

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before calling the first routine order, I am sure hon. members would wish me to and would join with me in congratulating the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) on his outstanding accomplishment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I hope we will not all be expected to emulate him.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to do two at the one time, one which I have here to table. I believe the House of Assembly would like to acknowledge the fact that two very prominent Newfoundlanders are in Ottawa today where they are being invested with the prestigious Order of Canada. I refer, of course, to Mr. Cam Gordon Eaton and Dr. Leonard Miller. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Canada was created to recognize outstanding achievements and merit in every major field of endeavour. I cannot think of any two men more deserving of this award. Mr. Eaton has been involved practically all his life with worthwhile community endeavours too numerous to mention and, as all members are aware, was awarded the Military Cross for his services overseas during the Second World War.

Dr. Miller is another outstanding Newfoundlander who has been involved in many worthwhile community projects and endeavours and was awarded the Citizen of the Year in 1971, the year he retired after a prominent career in the civil service. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all members of the House in extending our congratulations to these two fine Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The second thing, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention was what you brought up in the beginning. We have paid tribute to our hon. colleague from Kilbride (Mr. Wells). If one remembers the physical shape that gentleman was in just a few short years ago and the

3406?

PREMIER MOORES:

amount of cigarettes and other evils that he participated in at the time, it is absolutely not only a credit to himself but, when we talk about participation and we talk about the fitness of our youth, and in his case is an example of fitness to adults. I think it is very rare that we have seen someone with the self determination and the self discipline to have made an achievement of running in and finishing in the Boston Marathon, that very prestigious race. And I think the man deserves a tremendous amount of personal credit and is a credit and an example to all Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to deal with the last mentioned matter first, it is just goes to show, Sir, the lengths that some hon. members will go to to get away from this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the speed with which he did it.

MR. W. ROWE: And the speed. We are all tempted, I am sure, Sir, sometimes to enter the Boston Marathon if only we could get a respite from the House of Assembly. But, Sir, we would like to add our word of congratulations to the hon. member. As the Premier said, it was not long ago, Sir, that he could have made a considerable amount of money posing as a before picture for GASP. And now, Sir, of course, he is the picture of health, of vibrant youth. He looks like a man of about twenty-five over there. I will not disclose his real age, Sir, but he has taken twenty years off his life at least or twenty years off his age at least and added, I am sure, twenty years on to his life by the actions that he has taken over the last two or three years, and we would like to add our congratulations to this magnificent feat. I do not know, but perhaps the hon. member, who had obviously done research in the field, can tell us how many other Newfoundlanders have participated in and finished the Boston Marathon.

MR. WELLS: A good many over the years.

MR. W. ROWE: A good many over the years. That is encouraging as well, Sir. Maybe we will all get into it. Maybe the next election we will be

MR. W. ROWE:

decided on how many on both sides of the House can get involved in and participate in and stay in the distance for the Boston Marathon.

MR. NEARY: There is a many Kelly about sixty who has been running in them for years, I think.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right. Sir, so our congratulations to the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells).

I would like to join with the Premier in also extending tribute to Mr. Campbell Eaton and Dr. L.A. Miller, two fine gentlemen, Sir, great representatives of the Newfoundland and Labrador community. Mr. Eaton, of course, is perhaps most prominent in the way he has handled his job or his position as Chairman of the General Hospital Corporation. He is involved with the General Hospital generally in running that institution. Of

MR. W. N. ROWE:

course, he is a very prominent businessman as well and involved in other service and charitable groups, and we extend our congratulations and tribute to him. Dr. Miller, Sir, is a special case altogether, because anybody who served in the government leading up to 1971, or was a member of this House or had anything to do with the Department of Health can only remember Dr. Miller's participation there, Sir, with respect and warmth, a warm feeling. I remember myself sitting down as a young backbencher back in 1966 in his office just after getting elected, Sir, and the compassion! After so many years of service he was not casehardened at all. I believe he was deputy minister from 1949 onward, from Confederation onward. So the compassion and dignity and humanity which emanated from the man could not fail to impress anyone who had anything at all to do with him. I remember calling him on a couple of occasions when there were emergencies in my former districts, or on Sunday nights, late, talking to him and no sense whatsoever of having been disturbed or any sense that he did not want to be bothered at that particular time - always eager and willing, Sir, and ready to do his job and to actually take part in and show the compassion and the humanity and the dignity which anybody knew he possessed in any event who had anything to do with him. So I would like to join with the Premier in extending our congratulations and also to send the tribute of this House to these two gentlemen, Mr. Campbell Eaton and Dr. L. A. Miller.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two petitions, actually, on behalf of the hon. the Premier, the first one from 562 residents of the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. Their petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "We, the undersigned residents of Ramea, Newfoundland, do hereby protest government's decision to reduce the number of teachers allocated to school boards throughout the Province and do hereby request the government to review its decision until such time as a thorough study can be undertaken and completed on this matter."

Does anybody want to speak on it before I do the second one - shall I do one at a time?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the member for Mount Pearl has the agreement of the Premier to table this petition. This is the one which was the subject of the matter of privilege I raised in the House a week or two ago. And the history behind the petition is that I suggested to the people concerned that this is such an important issue, the matter of the education cutbacks is such an important issue that at least one of their petitions ought to be addressed directly to the Premier. And we were watching for it. I knew when it was circulated, at what date it came here, and it was my concern on the matter that the petition had not been presented that prompted me a week or so ago to raise the matter of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS: This issue, in this case being petitioned by 561 people in my district in the town of Ramea, is an issue that is going to mushroom. We are going to hear from people all over the Province, all over my district and all over the Province. It is not the only one the Premier is going to get. I believe in sharing things around. And I am disappointed that he himself did not see fit to stand and present the petition - no reflection on the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N.Windsor); it is part of his responsibility and I accept it in that spirit. But I would have hoped that the Premier would have seen these petitions, not coming from his own district but from another district at the direction or suggestion of the member for that particular district, that they come into the hands of the Premier so that the Premier of the Province could be identified with the prayer of the petition. I will have a look at the petition later to see who signed it, whether it was the member for Mount Pearl, who is presenting it, or the Premier. And as much as I am very happy to have the signature of the member for Mount Pearl on the petition, I would hope also that the Premier of this Province would see fit to associate himself with it.

I am a little concerned about the method here. We can wonder out loud

MR. SIMMONS:

if the petition would ever have been presented had it not been for the matter of privilege I raised a week or so ago, but that is a matter of speculation now. The real question is, is the Premier shying away from this important issue? Is he using the route that has been used today to disassociate himself from a very crucial issue to the people of Ramea and to the people of every community in this Province, Mr. Speaker? It is an issue that is not going to go away, I tell the Premier. It is an issue that he is going to hear from many thousands of people on. I say the same thing to the Minister of Education (Mr. House). He just does not realize what a bombshell he has set off here with his agreement, I suggest, passive agreement - I am sure he did not advise these cutbacks - but with his passive agreement in Cabinet to allow these cutbacks in education at this particular time, he set off quite a bombshell. He is going to be hearing about it for a long, long time to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hearing about it is not enough. Are we going to get a select committee of this House or are we not? Are we, as members of this House, going to have the opportunity to hear what is on people's minds about the subject of education cutbacks, education quality, the equality of educational opportunity? What is wrong with the proposal that we set up a select committee in the next few days to address itself to this whole question to give five or six or seven members of this House the full opportunity to receive briefs, to talk to people around this Province and to make recommendations to this House on the subject of the educational cutbacks and the quality of education, make appropriate recommendations so we can, as a House, be guided in the kind of action we take to ensure that the quality of education in this Province at the elementary and secondary level is not being adversely affected by the present policies of the government. I think the quality is being adversely affected by the policies of the government and I think before it goes too far to a point where it is irretrievable, I think we ought to take

MR. SIMMONS:

some action. And I believe the appropriate action right now in the face of the numbers of petitions we are getting - scarcely a day goes by, Mr. Speaker, but we talk about this issue - in the face of the numbers of petitions we are getting and in the face of the very genuine concern that exists in all parts of this Province on the subject, let us have the government introduce or make the proper move to have a select committee appointed, a select committee of this House to do the work that needs so badly to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute or so to support the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) on behalf of the five hundred- and-some-odd residents of Ramea. I think it is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the drastic cutbacks in education in this Province proposed by the minister and the government are going to hit education in Newfoundland where it hurts the most, and that is in the rural parts of this Province.

It will be inequitable certainly in the way that the share is going to be apportioned throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the quality of education in this Province and if Prince of Wales Collegiate or Bishop Fields College or Brother Rice High School lose a teacher, it will mean that instead of having three classes of music a week they may be cut back by one. It would mean they may be cut back in one physical education period a week or one industrial arts period a week or something of that nature. But when you take one teacher out of a school in Woodstock, Mr. Speaker, it means that you have lost your kindergarten programme. Or if you take one teacher out of the high school in Englee where you have forty or forty-five grade nine, ten or eleven students, it means that you put two grades, IX and X or X and XI in the one classroom. That is where it is going to hurt, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to hurt in the larger centers in this Province. It is going to mean that the rural

MR. RIDEOUT:

areas of Newfoundland will not have an equal opportunity and the same opportunity to a quality education that you will find anywhere else in this Province. And that is where the Minister of Education and this government are doing a disservice to the rural areas of this Province when their theme of development is to develop the rural areas.

So the inequity and the unfair treatment that the rural areas of this Province are going to receive through this policy cutback in education has yet to come to light. And I would hope that, as my colleague suggested, that we will have an opportunity

MR. RIDEOUT: through a select committee, or some other means in this House, to fully analyze the results of this particular programme. It is the rural areas of this Province that are going to be hurt. It is not going to be the urban centres, and it is the people in those areas whose children are not going to have the same opportunity for a reasonable education that you are going to find in the urban areas. That is what we are talking about and that is why I whole-heartedly support this petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak briefly to support this petition, because I feel I must, in view of the fact that there are going to be some teacher cut backs in my area next year, particularly in the small rural areas that the gentlemen who have spoken before me today have pointed out. I just want to mention a letter that I received in the mail today, Mr. Speaker, with reference to this particular petition and it comes from the Integrated Elementary School at Comfort Cove-Newstead, and it ties in with this petition, Mr. Speaker.

It says that, "During the last three years the Comfort Cove School and the Loon Bay School have shared the same physical education teacher." And I might point out to hon. gentlemen that I went to this particular school and with the talk of physical education here in this House today, this is rather important. "In fact," the letter says, "during the past seven years that this school has been opened we have always had a physical education teacher, but next year, for the first time since the opening of this school seven years ago, we will be without a physical education programme for our five to thirteen year old students when they most need it."

AN HON. MEMBER: That is progress for you, that is progress.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to support this petition and point out my concern that the rural areas of this Province

MR. WHITE: will be most adversely affected by this. Many of us who went to school in rural areas, Mr. Speaker, realize the progress that has been made in education during the last ten years. The school that I went to when I finished grade eleven there, there was not a single teacher on staff with more than one year university training. Today in that school, Mr. Speaker, there is not one teacher on staff who does not have a university degree.

So it is very important and I support the call that has been made by my colleague here for a select committee of this House to study all aspects of the quality of education in Newfoundland and I think it is incumbent on members here to get on with the job.

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to introduce a second petition, on behalf of the hon. the Premier, from some 533 residents of the community of Norris Arm. Sir, that petition is, "We, the undersigned concerned citizens of Norris Arm, hereby submit a petition to the government of Newfoundland, asking for their immediate attention to improve and pave our road in the town of Norris Arm."

Sir, I support this petition and ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad as well that the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) has presented this petition in the House. I gave the petition to the Premier. It was brought into St. John's to me by a delegation from Norris Arm South and I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the prayer of the petition has already been met. We had a long meeting with the Minister of Transportation and Communications and with his officials, and I heard the Mayor of Norris Arm on the air today giving his views on

MR. WHITE: what was discussed at the meeting and the response that he got to the meeting and I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to say that it is our feeling that what is contained in it will be carried out starting this year.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I table the annual report of the C.A. Pippy Park Commission for 1976-77.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and President of the Council.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table Development Areas Amendment Regulations, 1978.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice that on tomorrow I would like to move a motion, seconded by the hon. member for Mount Scio, as follows: "Whereas the needs and requirements for public services in Newfoundland far exceed the financial capability of the Province, despite the excessive tax burden on the people of the Province, and whereas the federal government accepts the conditions of Term 29, with the payment annually of \$8 million to assist in the development of public services in this Province to a level comparable to those existing in the other Atlantic Provinces, and whereas the \$8 million translated into 1978 terms would approximate some \$35 million, be it therefore resolved that this hon. House express itself and the resolution to the federal government in support of the renegotiation of the benefits currently being received by the Province on the aforesaid mentioned constitutional power."

