Neary stated his dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate it on the adjournment.	5509	
Strike of liquor store employees. Mr. Neary, Mr. Barry, acting President of the Treasury Board.	5509	
Query as to whether government supports the application for a rate increase submitted by Newfoundland Light and Power Company. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Hickman, Acting Premier.	5510	
Query as to whether government plans to intercede with Canadian National Telecommunications to alter plans and keep open several small offices CNT now plans to close. Mr. Gillett, Mr. Rousseau.	5510	
Government consideration of providing funds to the Terra Nova Integrated School Board to construct a new elementary school in the area of Dark Cove-Middle Brook-Gambo. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Ottenheimer.	5511	
Query as to whether government has received the report on possible environmental impact of the proposed expansion at the Bay D'Espoir hydro electric generating station. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Barry.	5512	
Query as to whether installation of an extra generating unit would mean additional electrical energy. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Barry.	5512	
Query as to whether additional peaking capacity at Bay D'Espoir is not dependant on diversion of the Lloyds River. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Barry.	5513	
Query as to whether in the light of the Charlottetown conference with the federal Minister of Transportation there will be in the foreseeable future any amendments to the Maritime Freight Subsidies Act. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Rousseau.	5513	
Steps taken to improve roads as requested by the Southcoast Regional Development Association. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5515	
Query as to whether the decision involves paving secondary roads. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5516	
Consideration to paving secondary roads. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5517	
Explanation sought as to why Mr. Rousseau did not consult with councils in the area. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5517	
Assurance sought that consultation will take place. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	5518	
Debate sought on a matter of public importance		
Under the provisions of Standing Order 23, Mr. Neary sought leave of the House to move the adjournment to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the failure of the government to take appropriate action and implement measures to deal with the increase in vandalism and serious crime in this Province.		
Spoken to by Mr. Hickman.		
Ruled against by the Chair.		5519

CONTENTS - 3

Orders of the Day	Page
On motion the following bills read a first time and ordered read a second time on tomorrow:	
"An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act."	5520
"An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."	
"An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act."	
"An Act Further To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act."	
"An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Association of Architects And Governing The Practice Of Architecture In The Province."	
"An Act Further To Amend The Wild Life Act."	
"An Act Further To Amend The Crown Lands Act."	5521
Address in Reply (continued)	
Mr. Barry (continued)	5521
Mr. F. Rowe	5537
Mr. Simmons	5558
(Moved adjournment of the debate)	
Adjournment	5571