Mr. Speaker, I know I am not allowed to refer to anything beyond the moving or giving

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

notice of the motion but I do hope that bearing in mind there are a large number of orders on the Order Paper and resolutions that we can get to that particular resolution with a bit dispatch.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. W.M. ROWE: Sir, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. He may recall that two or three days ago I asked him about the hiring procedures used by boards representing the public interest and answerable to the minister, and therefore the minister to this House, such as the General Hospital. Sir, I hope the minister does not take my words and twist them around. We had a man who heads up the hospital board here get the Order of Canada today so I am not talking about the quality of the people concerned on these boards. I want him to tell us, Sir, what procedures were used when they hired Mr. Syrett as the medical director, the library director or whatever it was, a very key position in any event -

MR. FARVY: Medical records director.

MR. W.M. ROWE: Medical records director, Mr. Speaker, what procedures were used by the board? Surely the minister has by now had the presence of mind and the concern to make some enquiries to the Hospital Board to find out what procedures were used to hire Mr. Syrett as the medical records director, a highly important position.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the hon. member, I think it was the Leader of the Opposition, two days ago that under the General Hospital Corporation Act and under the Hospital's Act the boards and the administration of the hospital who derive their authority from the boards have the right to hire and fire and so on and so forth. I undertook at the time, or I gave an undertaking to give the matter some consideration which I am doing and should have the information momentarily. I was in my district yesterday welcoming

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Lang out there, a very fine gentleman and it is too bad we do not have more like him on the other side of this House, Mr. Speaker. But as soon as I get the information then I will debate whether it should be cabled or not, but I certainly will give it every consideration and I will get back to the hon. member, hopefully tomorrow.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. The Minister of Health, Sir, is responsible to the public through this House of Assembly, and he is telling us that he has not yet had the concern, in view of very serious allegations, he has not had the concern, Sir, or taken the time, five minutes to pick up the phone, to find out how this gentleman was hired. He as Minister of Health does not know, Sir, how a board, which is responsible to him, hires its key responsible officials. I am not asking him, Sir, to interfere in the hiring or firing. I am asking him to tell me as a member of the House, and this House of Assembly representing the people, how the responsible officials of an important body such as the General Hospital or any other hospital, how these officials are hired. What are the procedures? How are the public protected against people such as Mr. Syrett who apparently used fraudulent means in order to obtain a highly responsible position and use that, Sir, parlay that position into an even more responsible position which has led to some very devastating results? Does the minister have to rise in this House and admit that he does not know how these key officials are hired by these boards, which boards are responsible to him and through him to this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let those remarks go unchallenged. The answer I gave to the Leader of the Opposition was quite factual, straightforward, and that is that the hospital boards have the right to hire and fire people on whatever position that we approve for them,

MR. H. COLLINS: and this government, Mr. Speaker, has never become involved in trying to dictate the people who are hired, which was the practise during the past administration with which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition must be very familiar with.

I gave the hon. Leader of the Opposition the undertaking that I would get all the relevant information and after I have seen that, and that is in the process of being made available to me, after I have seen that then I will decide if in fact it should be tabled in this hon. House.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

I would point out that there is always the danger with supplementaries that the matter can lead to debate and I wish to underline the matter that rules do not permit debate.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

In view of the public urgency of this kind of a matter, will the minister indicate to the House when he will be in a position, Mr. Speaker, to tell us what the procedures for hiring and firing responsible officials of boards of institutions are? When will he be able to give us this information?

MR. H. COLLINS: Hopefully tomorrow.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Some hon. member asked for a supplementary, I did not hear which one.

The hon. the member for Conception Bay South, I will hear a supplementary and then the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NOLAN: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, as a preamble if I may, suggest to the hon. minister on my question, that this morning his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, on CBC indicated publicly that he had taken action in his ministerial capacity to interfere with the development of hundreds of housing units in Cowan Heights administered by the St. John's Housing Corporation because it might interfere, and would interfere possibly with lots already

MR. NOLAN: held by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I am sorry if I confused - the St. John's Housing has the lots on Cowan Avenue. Now these are two corporations which the minister have taken direct action in, and perhaps rightly so. How can the minister then suggest that this minister has the authority to exercise control over what a corporation of the provincial government will do, and this minister wants to wash his hands of the whole Syrett affair? And if he is going to take this position, the Premier of the Province cannot renege on his responsibility to take immediate action.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: There are a number of ministers on the government side, Sir, who have two and three and four departments to look after and the government seems to be crumbling, falling apart.

MR. NOLAN: Could we have desk signs, please?

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the whole civil service seems to be demoralized. But I do not think the Minister of Fisheries has more than one portfolio, but something seems to be happening. In the minister's department we have two high ranking officials who have, I believe, submitted their resignations recently, namely, the assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries in charge of facilities, Mr. Joe Burden, and Mr. Dave Greeley, Director of Fisheries Development - two top ranking officials of the Department of Fisheries. Could the minister first of all tell us if it is correct that these two gentlemen have submitted their resignations or have indicated to the

MR. NEARY: minister that they are going to resign? And if so, could the minister tell us the reason? Are they leaving voluntarily or under duress? What is the reason? Or is the government falling apart?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, certainly the two gentlemen in question, the assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Burden, and Mr. Greeley both have indicated their intentions of leaving to enter private business, which is their right. Mr. Burden, of course, who has been a very competent assistant Deputy Minister, a very competent civil engineer, has indicated his desire to enter private practice in that profession, and Mr. Greeley will be going into a private business as well. Certainly, it is not under duress. Both gentlemen have performed extremely valuable services to the department. We are sorry to see them go. But, as I said, for the reasons that they have given there is not much we can do about it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary to the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the hon. the Premier tell the House, in view of the fact that the whole public service seems to be demoralized because of the threat of layoffs hanging over their heads of 300 jobs, plus the fact that ministers cannot handle the portfolios that have been flung at them, two and three and four - the Minister of Finance, for instance, who threatened to resign a year ago because he could not handle Finance, and now we have one minister handling two huge portfolios, Justice and

April 19, 1978

Tape 1221

EC - 4

MR. NEARY:

Finance -

MR. W. N. ROWE:

Plus House leadership.

MR. NEARY:

- plus House leadership.

And the minister who could not handle Finance has now three departments to look after. Would the Premier indicate to the House if there are any more resignations of top ranking public servants who have either threatened to resign, indicated that they are going to resign? And what does the Premier intend to do about this matter that is causing gross inefficiency

MR. NEARY:

in the various departments and in the Public Service as a result of the heavy burden that is placed on the shoulders of one or two or three ministers in the Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, that is a foolish question. First of all, there are no inefficiencies, there is no great unrest, as the hon. member would say. The fact is that the portfolio of Finance last year was coupled with Treasury Board, which makes it very different from just the portfolio of finance alone. There are no threatened resignations from the ministry. There are no threatened resignations - there may be some, I am no idea - from the senior civil servants. The replacement of the people who will be laid off, I would suggest, Sir, in the main will be done by attrition, which is the logical way to do it. So the only people who will be basically resigning from the service are people who already know they are going to be leaving either for retirement or for other reasons.

It is the sort of question, Sir, that, you know, I suppose basically should not be answered because, as I said, it is too damned stupid to answer.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear one additional supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is rather a stupid question, alright, when we see the mess that is in the Department of Public Works. All the evidence is coming out now, Sir. I would like to ask the Premier that question, to elaborate and to tell us whether that mess is straightened out and whether they are now calling public tenders. But I will leave that for another time.

I want to ask the minister about the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Murphy). Who is now handling that responsibility? Will the minister be coming back to the House? Will he be returning to his duties or has the minister - who I understand is not feeling well, and I am sorry to hear that, that is rather unfortunate - has he now taken up permanent residence in Sarasota? Will the gentleman be coming back

MR. NEARY:

to Elizabeth Towers or has the gentleman indicated that he wishes to retire from the Cabinet, remain in the House until the election is called and then drop out of politics altogether? What is the story on this particular minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure when the minister gets back, which will be shortly, by the way, that will be answered. In the meantime the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), his good friend and colleague in the House, the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation (Mr. Hickey), is looking after Consumer Affairs and the Environment, and I know, knowing the relationship between those two gentlemen, there will be absolutely no problem getting any information about that department from the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), followed by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons).

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Industrial Development (Dr. Farrell). The previous minister, the present minister's predecessor, indicated in the House that he was not prepared to establish Buchans Development Corporation as recommended in the — that was one of the top recommendations in the Buchans Task Force Report. Would the minister care to indicate as to what his position is on establishing such a corporation? Does he hold the same view, or is he prepared to establish, as recommended, the Buchans Development Corporation?

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

DR. FARRELL: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend, I had a meeting with the Buchans Task Force Committee, I believe approximately, they were in here three or four weeks ago. And I have had communications with them. We discussed this whole area in industrial development, an industrial development officer and a development corporation. And they set up the Steering Committee, which I received some word from — if I remember these details correctly now, approximately a

DR. FARRELL:

week ago to get a meeting set up to continue on the negotiations. As far as my feeling is, yes, I would like to get that type of corporation established and give them every assistance possible to industrial development.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: I wonder if the minister would be prepared to be specific. Quite apart from the Buchans-Howley road or the Hinds Lake Development Corporation, is the minister or his department considering any form of industrial development that would have the effect of shoring up Buchans economy in view of the fact that the economy, the mines, are destined to close in March, 1979? Is there any industrial development to which consideration is being given now, or just what is the minister's attitude towards the Buchans scene?

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

DR. FARRELL: We are in the process right now of defining any area in the Buchans area where we can help them in any development possible, wherever it is, and that is where the process is right now. And we are willing to assist in any area from any resource policy position of this government; we will be willing to go ahead. And that is what we are hoping to do and that is what we will be doing in the near future. Hopefully we will be getting together and initiating some of that.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate if they have pinpointed any one particular development that the government is prepared to fund or pursue? Can the minister name for the House, of all the recommendations the

MR. FLIGHT:

Buchans Task Force have put, of all the possible developments, industrial and otherwise, that could have been undertaken to shore up the Buchans economy when the mine closes, can the minister indicate to the House of any one, specific undertaking by way of development that he is aware of and that his department is looking at and putting in place in Buchans and in the Buchans area?

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

DR. T. FARNELL: Mr. Speaker, no. Because that, I feel, is up to the people and that is what they are working on, the committee out there, and when they come to us we will certainly supply all our expertise, all the help we can in every way as far as development areas, development offices, advice, which directions to go in, and that is the approach we are going to take. As I said in an initial meeting with the resource policy group - I am sorry I cannot be any more specific at the moment - we are hoping to initiate, as soon as we get time and in the next week or so, a further meeting on what the committee have set up.

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

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, who needs the Boston Marathon, we have our exercise over here. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. It relates to the Term 29 of the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada. I am wondering if the Premier could indicate whether the province has made any representation to Ottawa on the subject of the provisions of Term 29?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: The answer is for a considerable length of time we have been talking to various officials in the Department of Finance in Ottawa, and also at the ministerial level, just on the basis of the motion that was put today, because in fact if we take the true meaning of Term 29 it is something that is really one of attitude with government. There is a reason and a technical case after the commission, I guess - What year was it, the commission was?

MR. HICKMAN: 1957,

PREMIER MOORES: 1957, which put this figure on it but certainly if there was a change of attitude in Ottawa that was sympathetic to the real meaning of the Term 29 itself, it could very easily be translated in 1977 dollars and this has been not something we have made a lot of publicity about but something that, and I do not think you can because it is not a matter of one government going against another government; It is something that we have been working very strenuously on with our Federal counterparts.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Premier indicate what the nature of the representation is to Ottawa? What I am getting at in effect for his guidance in answering the question, I am not wanting him to spill the beans in terms of anything which is private, or has by necessity to be kept private, but I am wondering if the representation to Ottawa is by way of renegotiating the provisions of Term 29 or in terms of having the present dollar figure translated into present day dollars instead of 1957 dollars?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the main trust was to have the '57 dollars converted into '77 dollars or '78 dollars. The terms itself I would suggest would be very difficult to do. As far as the level of negotiation is concerned, I personally have talked to the Prime Minister about it and it has gone to the level of the officials of finance. So there have been quite a few people involved in it.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The Premier has indicated he has talked to the Prime Minister of Canada on this subject, Could he indicate just how recent that particular discussion was and also whether any time table has been nailed down for a response or for a further meeting on the subject?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the exact date but

PREMIER MOORES: it was around early February. It was since Christmas or shortly thereafter. As I said, it was done on a generalized basis. It was taken down to the officials to study exactly what the implications were and what the potentials were. It has not gone beyond that but it is not something we have forgotten. It is something that we are very much in communication about.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Daie Verte-White Bay followed by Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. RIDLOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The minister signed the Trans-Canada Highway agreement yesterday with his Federal counterpart in Gander, and I wonder if the minister is now in the position to give the House some indication as to what areas of the Trans-Canada Highway work will begin on this year. We know that some areas are in far worse shape than others. So I wonder if the minister could let us have some word of what areas of the Trans-Canada Highway work will begin on this year now in view of the fact that the agreement has been signed?

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

MR. DOODY: I hope to get that schedule before the House at a fairly early date. Some work on the actual construction will begin this Summer - it will probably be late this Summer - other areas we probably will not reach on until the following year; it depends on how much pre-engineering and design work has to be done. The actual schedule of work, when it will commence and what the staging and dating of it is, I do not have available at the present time. It has been worked on has been in the process of being brought up to date during the past several weeks and hopefully we will have a comprehensive report for the House in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, there was some concern that when the first work was done on the Trans-Canada Highway it may not have been done to the standard to which it ought to have been done because the first sections of the highway were done under a fifty/fifty agreement. In view of the fact that the work is to be carried out now over the next three or four years will be carried out on a fifty/fifty cost shared basis, can the minister tell the House whether or not the work that will be carried out will be the maximum, up to the top standard rather than the minimum standard? In view of the fact that it is on a fifty/fifty cost shared basis what standard will be used in the work that will be carried out on the Trans-Canada?

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

MR. DOODY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, one of the principles behind the Government of Canada's willingness to enter into this agreement with the Atlantic Provinces was to bring sections of the Trans-Canada Highway in the

MR. DOODY: Atlantic Provinces up to a common standard, the highest standard, a standard that can sustain certain trailer and tractor and axle weights which would facilitate the shipment of goods from one point to another in Canada at a relatively uniform rate and with less transshipment charges and so on. So it will be brought up to the highest standard rather than to the lowest permissible standard.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated to the House previously that when the deal would be signed there would be a reopener clause in the agreement pending the submission of the Sullivan Royal Commission. I wonder if the minister could tell the House what type of clause that is? Does it have to have the agreement of both governments to be reopened or can it be reopened at the request of the Government of Newfoundland, or exactly what does the agreement say? Are we into a closed situation or can it be reopened at our request?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: I would be only too happy to table a copy of the agreement so that members can have an opportunity to look at it themselves, but it is by agreement of both ministers that the agreement can be opened.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would only hear one additional supplementary, which I have heard.

The hon. member for Trinity -  
Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health, Sir. In view of the great number of letters and phone calls we are getting from people who cannot afford the three dollar ward fee for the fifteen days totalling forty-five dollars, could the minister

MR. F.B. ROWE: indicate whether there are any people who are being turned away from hospitals if they cannot afford the ward fee? If not, what procedures are being used to admit these people who cannot afford the ward fee to the various hospitals in the Province?

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

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate seeing the letters that the hon. member alludes to. I have not received one myself, but in response to his question the senior citizens, of course, are exempted from the requirement and I do not know of any case in Newfoundland, and I am not looking forward to ever hearing of one, where anyone will be refused admission to a hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the minister whether he had received any letters or telephone calls; I stated quite clearly that I had received letters and telephone calls and I asked him what the procedures were for entrance or admission to hospitals if they cannot afford it. Could the minister indicate, Sir, and answer the first question first? Could he further answer another question and that is, in the case of people who presumably are, as I understand some have been admitted to hospital and cannot afford to pay the ward fee, upon release is there any chance that these people's names could be forwarded to the Credit Bureau over a period of time for non-payment of a fee that they cannot afford to pay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, every hospital develops their own criteria in terms of how charges are applied and how collections are done. I want to reassure the House and the hon. member who is asking that never has anyone been denied

MR. H. COLLINS: hospital admission in Newfoundland and I do not see that happening now. I believe that from the reports which I am getting, the people in the Province realize the situation we are in and that people are co-operating to the fullest degree.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister undertake to find out from the various hospital boards or corporations, whether or not there is a chance of these people having their names submitted to the Credit Bureau, number one; and could the minister also answer, Sir, whether or not if a person stays in a cottage hospital for a period of, say, ten to fifteen days, which is the case in some cases, and then is transferred to another major hospital, such as the General Hospital, whether that person has to pay for the fifteen days in the cottage hospital and then turn around and have to pay for the additional fifteen days in the larger hospital?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the \$3 charge applies for a period of fifteen days, up to a maximum of \$45. In the event that a person ran up the fifteen days in any given hospital, and was discharged but was required to come back again for further treatment to the original problem, whatever that might have been, if that happens within a sixty day period then there is no charge. If it should be after a sixty day period we are negotiating with the hospitals now to see how to handle that.

With regard to the hon. member's question in terms of were a patient to spend, say, twelve days in the Brookfield Cottage Hospital and then be transferred to the General for another twelve or fifteen days, in any given year the total of fifteen days, whether he is involved in one hospital, two or three, or five.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River, followed by Bellevue.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Health. Two or three weeks ago I brought up the situation concerning the cost in Labrador to people who are ill and have to be flown out of Labrador, and I used the maximum example I had which was \$1,460, where a stretcher case had taken up three seat on an EPA plane and had to pay the cost. The minister at that time said the situation was under review and as I understood it, there are two possibilities; either that the hospital is upgraded to a regional hospital, as he was talking about, and trying to get staff in there, and that is obviously down the road. I am wondering if the minister could give us any results or whether they are going to take into consideration helping to pay the people in the middle? Because we understand that people who are on welfare or in cases of hardship, are paid; we understand that people who are on high incomes, for instance, and working with MOT or DPW are also paid; but the people in the middle who are trying to be independent people are the ones who have to pay these high costs. So I am wondering whether the minister has taken into consideration trying to fund some of these high costs, at least part of it, if not all of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, The problem to which the hon. member alludes is a very serious problem and it is not confined to residents of Labrador only. You will find it all over the Province and in fact all over the Nation. People who are removed from any given area to hospitalization on the emergency basis, at least as far as Newfoundland and Labrador is concerned, we have, I suppose, probably the best air ambulance and road ambulance service in existence anywhere.

People who are referred from a given hospital to another hospital, say, in Labrador to the Island, or from the Island part of the Province to Nova Scotia or to Toronto or Montreal

MR. H. COLLINS: - or to the United States, for that matter— if it is not of an emergency nature then of course they are required to pay their own transportation costs.

I can appreciate the hon. member's concern about the saw-off or the dividing line between what is commonly referred to as the indigent person and the working poor and sometimes there is only a few cents involved there. I can tell the hon. member that the whole matter is being reviewed and, as I indicated to him last week, the best solution we see to the programme is to be able to develop the proper types of medical services in any given area. That would certainly reduce the need for transporting people to another area. I would certainly be willing to discuss it with him because we want to get his input into it as well. We can all identify the problem. Sometimes the solution to the problems, of course, are more difficult but it is a concern with us and we do hope to be able

Mr. H. COLLINS: to provide better services in the Labrador section of the Province. And I think that is the answer, the solution which we will pursue.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker,

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day—

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have a point of privilege?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I meant the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, with your permission

I would like to address the attention of the House to this morning's Daily News, April 19, and on page 3 we have under the headline "Speaker's Office To Control Phone Bills", and I do not want to get into any kind of a debate one way or the other on this matter. Mr. Speaker, I merely raise it now because in addition to the inaccuracies that were tabled here in the House yesterday, the Daily News has now done us the honour of bringing in their own inaccuracies, and I hope when they are informed of the corrections that they will give the correction or corrections the same prominence that they have given the item that they have here on page 3.

In my own case, for example, I notice opposite my name and my alleged credit card number—

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, are the credit card numbers shown in that article?

MR. NOLAN: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: I will gladly send it over to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: Then the numbers should be changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt! But in the item

Mr. Nolan: from The Daily News I am now credited— was yesterday with \$36.43— I am now credited with \$3,224.96. and I -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is more like it.

MR. NOLAN: -did not make that number of calls overnight,  
Mr. Speaker.

So therefore I ask The Daily News to please correct it. And it is up to any other members where there might be inaccuracies opposite their names, perhaps they might also want to draw to the attention of the newspaper in question any inaccuracies that might be involved. Other than that I have no complaint, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to draw this out, Sir, but essentially on the same matter of privilege: I yesterday was credited with \$3,332.55, and today I am credited with \$36.43. So I would just like to bring this to the attention of the House, Sir, and ask the appropriate newspaper to make the correction.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, if you would be good enough to permit me?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: May I also draw to the attention of The Daily News and to the hon. the House if they would be good enough to inform us, the Premier, the House Leader opposite, and all of us, who our new colleague is, G. Gosse, MHA, credit card number 018-0174, \$646.33. Now who is that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I was just going to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the proper documents be forwarded to The Daily News and they make the corrections or it is going to take all afternoon for everybody to explain their own points.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear .

MR. NEARY: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think the most important point, Sir, that has come out of this whole matter is the fact that not all of the credit cards, but a substantial part of the credit card numbers of members have been published in the newspapers, which means now that it would be very easy for anybody in this Province, if they wanted, to use a combination of numbers to find out the members' credit cards and use their credit cards. So I do not know how we are going to deal with that matter, Mr. Speaker. I think we should all be issued new credit cards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before calling the motion, just in case perhaps some hon. members were not here at the very beginning when I did mention that the telephone company has been instructed to cancel these credit cards and to issue new ones. These are no longer operative because obviously the numbers are public knowledge.

With respect to inaccuracies, all I can say is that the media do have access to— I understand, did in fact get a copy of information that was tabled. Once it is tabled it is accessible to the media. I understand they did in fact get a copy of it, and what happened thereafter, of course, I do not know.

Motion 5 the Adjourned Debate . The hon. Leader of the Opposition had adjourned the debate.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate the last Private Members' Day on the amendment presented by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), a gentleman who in his usual partisan fashion could not resist the

MR. W. N. ROWE: temptation to use what should be essentially non-partisan, what should be a motion which should go through the House in unaltered form and have the unanimous support of the House, He could not, of course, resist the temptation to move an amendment which got rid of one of the recitals.

Now, Sir, the main motion has to do with the development of Labrador and Labrador's resources, and as I indicated the last day, Sir, the last time we spoke on this motion, in the field of resource development I consider the salvation of this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, to lie in two fields; one would be the rational, optimal development of the fisheries around the Island and in Labrador, bringing the fishing industry from its present value of something over \$100 million a year - \$120 million/\$130 million a year value up to \$1 billion a year, which according to studies and expert opinions can in fact be done if the right moves are taken. And of course, one of the dangers under the present administration is that the wrong moves are being taken and the right moves are not being taken. And we will have a debate on that when the next motion on the Nordsee proposed takeover is debated as well.

The other salvation, Sir, for the Province, not pie in the sky, but realistically, is the rational, sensible development of the Labrador resources including, first and foremost, the hydro development of the Lower Churchill and the other five rivers flowing from Labrador into Quebec and the other basins as well, and getting back our fair share of the value of the Upper Churchill power currently worth to the Province of Quebec some \$800 million or more per year, one half of which, at least, this Province should be getting on a yearly basis. That move has to be made as well, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We have to have a government which has the courage, the fortitude, to take the right moves. Pull the switch, I said last time, Sir, if necessary - not necessarily pull the switch, but pull the switch if necessary to make sure we get our fair share of the value of that power for this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) and pull the switch.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I wish the hon. member had a switch I could pull, I would do it, Sir, with alacrity.

Mr. Speaker, the other important thing about this resolution is that we are talking about the development of Labrador resources not as they have been traditionally developed - mainly for the benefit of other parts of Canada, other parts of the United States, for people elsewhere - but to develop Labrador's resources for the use of the people of Labrador and the people of Newfoundland. And, Sir, the resolution states that the strategy should include developing the hydro resources as a source of power for the industrial development of this Province, particularly Labrador, and for our Province's domestic and commercial use with any surplus power being made available to other provinces of Canada on a short-term, recallable basis. Surely everybody can agree with that, Mr. Speaker. And we also talk about the development of a fully serviced, fully fledged port, Port Labrador on the Labrador coast, for obvious reasons - we do not need to get into details on that anymore - and the processing within Labrador of the Labrador raw materials, not shipping everything out of Labrador, hydro and raw materials for processing elsewhere, but do it in Labrador.

And, Sir, also we mentioned the assurances that the native peoples and the settlers in

MR. W. N. ROWE: Labrador, and the people who would settle in Labrador, obviously, if such a development were to take place, assurances to these people that these developments will take place only after consultation with people living there and consideration of the methods to protect the environment in that most delicate part of our Province and most beautiful part of our Province.

Those are the main points, Sir. And the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) never got to these points, these important points which can be,

MR. W.N. ROWE: with the development of the fishery and some other developments as well, the salvation of this Province. Never got to that, Mr. Speaker; could not see past his partisanship, Mr. Speaker; had to rise in his place after his colleague the member for Naskaupi district (J.Goudie) and other members and the Premier himself had already stated publicly that they were going to unanimously support the Opposition in this resolution. They were going to go along with us, Mr. Speaker, on this resolution. After this was publicly stated, the member for St. John's East (W.Marshall) had to get up, Sir, break party ranks, and make an ammendment which shows his true partisanship and his inability to see around partisan matters and deal with the real substance and problems facing this Province.

A point made in the preamble to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Canada and the party supporting the Government of Canada presently, and I would submit after the upcoming federal election, that party and that government has indicated that they are prepared to take these bold new steps with regard to the development of the last frontier left in Canada of great hydro energy, a great resource development. The government is prepared to do it, Mr. Speaker, and that point has to be made publicly. Because owing to the partisanship and the kicking out and lashing out of members opposite against the Government of Canada at every opportunity to make a few political Brownie points which they have failed to make in the eyes of the people of this Province, owing to that attitude, Mr. Speaker, we have not gotten as much from the confederation we have with Canada as we ordinarily might have gotten. We have not, we have not got it, Sir. Because instead of in a hard-nosed, sensible, man-to-man fashion sitting down with the Government of Canada and negotiating things and policies and solving problems facing the Province, what we have, Sir, is a political statement made. If something does not materialize overnight the Minister of Finance/Minister of Justice will rise in his place, Sir, and he will say the Government of Canada is to blame. Other members in the government

MR. W.N. ROWE: every second day will rise in their place, Mr. Speaker, and say-

MR. HICKMAN: Lassard said if any man can- not a copy of that letter?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let me give the hon. minister a letter. Which of these Cabinet ministers stand out in your mind for doing a good job, Mr. Speaker, in the Province? And then the Minister of Justice's name is mentioned here, and he is among the highest. And what do you think, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the people of this Province polled believe this minister is doing a good job? He is one of the highest. Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A little higher than ten.

MR. NEARY: Twelve.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A little higher than that.

MR. NEARY: It cannot be any higher than fifteen.

MR. W. N. ROWE: You are getting warm now, Mr. Speaker, 17 per cent of the population think that that minister is doing- and he is one of the top ministers! In other words, Sir, 83 per cent of the population do not think he is doing a good job. That does not necessarily mean they think he is doing a bad job, but they do not think he is doing a good job. So if I were that hon. minister-

AN HON. MEMBER: What about his own constituents?

MR. FLIGHT: 87 per cent (Inaudible).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, his highest- it is interesting- his highest percentage is in St. John's area, that is what brings it up, Sir, to 17 per cent. In the area- not in his own constituency- but in the area in which his own constituency is located, less than 12 per cent think he is doing a good job as a Cabinet minister.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. NEARY: Resign, resign!

MR. W.N. ROWE: This is one of the top ministers, Sir, and he has the gall, Sir, to heckle and bicker in this House of Assembly.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I ask that the hon. gentleman to table the document to which he just referred and read from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: He is obligated to under the rules.

MR. NEARY: He did not read it. The hon. gentleman did not read it.

MR. HICKMAN: You will have to do it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I was referring to notes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: No, he took it out and said, "I have a letter."

MR. W.N. ROWE: I said talking of letters.

I have notes -

MR. FLIGHT: If he tables it you will all be ashamed.

MR. HICKMAN: Is it the apple salesman you are talking about, Mr. Goldfarb?

MR. FLIGHT: If he tables it you will all be ashamed; only you are ashamed now.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I will table it, Sir, in due course.

That hon. member did not even rate, Sir, unfortunately. Now the minister of - what other ministers? There are no other ministers in the House, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: You walked into it, 'Bill'. You walked into it.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, Mr. Speaker! There is one of the leadership candidates over there.

MR. NEARY: What did he do? Two per cent, is it?

MR. W. ROWE: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Is the hon. member speaking on the point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that what it was?

MR. W. ROWE: That was not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will rule on it. To my knowledge the hon. member read and quoted figures from a document and I feel it should be tabled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have no document in my possession, Sir, which I quoted from any figures. I have some handwritten notes which I have made myself and -

MR. J. CARTER: We need the documents.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I have not read from any document.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To my knowledge the hon. member read from a document stating certain -

MR. NEARY: A few notes in his inside pocket.

MR. F. ROWE: That is a new one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not table them.

MR. W. ROWE: I am not going to table them. I have nothing to table! I referred to a few notes. Now I can table everything on my desk here.

MR. NEARY: Table what is on mine, too, so I can get rid of it.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have made a ruling that the documents read by the hon. member be tabled. If he wishes to challenge my ruling he may do so.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not have anything to table.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table your cheque book. Give him a blank cheque, boy.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, speaking on a point of order.

MR. W. ROWE: I hope that Your Honour is not making a mistake in this regard. I have referred to certain notes which I have, I have referred to this, I have referred to my memory. I have nothing to table. If I was reading from a letter and saying that it allegedly came from something or other, Sir, I could easily - or name somebody or said I had a letter or was reading from a newspaper, I am reading from a few notes in my pocket or a few notes here, I mean, I have nothing to table. I am sorry, I have nothing to table.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I just refresh the hon. Leader of the Opposition's mind. He opened his remarks by saying "Speaking of letters, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter -" and he pulled it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

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

MR. MARSHALL: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the precedents of the House and - if I could have Your Honour's attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The hon. gentleman when he is referring - when he was speaking in debate, referred to what was said, what is thought by the people of Newfoundland, he quoted a percentage - the Minister of Justice - and he was referring to a document which he had in his hand. And I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 134, Section 159. And the authority is undoubted, Mr. Speaker. Documents that are referred to in debate in this House must be laid before the table of the House. And I refer you to this authority, Section 159 (3) - perhaps Your Honour may wish to - although Your Honour has already made a ruling - if my interpretation is correct perhaps Your Honour will wish to adjourn after hearing this and consider it, but it is a very important point. "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held

MR. MARSHALL: to apply to private letters and memoranda. On the 18th of May, 1965, the Attorney-General, on being asked by Mr. Ferrard if he would lay upon the table a written statement and a letter to which he had referred on a previous day in answering a question—" and then it goes on. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if a document has been quoted in this House it must be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest.

Now, the hon. gentleman was referring to some document, some document which apparently had certain statements in it relating to some opinion, what have you, or otherwise with respect to ministers in this House, members of this House, and not only would that not be

MR. MARSHALL: injury to the public interest but I would say it would be very much a matter within the public interest that this information should be known.

Now, you know, the rules of this House are not here for the interpretation of members as they see fit. If a member stands in his place in this House and he reads from a document, he reads from it and he is really the guarantor as to the authenticity of the document itself, and he is responsible for it, and that is the reason why this rule is set down. It has been enforced time and time again, that where a member refers to a document in debate in this House it has to be laid on the table of this House. And I would ask that the rule be enforced in this case and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who was obviously referring to a document, he quoted from a document at the time, be required to lay it on the table of the House so it becomes public knowledge what he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: We will lay the member on the table of the House if he keeps that up.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W.N. ROWE: We are on another point of order now, Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a point of order.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well he raised it as a point of order.

Now I would like to know what citation it was that the hon. member referred to, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKMAN: Page 134, paragraph 159, sub-paragraph (3) and also sub-paragraph (5).

MR. W.N. ROWE: Okay. It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda. Now, Sir, I have received some private memoranda from various sources concerning the popularity of this minister. In my own good time I will make it public. I have already made some of it public.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I cited some information from this private memoranda, Sir, but I have it by memory only. I have a note scribbled down here, Sir. You know what it says, Sir? It says -

MR. HICKMAN: It is a wonder you did not preface it by saying, "Speaking of a letter I am without."

MR. W.N. ROWE: "Rickman - seventeen per cent, Sir." That is what I said. I apologize for mentioning the hon. gentleman's name. But, Sir, I scribbled down a note based on a private memorandum, which I do not have in my possession, which indicated that the hon. Minister of Justice was considered by seventeen per cent of the population to be doing a good job. That is what I mentioned. A private memorandum to me, a private memorandum is not a public document. It does not fall within this rule here. As a matter of fact it falls within the rule that "the same rule however cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda." I received a memoranda from somebody else, completely outside of this House, indicating how unpopular the most popular minister of this government is, how unpopular he is. Seventeen percent think he is doing a good job, twelve per cent in his own district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I am required to table my memory or a scrap of note that I may here have on my possession, you know, I think we are lowering the dignity of the House to say the least, lower than even the hon. minister's popularity has already brought us.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Not so, Mr. Speaker, not so. The hon. member was referring, as we all know, which has been quoted before in the press yesterday and on television, to a memorandum which he has in his possession, name some poll or some documentation that came to him which related to the popularity and/or otherwise of this government, and he referred to it. It could not have been out of his own memory. He quoted figures. They correspond with what was there before the press. It cannot be deemed to be, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: it cannot be deemed to be other than a document. It cannot be deemed to be in a private nature, because it is not a correspondence that is private to the person doing the letter itself. It is a document to which he referred, and if you go on further in Beauchesne you will see "The point of order that a member should lay on the table, a document which he quotes, should then be taken when reference is made to that document," And reference was made, Mr. Speaker, to a document. And the fact that members in this House get up and refer to a document, and may not have tabled it in the past, does not mean that this is not a requirement. It is one of the rules by which this Legislature operates and surely of all people, the Leader of the Opposition is going to comply and comply with that rule that is engrafted into our rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is a serious situation we have on hand here, and it is a matter of interpretation by Your Honour.

And two points have come out.

MR. MARSHALL: Not so, not!

MR. F. ROWE: And I say, "Not so, not so!" to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Sir, Beauchesne, Section 159 (3), page 134, says, "The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda".

Now, Sir, the fact of the matter is that this is a private document that has been provided to the Leader of the Opposition to which he referred by memory. A private letter, document, memorandum or whatever you want to call it, it is private. And Beauchesne says quite clearly, "The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda". Now, Sir, the hon. Leader -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: If I could be heard, Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: There have been many cases I can remember in this House, I cannot pinpoint the date, but I can remember sitting here over the past five and a half years where hon. members have read from, actually read from letters. And when this point of order came up they did not have to table the letter, not on the clear rule here, but based on the fact that the member simply stood up and said, "I did not read the letter," whether it was private or public, "I simply referred to it." Got off the hook on that easy way out. But here it states very, very clearly, "The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda."

Now, Sir, this is clearly a private memoranda or document which has been provided to the Leader of the Opposition, and I submit, Sir, that he does not have to table this particular piece of information if he desires not to.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PECKFORD: There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition, nor the member for Trinity Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) can weasel out of this situation by trying to throw a red herring across the House as it relates to privacy, Mr. Speaker. It is common knowledge now since yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition has made public -

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. PECKFORD: - the document to which he referred. The salient information in the document to which he refers.

So if the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde is going to try to insist now this late in the day that this is a private letter, a private memoranda between somebody not named to the Leader of the Opposition, well then it is a bit late in the day to so do, because the Leader of the Opposition has already indicated the contents of that so-called private document.

Number two point, Mr. Speaker, is on the question of what happened in this session or in sessions before now as it relates to hon. members reading documents. The only time I remember it coming up was in my own particular case last year when I was reading from a document as it related to legal opinions given to the government as it related to the Upper Churchill contract. And on that score the Speaker ruled that it was not in the public interest to so table that document. It was the only time that it occurred, to my experience in the House, and hence the Leader of the Opposition has no alternative but to table the information which I am sure he is going to do right now.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! I feel that I have heard enough argument, and to my knowledge the last reference to a piece of paper that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition showed out that he read from was not the piece of paper I asked the hon. gentleman to table. I would ask the hon. member is he willing to table the document that he quoted from?

MR. W. ROWE: No, Sir, because it is against the rules of the House to be required to be tabling notes and so on.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG) Order, please! I have no alternative.

I would like to adjourn the House for about five or ten minutes so that I can get the information that I need.

RECESS

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

I would like to quote from Beauchesne, Item 3: "It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table, if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to letters or memoranda."

In my opinion, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was quoting from a document, but the hon. member in discussion says that he was not quoting from a document, but informed the hon. House that he was quoting from notes and I have to accept the hon. member's word. The hon. member has five minutes left and I would ask him to continue.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Your Honour has put me to a lot of work now for nothing, because these are the notes that I quoted from. But I did take the liberty of going downstairs, Sir, and getting the document itself from which I had made some notes, the document I am citing from. And, Sir, it shows the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs in answer to the question which of these cabinet ministers -

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

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

MR. HICKMAN: The resolution that is presently before this House is a motion to amend the resolution by striking out one of the recitals as it deals with Labrador, and I submit that under the rules of relevancy, the popularity of the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not in any conceivable way relevant to the developing of Labrador hydro resources or a fully serviced, full-fledged Port Labrador or processing within Labrador of raw materials or assurances that these developments will proceed; nor is it at all relevant

MR. HICKMAN: to the national convention of the Liberal party, which is the motion presently before the House, because I have heard it on very good authority that the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not a Liberal.

MR. W. N. ROWE: We would not have him anyway.

(Inaudible) just wish he would not.

MR. HICKMAN: And I do submit that the rules of relevancy beyond all reasonable doubt if the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, were permitted to pursue along the lines of his rather nefarious and totally unattached -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) Order, please! I feel that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not irrelevant and I would ask him to refrain from quoting from the documents.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Sir, the reason why this government is in such disrepute in the Province partly relates to its Labrador policy. And, Sir, if there is any doubt about the fact that this government has fallen down on the job with Labrador policy, all we have to do is refer to this document -

MR. NEARY: Table it! Table it!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - this document, Sir, which indicates quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, that -

AN HON. MEMBER: - point of order.

MR. NEARY: No, we have ruled on the point of order.

MR. W. N. ROWE: How many people are impressed with the Premier? - 9 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What?

MR. W. N. ROWE: - of the population are very impressed with Premier Moores.

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

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

MR. PECKFORD: I did not hear Your Honour make a ruling on the point of order just made by the Government

MR. PECKFORD: House Leader as it related to the relevancy of the talk now that the Leader of the Opposition is making, and if that has been so ruled, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to submit an additional point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:(Mr. Young) I did make a ruling that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not irrelevant -

AN HON. MEMBER: Was not?

MR. SPEAKER: - was not irrelevant and I would ask him to refrain and he agreed, and I asked him to continue.

AN HON. MEMBER: So continue it.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: Maybe the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would agree that it may not technically be a point of order that the 1,800 sample survey we have, we could table them both the same time and have a debate on the subject.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, I would like to see that.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that is not a point of order, but -

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: - more or less a matter of opinion or an explanation.

MR. NEARY: Table the document.

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Anyway, Sir, the point I was making is that this government had no Labrador policy until they were dragged kicking and screaming into having such a policy, emulating hours after we presented it to the Liberal convention in Ottawa and then a private member's motion in this House was required, Mr. Speaker, to get this government to mention anything about the development of Labrador. And, Sir, when I have an opportunity to wind up the debate on this motion, Sir, I am going to indicate by quoting from this document, now

April 19, 1978

Tape 1232

EC - 4

MR. W. N. ROWE: a public document because it is getting to the press.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to table it?

MR. W. N. ROWE: If His Honour requires me to table it, I will certainly table it.

MR. NEARY: Does the member have to table the document, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. N. ROWE: What I did not want to table the first time, Sir, was some notes which I had scribbled down here, so I went downstairs to get the document itself, which I do not mind tabling.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) I am sure the hon. member is reading from the document, "e knows the House rules well enough to table it.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I do not mind tabling it if members require me to table it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, table it.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Sir, when I wind up this debate on Labrador policy, what I shall do, Sir, is give some tangible evidence, scientific evidence as to the unpopularity of this government for a variety of reasons. One of the reasons is its bankruptcy of ideas with regard to the proper development of Labrador. And the unpopularity of the government is clearly evidenced by this document, Sir, which I have here, and which I will gladly table because I intend to cite from it to show that the government is, in fact, very unpopular. Is best for 'under twenty-five' voters: Rowe 40; Moores 20; is most concerned about the issues. All of these things, Sir, are very important, I think, in the public interest. The party most likely to vote for - 'If there were a provincial election tomorrow which one of the following parties would you be most likely to vote for?' And of those answering, Sir, Liberal or Conservative - 58 per cent indicated they would vote

April 19, 1978

Tape 1232

EC - 5

MR. W. N. ROWE: Liberal, 42 per cent indicated they would vote Conservative before, Mr. Speaker, two weeks before the abysmally bad, disastrous Budget brought down by the Minister of Finance, two weeks before that when the Premier thought he was riding high. Sir, that is what the scientific poll shows. ...

MR. NEARY: He hit an air pocket.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And one of the reasons for it, Sir, is that Labrador was not even mentioned in the Throne Speech, or mentioned casually, nor was it mentioned except casually in this blueprint. And the evidence then, Sir, of this abysmal

MR. W. ROWE: neglect of a very important part of our Province shows up in this scientific report here, Sir, which shows that the Province has very little respect or feeling of popularity -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: - for the particular party which now forms the administration. I will go into further details, Sir - I know my time is up - I will go into further detail when I wind up the debate.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it give me -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour made a ruling there a few moments ago that any documents that were referred to in this hon. House would have to be laid on the table of the House. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition referred to a document, Sir, and I would ask Your Honour -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The page is here from the document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Can I speak to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel it is not a point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak again in this debate. There is an amendment now made to the resolution, a very important amendment in my view. It has been the contention of the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) that we have or the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has by this amendment introduced partisan politics into an otherwise non-partisan resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how the Leader of the Opposition can make such a charge when in one of the recitals of his resolution there is mention off the Liberal Party of Canada and

MR. PECKFORD:           thereby can contend that his resolution is non-partisan, completely and absolutely escapes me. If the Leader of the Opposition uses that kind of logic to try and win debating points in this hon. House, I should say that the quality of debate will continue to degenerate. Because what the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has done, he has done the very thing that the Leader of the Opposition should have done in introducing the resolution in the first instance and that is kept all parties out of it. Now remember that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did not say, "Let us delete reference to the federal government or the Federal Liberal Party and replace it with the Federal PC Party and its avowed positions as it relates to Labrador development," No, he just asked for the deletion of any connection with any political party.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that it is the Federal Progressive Conservative Party that has said, talking about policy, that it will turn over jurisdiction to the offshore oil and gas resources to the Province of Newfoundland. Now if the federal government, the Federal Liberal Party which is now the Government of Canada, wants to do something tangible to show how willing they are to allow Newfoundland to develop its resources whether they be on land or in the seabed, the most concrete way that that can be done today is not through a tokenism resolution at an annual meeting of that political party, of that national political party; if they really want to show how interested they are in giving Newfoundland and Labrador a chance to develop, do not do it through a general motherhood resolution at a national political convention which forum deals with just about every kind of resolution under the sun in every political party. It binds them to nothing, there is no obligation on the Federal Cabinet, upon the federal government, upon the House of Commons or anybody else to follow through on that resolution. If the Liberal Party of Canada is serious, I challenge that party and that government to submit to the claims now being put forward by the Government of Newfoundland and

April 18, 1978.

Tape No. 1233

AH-3

MR. PECKFORD: Labrador as it relates to offshore resources. There is the way they can do it now. Let us not talk about tokenism, let us not talk about resolutions to a national political party, let us put that kind of so-called interest and concern that Mr. Trudeau and the Federal Liberal Party has for Newfoundland into action now before they call their election. Let them say to the people of Canada, let them say to the people of Newfoundland today, tomorrow, that we will forget about this court case, that we will forget about the jurisdictional dispute and that we will allow the Province of Newfoundland to have some say over the development of its offshore resources,

MR. PECKFORD: because at the present moment, Mr. Speaker, the federal government's position on that very vital issue is that it will give Newfoundland and Labrador no real say in the development of those resources.

So, Mr. Speaker, this whole business about the silly resolution, this foolish resolution, this tokenism resolution by the federal Liberal Party means nothing. It is absolutely useless, it is tokenism. And if they were really serious about wanting to help Newfoundland, if they were really serious about wanting to develop Labrador there is one way you can go about that it; you can stop the silly, foolish resolutions which which go through every political national convention, whether it be Liberal, P.C., NDP, Communist or whatever, you can stop that and not use that as a reason for trying to prove that the federal Liberal Party has some great interest in Labrador. They can put it into action now. Right now! Today! Tomorrow! That is the way we would like to see the federal government translate its so-called concern. We would like to see them translate it now into action so that we can get on with the business of getting offshore resources developed in a rational, sane manner and in tune with the priorities of the region and of the Province. That is the way it can be done, not with this tokenism resolution.

Not only then does the Leader of the Opposition swallow that hook, line and sinker because the Leader of the Opposition happened to get a meeting with the Prime Minister which, of course, totally overwhelmed him and therefore he thinks that because this is a resolution coming out of the national party convention that it is suddenly going to change the face of Labrador. Because he is so overwhelmed with the Prime

MR. PECKFORD: Minister and had a meeting with him, big deal! He had a meeting with the Prime Minister, that is something, I know. That is something! That is not going to get us action in Labrador, that is not going to get us a fair deal on offshore resources, this tokenism. And the Leader of the Opposition then to stand up and to say, We want a non-partisan resolution, Mr. Speaker. We want a non-partisan resolution and then to introduce the political situation into it of one party in Canada. That is non-partisanship?

What the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) did was to legitimately introduce a resolution with no political party involved in it. He took it out of the hands of the politician or political party and put it squarely in the hands of reason, in the hands of common sense and let it stay there. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get up today and support the amendment as put forward by the member for St. John's East.

Mr. Speaker, let us just look at it. Let us just look across the way here for a second to that hon. crowd on the other side, this hon. crowd that now has all the great love, oh! their hearts are swelling for joy and pride to get at developing Labrador.

The Leader of the Opposition, the present Leader of the Opposition, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe), member, cabinet minister in the former Liberal administration in this Province for a number of years; the member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) who was a cabinet minister in the former administration; the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), a cabinet minister in the former administration; the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan), all involved and very much a part of

MR. PECKFORD: the decision making  
process -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon.  
gentleman was just reciting ministers in the former  
administration and I resent the fact that the hon.  
gentleman left out his colleague, the Minister of Justice,  
the Minister of Finance, the member for Grand Bank (Mr.  
Hickman). I resent that, Sir, the hon. gentleman was  
in the Cabinet. He may have been a non-member of that  
Cabinet, insignificant, ineffective, but he was there in  
body. He might not have been there in spirit but he was  
there in body. He sat to my left for over two years.  
The hon. gentleman sat to my left hand incapable of  
making a decision, incapable of giving the government -

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

MR. NEARY: - the legal advice that it  
needed, but the hon. gentleman was there.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point  
of order. If any hon. gentleman could imagine anyone getting  
to the left of the hon. the member for LaPoile and still  
survive, then he has a very vivid imagination.

The rule in law is called  
confess and avoid. I confess that for three horrendous  
years I sat in a cabinet not of the Progressive Conservative  
making, and about one year of that, as I recall, the hon.  
gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who had been waiting  
years and years to be invited in, came in. Other men, Sir,  
with great distinction - the hon. the member for Port de  
Grave (Mr. Dawe) was the Minister of Municipal Affairs,  
as I recall it, and oh, there were many others in that cabinet.  
And I do not know if it is a point of order, that when the  
hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy starts referring to  
those who had served, the multitude who had served in the  
cabinet of the previous administration that he is in breach of

MR. HICKMAN: one of the rules of this House when he refrains from giving the entire list, because if he does there is a great list starting with the hon. Leslie R. Curtis, and going all the way down through. It is up to Your Honour to direct -

MR. SPEAKER: I think I have heard enough learned submission on this point of order. There is no point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

All I was trying to do was to indicate that the predominance of people who were closely associated with policy making in the former administration reside now on the opposite side from myself. And, Mr. Speaker, this hon. crowd over there, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who made a shambles of every portfolio he was in.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. PECKFORD: It was a public disgrace at the time. Everybody recognized it as such. This hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can now piously stand on his feet and talk about how much he wants to do for Labrador, and the hon. member for LaPoile knew nothing more about Labrador than I know about the other side of the moon. He made a shambles of every portfolio he was in. He was a disgrace not only to his own colleagues, he was a disgrace to the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! All hon. members on both sides who have not already spoken will have an opportunity to speak, but that opportunity will be exercised one at a time.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was a disgrace. I remember time and time again, as a private citizen in this Province, involved on the periphery of politics, listening to people in his own party, as well as people in other parties, ashamed of the hon. gentleman, ashamed of the hon. member for LaPoile, because of his incompetence as a minister. I heard of people who, all around the Province at that time -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible). Fisheries scandal (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: - who were trying to recommend to the then Premier of the Province, trying to recommend to the then Premier, "Get rid of that hon. member from the Cabinet. He is incompetent."

MR. NEARY: We got ministers -

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

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

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. member for LaPoile seems to be awfully sensitive now and will not allow me to speak in silence.

MR. NEARY: I will let the hon. gentleman, if every now and then -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no doubt every hon. gentleman has the right to speak without interruption. I ask hon. members to observe that.

MR. PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is getting rather touchy now. We are getting back home now, Mr. Speaker. When we start to indicate on this side some incompetency that might have occurred over on the other side, all of a sudden now, Mr. Speaker, we get it thrown across the House, we get the innuendo thrown across the House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I still cannot speak in silence here and a point of order is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no disputing the fact that every hon. gentleman has the right to speak without interruption, and when he insists upon the observance of that right, and points it out to the Chair, then obviously the Chair must require its observance. So I do draw this to the attention of hon. gentlemen.

MR. PECKFORD: I remember clearly the kind of development opportunities that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for LaPoile and others in the then government of the day did for Labrador. I remember them very well, because I was in Labrador at the time. I spent some time in Labrador and I was in Labrador at the time. And I know the kinds of things that they tried to do for Labrador. To cite one real, stirring,

MR. PECKFORD: classic example, Mr. Speaker, I remember clearly in a place known to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), in a place called Mary's Harbour, Labrador - which this administration is now going to put on the map, and other places in that area in fishery development, in rural development. I remember that there was some concern being expressed by the government of the time that they had better do something in a number of places in Labrador if they wished to get re-elected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was no great policy as to fishery development. There was no great policy as to trying to get some secondary processing from primary resources. There was no great policy to try to assist, through some Rural Development scheme to help the people develop a realistic and worthwhile development there. But rather it was decided, even though there was no road around the community, it was decided it might be a real good idea, it might be a fantastic way to buy a few votes or whatever, it might be a good way to develop the Coast of Labrador by putting a bridge across the river.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. PECKFORD: By putting a modern, in those days, fairly modern bridge across the river to join up both sides. Now, Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that most of the people in Mary's Harbour, Labrador, at that time, as is even true today, went back and forth across the harbour in boat. They had some small paths there but they did not bother to go across the bridge. The bridge was a white elephant. I do not know, I guess today it might have some use and needs to be repaired if it has not been. This was the kind of economic development, this was the kind of industrial development that was practiced by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. gentlemen who now profess to have such a love for that great land called Labrador.

Mr. Peckford:

This is the hon. group that want to form the next government of this Province. And the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, if he had his way, and he was around long enough in those days, would have had them all resettled in any case, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PECKFORD: And this is the group now that piously stand on their feet and try to pretend that 1966, 1967, and so on no longer exists, that their previous record in economic development, that their previous record in industrial development, that their previous record in rural development, in Labrador, is one to be proud of. They have not changed, Mr. Speaker. They have not changed they still have their spots.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I cannot be selective in application of the rules, and the point about the hon. gentleman wishing to speak without interruption was made a couple of times, I think it was made specifically toward the hon. gentleman for LaPoile, but as I say when the rule is made, the rule is there for everybody, and I think I have to draw to the attention of the hon. gentleman behind him, and to his left, and to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans as well, The rule applies for all hon. members on both sides.

MR. PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue, it was mentioned by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in his address last week or the week before when he was speaking on this resolution or on the amendment to it, that the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa had offered 50 per cent of the cost of doing a deal on the Gull Island clearing. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is totally untrue. In no way, shape, or form, in writing, or verbally has the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa offered that kind of a proposal. That is not true. What I have already indicated to this hon. House on a number of occasions was, Mr. Speaker, to just review and to make sure it is clear in everybody's minds is that this Province said to

Mr. Peckford: the federal government, Federal government you have \$60 million that you are going to spend in Canada Works programmes in this Province. We do not think that all of the money in those Canada Works programmes is spent in a wise manner, number one, and number two, spent sometimes on projects that are really to the benefit of the people in whose areas they are going to be built.

So federal government we still recognize you have a bit of a political problem here. These Canada Works programmes are controlled to a large measure by your members and so on, so we are not saying scrap completely the Canada Works programme, we know you would not agree with that in any case. However, of the \$60 million that you have available, at your disposal, would you consider, would you just even consider using \$10 million of that \$60 million. Take the other \$50 million and use it as you are going to use it, as you have used it in the past, as you are using it now, but take \$10 million of the \$60 million, just \$10 million one-sixth of it, just take \$10 million of the \$60 million, and put it aside just for a major resource development work programme for the Gull Island clearing. That is what we asked for, Mr. Speaker. That is what we asked for.

We were told at the time by the hon. the Minister for DREE, we were told at the time by the hon. Minister for the Environment, we were told at the time by the hon. Minister for Energy, Mines and Resources what a fantastic idea, tremendous idea. Why did we not think of it ourselves? And we put forward then on paper, several weeks later, that proposal. There was no talk, Mr. Speaker, of contributing \$8,000 per job, there was no talk of fifty-fifties, there was no talk of seventy-five-twenty-fives, ninety-tens, in anyone's favour or against, or one hundred per cent, it was perceived as an opportunity to perform an experiment on make work programmes in this country. That is how it was perceived, that is how it was developed, and the federal government procrastinated for months on end about that project.

Mr. Peckford: Now if the Federal Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. PECKFORD: - if the federal government wants to do something for unemployment in Atlantic Canada, and wants to do something about unemployment in Newfoundland and Labrador, they can either put up or shut up.

DR. FARRELL: Hear, hear!

MR. PECKFORD: They can take part, only part, one-sixth of the expenditure that they are going to spend in any case, it is not extra money, and put it into a particular resource development activity, and try it out. And if when the \$10 million is spent and 300 to 400 jobs are created, it did not work to the satisfaction as it was supposed to work, then you cancel it. You would not be any worse off than now with some of the money that is being spent. A lot of it, I agree, is being spent a lot better than it was two or three years ago. I agree. But it would have put 300 to 400 loggers to work for three or four years if it was stretched out over a three year period, \$10 million a year. That would take the total cost of the Gull Island clearing into consideration. That would have done it. There was no talk of splitting it. There was no talk of 50 per cent. And it lay in Ottawa for six or eight months,

MR. PECKFORD: and now we have had to go back in response to a programme that the federal government offered—seven months later—which deals with providing 8,000 to 10,000 jobs on a project which is going to cost \$25,000 to \$30,000 a job. In order for us to get \$2 million we have to spend \$4 million. And we do not have that kind of money, that is why we went to them in the beginning, that is why we thought they agreed to it in the beginning, not to be told six or seven months later that this is no longer the way we are going to look at it. They wanted to have their cake and eat it too, to use the full \$60 million on Canada Works as they saw fit and yet to come back in a way that would perhaps be perceived by Newfoundlanders, who do not know too much, that is all, it is an insult, to come back then with an offer which was supposed to camouflage and diffuse the whole issue so that they would not be perceived as opting out of a good idea. That is what they did, Mr. Speaker. That is what they did. They used another programme which ostensibly, superficially looks grand, offering you \$6,000 to \$8,000 per job. What is wrong with you Newfoundland you will not accept \$6,000 to \$8,000 per job? Only, Mr. Ottawa, that per job costs down there are going to run \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year because of the terrain, because of the environment, because of the climate, because of the kind of activity that you are performing down there, that is why. So when you scale it down, when you get at the guts of the issue we see what happened on Labrador development. And yet the hon. gentlemen opposite want us to believe that a pious resolution with motherhood clauses in it, passed by the Federal Liberal Party, is suddenly going to be the panacea for Labrador power development, for Labrador economic development. Absolutely crazy, Mr. Speaker, it holds no weight at all.

If the federal government were eager and serious about helping us in Newfoundland with development in Labrador, they could agree tomorrow morning, without hurting them one little bit, forgetting

MR. PECKFORD: their \$11 billion deficits, and forgetting the eighty-six or eighty-seven cent dollar, and forgetting the million people unemployed, forgetting all the rest of the things that the Liberal Party of Canada has succeeded in doing to this Country over the last decade.

It is interesting to note that that same Liberal Party of Canada is the party which said ten or eleven years ago that they were going to unify this Country, number one, that they were going to bring some just society into this country. And what have they done, Mr. Speaker? In a decade they have disunited the Country. The Country has never been more disunited than it is today. The very Mr. Trudeau from French Canada who said he was going to unify it, this is the man who has seen the dollar degrade and now this is the party which says, in a resolution to its convention, that it is going to give some attention to Labrador. This is the party.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the minister is not now being relevant. He would be more relevant if he read The Evening Telegram, and read the headline on page three which said, "Labradorians Frustrated With The Government."

MR. PECKFORD: That point of order is facetious and foolish.

MR. HICKMAN: Not only is it not a point of order, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Lang and Doody, sign up an agreement.

MR. HICKMAN: - he is taking advantage of the point of order and I would ask that Your Honour take the necessary action, whatever that is.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no doubt that the rule of relevancy applies and the subject under debate is the deletion or not of a preamble to this resolution on Labrador. I think the hon. gentleman's remarks extended for some period over the merits, or lack thereof, of the

MR. SPEAKER: Liberal Party or the Liberal Government's performance during the past eleven years may have well and, in fact, did stray from the subject. So the hon. gentleman's remarks do have to be related to the subject under discussion.

MR. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to point out that the weakness of the Liberal Party of Canada in developing or unifying this country and I was trying to compare that with their same weakness, their similarities, and same weakness in trying to do something in Labrador. We have been a part of confederation since 1949 and the National Government has a commitment both jurisdictionally and otherwise to do something for creating jobs and unifying this country, and one way that it can be done is through the proper economic development of various regions.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to proceed. Mr. Speaker, I indicated a couple of times in the last number of weeks that contrary to what the Opposition, who did nothing for Labrador for a long while when they were in the government, contrary to their statements that we had not put forward a comprehensive plan for a transportation system in Labrador which could enhance the economic development of Labrador, I suggested on a number of occasions that we had put a proposal before DREE so to do, to develop a plan for Port Labrador which would help expedite the whole business of trying to get some of the resources to a central location for processing, for shipping out, for export of the finished product this kind of thing. I have been questioned a number of times, Mr. Speaker, about the validity of those remarks and I want to table, put on the table of this House a copy of the original proposal that was put before DREE for the Port Labrador study. There are other back-up technical, private technical considerations that enter into it, Mr. Speaker, that prevents me from providing some of the additional information although I would only be willing to give it to hon. members opposite privately because it contains cost data which is competitive, cost data which would expose the group that did some of the back-up work for us and expose those prices—and we should not, of course, do that—but I shall table the

MR. B. PECKFORD: original document. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is for all and sundry to see that the Newfoundland government did it was in a letter from the Deputy Minister of Mines and Energy to the DREE people on September 23, 1976 - put a proposal on Port Labrador on the table which was rejected. And secondly, in 1977 to re-submit it with a back-up technical proposal giving cost data precisely, minutely what we were going to do in that so-called study that we wanted to get underway on Port Labrador. Not to be undaunted, Mr. Speaker, not to feel defeated and deflated by those two rejections we have now, Mr. Speaker, within the proposals being put before DREE for the subsidiary agreement on Labrador, we have put that proposal back to them again through that other medium by going through the proposal that is going up from the Department of Rural Development through the Intergovernmental Affairs people. So this is the third now that we are back to the DREE people on this whole proposal of Port Labrador.

MR. F. ROWE: Will you table the letters in reply?

MR. B. PECKFORD: I have not got the rejections but the reason I have not got the rejections was -

MR. HICKMAN: Sure if the hon. gentleman asked for it. Ask him if he asked for it.

MR. PECKFORD: If the hon. gentleman is asking for it I shall table it. So, Mr. Speaker, when I get a page of something - if somebody will take this proposal and lay it on the table of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about what this administration is or is not doing for Labrador and as it relates to comments in the Evening Telegram of today's date from the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, I mean, let it go on record that this government is funding the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, that in meetings with them yesterday and in their annual report we are consulting and co-operating with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council on almost every given day. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is this government that through the Department of Rural Development which has, and we will get into this tomorrow, a total

April 19, 1978

Tape No. 1238

DW-3

MR. B. PECKFORD: budget of around \$16 million close to 60 per cent of the budget of the Department of Rural Development is going to Labrador, to one region of this Province and so it should. Over 50 per cent of the total number of dollars in this Department of Rural Development will be going to Labrador. We have developed a fairly comprehensive proposal that is now before DREE for over \$100 million to be spent in the Labrador area to, as Mr. Flower's of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council says, change the face of Labrador. This is what we are doing. We have established a very real presence through-the former minister has a lot to take credit for here - a presence in Labrador and put a man there with clout, an ADM in the

MR. PECKFORD: from St. John's. We have taken pretty major steps. It can be argued, Mr. Speaker, that we have shown our lack of faith in Labrador by cutting the budget of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council from \$100,000 to \$50,000. Let me only say there, Mr. Speaker, that they still have \$10,000 or \$11,000 left from last year to spend which will bring it to \$60,000 number one, number two, they have a proposal before the government right now for another \$30,000 to take the DREE proposals that we have put together before DREE and go to every community in Labrador to get the input from the communities and then come back to us with a side proposal, if you want to call it that, and we have agreed to let them have a look at that proposal and to give us their input. The question of the \$30,000 will be resolved before another seven days are out. So we are trying to do what we can to tune in with the real needs and aspirations of the Labradorians, the people in Labrador, with the Inuits, with the Eskimos, with the Indians, with the settlers and with other people in Labrador, and we will continue to do what we can. If the people of Labrador and the Labrador Resources Advisory Council are frustrated, so am I and so is every Newfoundlander in trying to get this Province developed in a sane and a rational manner so that we will get something out of it. It is a frustrating business, it is not a matter of the Labrador Resources Advisory Council being frustrated with government or government being frustrated with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, it goes beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it goes into the range of how do you take a large land mass of 114,000 square miles, or whatever it is, and a few thousand people, and a government in St. John's that is strapped for money, and look at the past and the kind of developments that went on and now try and change it? You have the whole question.

I met with one of the representatives of the Southern Labrador Development Association yesterday and he is frustrated because on the one hand he says the district that that development association covers is too large, one, but two, do not break it up because

MR. PECKFORD: then you are going to get vying interests and there is really not enough there to break it up. so we have got to consider some way to better handle the Southern Labrador Development Association. In other words, instead of them getting a grant of \$15,000 like all development associations get we should be funding them perhaps \$30,000. A good case can be made and I ask them to make it, to reflect the differences in geography, the differences in topography, the differences in the demographic distribution on the coast that varies from place to place or region to region there. These things have to be taken into consideration so it is a frustration I hope, Mr. Speaker, that reflects an overall frustration that all Newfoundlanders have rather than say it is a frustration with me or with government, because I do not think their frustrations are really there. We are in this game together with them, with the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and we are putting time, effort and our oodles of money, \$9 million in this present year in Labrador just through the Department of Rural Development alone, \$9 million which is still not enough to do the thing that has to be done. That is why we have a big DREE proposal just on Labrador for over \$130 million, to go in there to do the kind of things that have to be done, on fish plants that we are trying to do now and seeing that a proper fisheries development programme is done in Labrador. A lot of the people were saying to me yesterday "we do not want huge fish plants" You want to put something in Williams Harbour, you want to put something in Black Tickle, you want to put something in Fox Harbour, you want to put something in Mary's Harbour, that is small to meet the needs and the fisheries resource, in St. Lewis Bay, the fisheries resource in Groswater Bay, the fisheries resource up around Grady and so on. So we are going to have, they say, to do a full analysis of what the fisheries resource is going to be over the next twenty-five years, the central communities, and there are a lot of them, and then develop your facility around the resource in that particular area of Mary's Harbour, that particular area of Williams

MR. PECKFORD: Harbour, that particular area of Cartwright or Grady or Rigolet or Nain or whatever and do not get into one or two huge big plants, the other way is the better way to go. That has to be worked out, that is important. We have two fish plants now in Nain and Makkovik, I think, that we are administering, that we are about to pass over to the Department of Fisheries to help along that way. There is a lot of work to be done on the coast of Labrador to provide decent facilities and to give the people a chance and it can only be done through development associations in this way.

Mr. Speaker, we are aware on the power side that if we develop Gull Island, we are aware that it must be done in a way that is different from the Upper Churchill. The hon. gentlemen

MR. PECKFORD: on the other side indicated that we did not mention in the Budget anything about Labrador Power Development and the picture on the cover of the Budget is the water of the Upper Churchill flowing down. And we meant the tragedy that is Churchill and go into that in great detail in the Budget. We cannot stand for anything less than a deal that is going to give us some return and we must try with all the power that is within us to get a better price on the Upper Churchill, one mil change on the Upper Churchill gives us \$33 million a year, one mil, and three and a half mils to four and a half mils gives us \$33 million a year. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we could get the two or three mil change, it would change the whole complexion fiscally and every other way then, of course, naturally, of Newfoundland and Labrador, change it completely. More credit rating, all the way through, our ability to borrow and do the kinds of things that we want to do. We must go that route. And who can argue with motherhood statements of secondary processing, get more of your resource processed. That has to be done. That has to be done to the degree it can be done and still keep that industry viable. That is the point. How far down the road can you bring it? And we must, as a government, push to bring it as far as is humanly possible to push it and still make something off it. That is what we have to do. That is the question. The question is not whether we want to get secondary processing for primary resources, the question is how far can you push that to give you the more jobs, to give you the additional revenue, to still make it an industry that is viable?

AN HON. MEMBER: There is not a quorum in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I ask the Clerk to count the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We have a quorum.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, could I get a reading on how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. PECKFORD: Fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, just to finish off on the whole question of the Gull Island clearing, Mr. Speaker, and to get it clear, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned when he was talking about Gull Island clearing that, you know, we have not given it that high a priority, that we have just played around with the whole concept of Gull Island clearing, well, Mr. Speaker, now let it for the record, let it be said that the Premier of this Province, when he met with the Prime Minister of this Country, mentioned it as one of the priority items in the whole business of resource development, number one. Number two, besides the Premier and three or four ministers doing it last June, the Premier did it with the Prime Minister, told him about it when he was down here on this grand tour across Canada that he made, and then that was followed up by one of the Prime Minister's chief lieutenants in Ottawa, Marc Lalonde, the minister so-called responsible for intergovernmental affairs across the nation and so on. And when the hon. Mr. Lalonde came down here - we had a meeting with Mr. Lalonde and people from the Prime Minister's office and the number one priority in the immediate future for employment generation was Gull Island clearing. That was made clear to the Prime Minister's office. That was made clear to the hon. Marc Lalonde. So let not the Leader of the Opposition try to pretend or try to put across to the hon. members of this House, or to the media that are listening, that this whole idea of Gull Island clearing was a low priority with this government. It was the number one priority in the business of an immediate plan to get the Country moving again. That is what we said, that I said personally to Mr. Lalonde, that I said to the members from the Premier's office who were down here so that this whole question of it not being a priority is one that has to be laid to rest because it is just not so. It is just not true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if anybody really, really realizes just what offshore resources, the oil and gas can mean to this Province. There is no other within the next twenty to thirty years, Mr. Speaker, I submit, there is no other way that revenue can be generated at the rate that it can be generated through oil and gas that will give us the kind of fiscal flexibility to do the things socially and on the resource side that we all want to see done. There is no other resource.

You can take the fishery, Mr. Speaker, you can take the forestry, you can take agriculture, you can

MR. PECKFORD: take the mines, you can take hydro power development and you can put it all together in one big pot and use the most optimistic scenarios for development of all those resource developments and you will not generate in the short or medium-term the kind of new dollars that are going to be needed to even keep the same rate of increase going in this Province. The only one development that can give us in the immediate or medium-term the kind of new dollars that will therefore allow for the proper expansion of our social services on all sectors in the social scene, and to allow for some injection into the fishery that is needed to get it going, and into other areas of the economy is through offshore oil and gas. It is the only way. And, Mr. Speaker, that can only be done, that is only possible through our oil and gas regulations applying. So if the Liberal Party of Canada, if the Federal Government of Canada, if the people of Canada want to do something to see that Newfoundland has a chance to contribute under the present formula as a 'have' province of Canada, they have the opportunity now, not through tokenism resolutions at an annual convention, but, Mr. Speaker, by saying to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in the next few days before the election is called, 'Newfoundland, that resolution at our convention meant something; and because it does mean something and that we are concerned about Newfoundland and giving it the fiscal flexibility to move ahead as a region, we shall pass over jurisdiction of the offshore resources to you and accept the regulations that you have put in place'-that we have tried nine years to do and still cannot do-'and Bill C-20 is going to die on the Order Paper. We shall give it to you.' So if the Leader of the Opposition wants some sound advice, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest before he gets overwhelmed with the Prime Minister when he meets him, would he please suggest that if he really

MR. PECKFORD: wants to do something as Prime Minister of Canada to be remembered by Newfoundlanders, to give us the opportunity if there is a commercial find off our coast, to have the kind of revenue return that we can get now under our regulations. Without that kind of commitment from the federal government these kinds of wishy-washy resolutions mean absolutely nothing, and even if followed, will not allow for any flexibility for this Province to get ahead and to really have a chance to have its place in the sun in this Confederation.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we on this side are quite ready to put this amendment to the test. However, if hon. members opposite are going to speak on the amendment I will continue on and speak to the amendment. Is it the intention of the member for Grand Falls - let us call the question on the amendment and get back to the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Well, if the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) is going to speak on the amendment -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have not recognized the hon. member.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I was going to spend maybe ten minutes on the amendment, but if the member wants to speak on it that is his prerogative.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, fine, I will carry on with the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy gets up in this House and calls this most important motion a token motion, tokenism, pure partisan tokenism. Sir, I do not know where the hon. member for Green Bay and the Minister of Mines and Energy were over the last few weeks

April 19, 1978

Tape 1241

EC - 3

MR. F. ROWE: when hon. members opposite got  
up and gave their full-fledged support to this most important  
motion moved by

MR. F.B. ROWE: the Leader of the Opposition relating to the total and complete package development of the Labrador portion of our Province. Sir, I can not understand it, how the Minister of Mines and Energy can get up in this House today and call this a silly, wishy-washy, tokenism motin when the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) representing one-third of Labrador, the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) representing approximately one-third of Labrador, for all intents and purposes, other hon. members opposite, the Minister of Mines and Energy himself, Sir, has already spoken to the motion.

MR. NEARY: Naskaupi, you mentioned that.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy himself has been up in this House, Sir, and has spoken in support of the motion. Then we have the spectacle, Sir, of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) whom I have a great deal of respect for, Sir, and whom I admire from time to time, he is a learned gentleman, certainly, a member of the Bar, is usually rational but, Sir, every now and then the member for St. John's East will make thirty minutes of rational, genuine, sincere argument and then his mind becomes clouded with his usual partisanship and everything returns to normal.

MR. NEARY: Silly, petty.

MR. F.B. ROWE: And he has the gall, Sir, to come in here and ask that the second recital of this resolution be deleted because it mentions the dirty word, in his mind, of the Liberal Party of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: God blessed us! God blessed us!

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

MR. SPEAKER(Young): A point of order has been raised.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order. I believe, if memory serves me correct, that the hon. gentleman now speaking adjourned the debate two Wednesdays ago. As much as I would like to hear what he is saying now, which is very good, he adjourned the debate, I believe, if your Honour will consult the journals, Two Wednesdays ago he got up and he said, "I adjourn the debate", then he was not here last Wednesday -

MR. J. CARTER: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: - so he is not entitled to speaker now. I think -

MR. J. CARTER: No, not at all.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I think Your Honour should consult the journals because I feel fairly sure that I am correct, or that Hansard will show that the hon. member adjourned the debate on - and spoke immediately after I introduced the amendment. He was not here the next day so I do not believe the hon. gentleman is now entitled to speak.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to that point of order. The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is quite correct, Sir. The record will show that I adjourned the debate two Wednesdays ago. I approached the Chair, the Speaker at that time - not Your Honour, Sir, the Speaker of the House of Assembly - I informed the Speaker of the House of Assembly that I had an urgent matter in my district and I had to -

MR. NEARY: What is so funny about that?

MR. F.B. ROWE: There is nothing funny about that. - and the hon. Speaker at that time, Sir, gave me every indication that I could indeed speak. Now I have not

MR. F.B. ROWE: had a ruling from the Chair up to this point and I would submit, Sir, that the hon. member for St. John's East, if that was a point of order - and I have been speaking for five minutes - should have raised that point order at the earliest possible time.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: He slept on his rights, he did not raise the point of order at the earliest possible time, five or six minutes ago, Sir, and I submit that his point of order should be rejected on these grounds alone, particularly since the Chair, in fact, did recognize me. This member has been sleeping on his rights and has -

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Sit down, you big galoot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down!

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: I am still speaking to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit, Sir, that I have been recognized by Your Honour. I brought this matter to the attention of the Speaker of the House of Assembly, it has not been brought to Your Honour's attention, the member for St. John's East has slept on his rights he should have brought it up six minutes ago. The only reason, Sir, he is bringing it up now is because I am referring to the hon. member for St. John's East and the motives, I think, for which he deleted this particular recital. I am obviously hitting a very tender cord with the hon. member and that is the pure motive for the member getting up and deliberately trying to get me off my feet, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER(Young): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: It is right or wrong. It is right or wrong. If he is out of order he is out of order.

MR. J. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I recognized the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde it is true was speaking in this Chamber for five minutes this afternoon before his right was challenged by the hon. member for St. John's East. But it must be remembered by Your Honour and all members here that

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) speaks in a low monotone. His voice is very boring and he would lull you to sleep, therefore it took a while for us to gather ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit, Sir, that this is not a point of order. It is merely a move on the part of the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who is noted for making spurious and childish points of order in this House, Sir, to muzzle my hon. friend, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. My hon. friend has every right to speak in this House, even though Your Honour, and I want to point this out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman did move the adjournment of the debate and then did approach the Chair, and the Chair recognized me. I was the one who spoke in the debate, not the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. And so the hon. gentleman should not have to give up his right, Sir, to speak in this hon. House. It is just a move, Mr. Speaker, to muzzle, to gag members on this side of the House and I submit to Your Honour that my hon. colleague be allowed to carry on his few remarks.

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not here two weeks ago when this occurred but that is not relevant because the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) has concurred and admitted that he did indeed move the adjournment.

Now may I refresh - the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talks about muzzling on the other side and the rules of precedent apply to this House very clearly. The hon. gentleman, the present Leader of the Opposition, will recall that when the present Mr. Speaker - the hon. Leader of the Opposition nods in agreement - when Mr. Speaker was then Leader of the Opposition there was

MR. HICKMAN: a motion of non-confidence moved by I believe the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. T. Hickey) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition simply stood and nodded, who is now Mr. Speaker. A few days later he stood in his place to speak and the then Premier of this Province, aided and abetted and I confess that I was on this side, aided and abetted by all hon. gentlemen who sat on the government side of the House at that time, ruled that - you did not even have to move the adjournment - the simple standing and nodding constituted a participating - the rule was made, it was carried by the House and the then Leader of the Opposition was not allowed to participate in the debate.

The doctrine of laches, Mr. Speaker, does not apply to this House and no hon. gentleman can lose his rights by not moving quickly and promptly and forthwith, as soon as he recognizes or realizes that the hon. gentleman from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) is speaking. If it is a breach of the rule then whenever it is raised it must be dealt with and dealt with expeditiously -

MR. J. CARTER: Forthwithly.

MR. HICKMAN: - forthwithly and in accordance with the rules as set forth by Mr. Beauchesne and Mr. May. The rule is clear, unambiguous, the precedents are there. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may say that it was wrong but it is the rule of this House.

MR. NEARY: Not all the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: The Minister of Justice has repeated history quite correctly.

MR. W.M. ROWE: No, not correctly.

MR. F. ROWE: Okay, well there is probably - the hon. member was in the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I feel -

MR. F. ROWE: Can I just continue on, Mr. Speaker, with my point. To my knowledge, I was not in the House at the time, and it was not on the same matter. It was not an adjournment.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. F. ROWE: It was not an adjournment. It was not an adjournment, Mr. Speaker, that is the point that I want to make.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a point.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I would like to remind Your Honour, that I approached the Chair two Wednesdays ago - last Wednesday I am sorry, and I explained to Mr. Speaker that I had an urgent matter in my district that I had to go to - you know, if we did not get around to Private Members Day in time, and I admit I told Mr. Speaker, that I had adjourned the debate and there was no indication from Mr. Speaker, that I would be not allowed to speak if I rose on the amendment at a later date, Sir.

Mr. F. Rowe: and I would also like to point our, Sir, if -  
I do not know if any other submissions are going to be allowed,  
but the example that the Minister of Justice -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes they are, it is too important.

MR. F. ROWE: It is too important, yes. But I would like  
to point out, and I am sure the Leader of the Opposition who is  
more knowledgeable on this particular subject - when the member for  
St. John's - where was he the member for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: St. John's East.

MR. F. ROWE: - East at that time, it was not because  
he had moved an adjournment, it was an entirely different matter,  
he seconded the motion at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: A different thing entirely.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please. I feel I can make  
a ruling on that now. Beauchesne, page 112, 122, "On resuming  
a debate - "

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please! "On resuming an  
adjournment debate, the member who moved this adjournment is by courtesy  
entitled to speak first if he rises in his place when the Order is  
called, but if he does not avail himself of the privilege he is not  
thereby debarred from subsequently joining in the debate."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER; (MR. YOUNG) I will ask the hon. member to continue.

MR. NEARY: Learn the rules. Shot down again!

MR. F. ROWE: Where are my notes? Where are my notes?

MR. NEARY: Do not be obstructing the business of the  
House.

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

MR. NEARY: Delaying the House.

MR. F. ROWE: I lost my notes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Obstructionist!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I hardly remember where I was -

AN HON. MEMBER: .... back to work.

MR. F. ROWE: - when I got into the debate.

But, Sir, what I was referring to when the member for St. John's East got up on his point of order was this -

MR. W. ROWE: Ridiculous point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Specious, ridiculous, shot down point of order,

MR. W. ROWE: He calls himself a lawyer then.

MR. F. ROWE: And a learned member.

MR. NEARY: I would not want the hon. gentleman down defending me for anything serious.

MR. F. ROWE: I will have to go to other lawyers in the future.

MR. NEARY: What a shame! Making shambles out of The Hon. House.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, apparently the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), he got up speaking to the resolution itself, and made no reference whatsoever to the important sections of this particular motion, and its meaning for the total package overall development of Labrador for the people of Labrador, and the Province as well. No reference, Sir, to developing Labrador's hydro resources, no reference to Port Labrador, no reference to processing the raw materials in Labrador whether it is mineral, fish, forest, offshore oil and gas. No reference at all, Sir, to the important submission in the resolution, assuring that these developments would proceed only after full consideration of methods to protect the environment, and after full consultation with people living in all parts of Labrador. No reference to these things at all, Sir. He has to pick out one little recital because he does not like it, because it contains the word "Liberal Party", and the recent National Liberal Convention.

MR. F. ROWE: Well let me assure the hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is of utmost importance that that particular recital stay in the resolution for this reason, this was moved unanimously, unanimously by the grass roots of a political party; a major political party in this Nation, the grass roots, the people, the ordinary people not Cabinet ministers -

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the Civil Service.

MR. F. ROWE: - not MPs, not the civil servants up in Ottawa, but by the grass roots of a major political party in this Nation.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The major.

MR. F. ROWE: The major. The only I would submit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The next government of Canada.

MR. F. ROWE: But I am not going to get partisan.

MR. NEARY: The next government of Canada.

MR. F. ROWE: The next government of Canada.

MR. W. ROWE: The party of the extreme -

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I want that recital to stay in that resolution so that the grass roots of that great party can continue to remind the next Liberal Government in Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: - of that resolution.

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

MR. F. ROWE: That is where the clout of this resolution lies, Sir. And I would submit that this is why the Leader of the Opposition put that in the recital, as one of the recitals, not because he wanted to score a few political points.

MR. NEARY: Sit down, boy! Sit down.

MR. F. ROWE: No reason whatsoever, Sir. Because we as delegates,

MR. F. ROWE: and other thousands of people as delegates to the great Liberal convention in Ottawa would be able to remind this present Liberal government in Ottawa and the next Liberal government in Ottawa that this was a resolution moved unanimously by the grass roots of that party, and the federal Liberal government had better get on with the job of implementing it.

Now, Sir, that is why I submit I will vote against the amendment moving for the deletion of that particular recital in the resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, boy, get in your seat. You are not allowed to be out of your own seat when you are speaking. You have the rules to follow.

MR. F. ROWE: Now I would submit, Sir, that we have a situation here where the hon. members opposite would have dearly loved to have moved this type of a resolution. And we had a case where every single member, one, two, three, four, five, I am not quite sure about the exact number, but four or possibly 5 members opposite stood up and supported this complete resolution word by word, recital by recital, and the sub-resolutions - no objection whatsoever. The member for Menihek did not move such a deletion; the member for Naskaupi did not move such a deletion; and these two members, Sir, represent the district of Labrador and they wholeheartedly supported the resolution. But a gentleman from the inner core of St. John's, not at all familiar with the problems of Labrador, sees fit to move -

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

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) A point of order has been raised.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Just to clarify the record, the member for Menihek did not completely support the resolution. The member for Menihek asked that the House Leaders and the

MR. ROUSSEAU: Opposition Leader get together and check the record. As I said, government supported the resolution - that has not changed, government does support the resolution. And I asked that there be some togetherness between the Leader of the Opposition or their House Leader and our House Leader with respect to the - preamble, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Recital.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right, recital. But I submit the record will show that.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I submit that is not a point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. members and I will rephrase it if it makes the member feel more at ease. I remember quite clearly the member mentioning something along the lines of what he just mentioned, but the -

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) The point of order must be ruled on.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel it is more a matter of an explanation than a point of order. I will ask the hon. member to continue.

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

Sir, I had the occasion to travel to Labrador two weekends ago and met with the many and varied groups of people - the Naskaupi Montagnais people of Labrador, the settlers, the original whites of Labrador, the various interest groups, power groups - and many things came out of it, Sir. And I might add, Sir, that I have had the unique experience, back in 1952 I believe it was, quite a while ago now, of having visited every single community in Labrador - every single community back in 1952. Some of these communities, of course, no longer exist. Carol Lake, which is now Labrador City and Wabush, did not exist at that time.

April 19, 1978

Tape 1245

EC - 3

AN HON. MEMBER:

When?

MR. F. ROWE:

Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

When and where did you visit?

MR. F. ROWE:

Back in 1952. Right, every single community. And it took seven weeks. And, Sir, I have seen the changing face of Labrador. It is an unbelievable change. We really had three or four faces - I think the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) mentioned that in his speech. We had three or four, possibly five faces of Labrador, and this is why I feel that these

MR F. ROWE: this is why I feel that this(D)section of this particular motion is of the utmost importance, that there is assurance that these developments will proceed only after full consideration of methods to protect the environment and after full consultation with the peoples living in all parts of Labrador. Now, Sir, I would suggest that this is possibly going to be the most difficult aspect of the whole thing. Sometimes we tend to think that developing technology is the holdback, technology is the holdback on the development of this last great frontier, waiting for technology to develop to the point where certain things can be done to tap the vast potential of Labrador. But I would submit, Sir, that if both governments, the provincial and the federal government levels, do not approach this consultation aspect with the very many different interest groups in Labrador then that will in fact be the factor that will hold back the development of Labrador for the best interests of that particular part of our Province. And I say that, Sir, having travelled into communities some seventeen or eighteen - more than twenty years ago now, and having witnessed the changing face of Labrador through my experience in politics and in the bush. I accepted an invitation from the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) when he was supervising principal of the school there and I had a good insight into the educational system in that particular area and the hon. minister pointed out the difficulty he had with the native population in this traumatic experience in moving from their particular social milieu into a great, new, modern school. How this social change was so great that some of the native peoples just could not adjust socially to the extent that their whole educational - What is that?

MR ROUSSEAU: Nobody did.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. minister goes one step further and says "Nobody did." Now, Sir, we can get into some of the things that were done in Labrador in order to try and help the native peoples which turned out to be a complete disaster, like the North West River

MR. F. ROWE: situation. This was a genuine attempt on the part of the government of the day to try to help the Indian population out on that particular bank of North West River and because of the traumatic change from the tent to a clapboard house we saw what a disaster that was. Well the only comment that I can make on that is that the only way you can make mistakes is by trying something.

AN HON MEMBER: ( Inaudible )

MR. R. ROWE: Well that is right, but I am talking about a different issue now with respect to the transition from the tents to the houses on the Indian side of Labrador. But, Sir, to get back to the amendment, I am getting on to the main motion now which was not my intention, I have to vote against the amendment moved by the member for St. John's East ( Mr. Marshall) for the simple reason that, while I do not want to attribute motives to the member, I feel that he just could not stand the fact that there was reference to the Liberal party in the recital. The member openly admits it, that he could not stand the mention of the word Liberal in the recital which is, I submit, a very partisan and weak reason for deleting a recital out of the -

MR. NEARY: Narrow minded.

MR. R. ROWE: - resolution. But, Sir, may I, before I sit down, remind this House that we who were delegates at that particular convention and the other grass root members at the convention from all over Canada want to be in a position to remind the government, the Liberal Government in Ottawa, that we want this resolution adopted. It has been adopted by the convention but we want it adopted by the government itself. Now before we have adoption, Mr. Speaker, by the government itself -

MR. HICKMAN: I would just call to the hon. gentleman's attention that if and when the resolution is passed, and presumably

MR. HICKMAN: then sent to Mr. Speaker in Ottawa, the recitals do not go along as part of the resolution.

MR. F. ROWE: It does not go to Mr. Speaker in Ottawa?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes it does.

MR. F. ROWE: The resolution, Sir, from the Liberal Convention, presumably -

MR. HICKMAN: No, this one, the one that is before this House.

MR. F. ROWE: Oh this one here goes before the Speaker here.

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, and then is transmitted to Ottawa.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, if the hon. House wants to transmit it to Ottawa.

MR. HICKMAN: The point I am making is that the recital is not in the resolution.

MR. NEARY: What is wrong with it?

MR. HICKMAN: The recital is not part of the resolution.

MR. F. ROWE: Well if the recital is not a part of the resolution -

MR. NEARY: What is the member so concerned about?

MR. F. ROWE: That is what I was going to ask, if it is not going to be sent off to Ottawa -

MR. HICKMAN: No, because I know why. Where we wanted to have a non-partisan debate, that resolution makes it so shockingly partisan that it colours the flavour of the debate.

MR. F. ROWE: There is a very interesting dialogue going on here.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the only gentlemen who made this resolution partisan were hon. members opposite when they drew attention to this fact here and decided to ask for the deletion of it. It is as simple as that. And if what the hon. House Leader is saying is true, what is the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) so upset about if the recital is not going to go off to Ottawa anyway?

Mr. Speaker, we got the sad spectacle in this

MR. F. ROWE: House today, Sir, of me standing in the House and saying, I thought I was going to be unparliamentary because I was attributing base motives to the hon. member. I said, Sir, I suspect that the motive, the reason why the member wanted this deleted was because he cannot stand, he needs a vomitorium with the word Liberal mentioned. And he was over there nodding in agreement. He has admitted, Sir, by nodding his head, that he cannot stand the word Liberal in this resolution and has admitted that this is the only reason that he moved the deletion of this particular recital.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty-eight per cent of Newfoundlanders.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Sir, I submit that that is a very weak reason, a very weak reason for moving for the deletion of this particular recital and I, Sir, will certainly vote against it. I will certainly vote against it.

MR. NEARY: Down on the grapevine he is down in the gutter, low, low level.

MR. HICKMAN: Kindest regards.

MR. F. ROWE: And Sir, may I add that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is okay. Adjourn debate now, boy, Look, it is two minutes to six.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not the least bit worried about who is in the gallery, Mr. Speaker, What I am worried about is what is sitting down in the corner down there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could interrupt and carry on with my speech.

MR. NEARY: Move the adjournment, 'Fred'.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it being approximately six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: . Let it be noted that the hon. gentleman has spoken.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00, and that this House do no adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, 2:00 P.M.