

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present a petition on behalf of 518 students from the Regional College at Corner Brook. The prayer of the petition is to the Hon. House of Assembly, "Whereas measures introduced in the 1978 Budget concerning changes in student aid will tend to place a tremendous financial burden on graduates from Memorial University; whereas these changes will cause a substantial decrease in enrollment at the University based on financial rather than academic qualifications; and whereas the increase in the operating budget for Memorial University is not sufficient to cover inflation in salaries and costs; and whereas this minimal increase will decrease the quality of education at Memorial University; and whereas tuition and residence fees will be forced to rise, therefore we the undersigned respectfully petition the Government of The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to reconsider the allocation of funds in these areas of the Budget and respectfully request that the government increase its support to university education."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was signed by 518 students at the Regional College in Corner Brook, in the same way as the petition which was presented yesterday by the University here in St. John's. They too are concerned about rising costs to the students.

Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the government increased the Canada Student Loan to \$700, as they are doing now, and then they withdrew it because of the effect on declining enrollment. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, enrollment decreased at the University by 12.5 per cent, a 12.5 per cent decline in enrollment. Now the government has brought in this increase again, and if we look at the situation today as it could be compared in 1973 with the raises in the cost of living, I believe we have the highest cost of living in Canada, the spiralling inflation which has taken place in the last several years, and the fact

Mr. Hodder: that unemployment is very, very high in this Province, the highest in Canada, and the fact that students can no longer find jobs in the Province in the summertime, I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the enrollment at the University will decline substantially, and I am afraid of this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we look at what has happened at the University in the past few days or the past few months, it was anticipated at the Spring semester at the University that they would have 2,000 students. As it happened there were slightly under 1,400 appeared for the Spring semester. In the Summer semester the prediction was that more than 1,800 students would be attending for the Summer semester. Again it was just slightly over 1,400 students turned up for the Summer semester. And it is anticipated by the University that enrollments will decline further.

Now, the liaison officer for the University did a survey among high school students. Now he found that on the Avalon Peninsula there was not a great concern about the increase. However, there was growing concern, quite a bit of concern, outside the Avalon Peninsula. Now this goes to the crux of what - that along with the figures quoted as for the decline already during the Spring and Summer semester and the fact that surveys among University students has shown concern throughout the outer parts of the Province, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are in for a drop in enrollment again and I feel that it is the rural areas of the Province that will suffer most.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when a petition similar to this one was presented in the House of Assembly, the argument was, or it was said here in the House by the government side that our student loan programme is comparable to that of the Atlantic Provinces. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. This is the only university in the Atlantic Provinces that has three semesters and for that reason our students are often required to borrow \$2,100 a year rather than the other Atlantic Provinces which borrow

MR. HODDER: \$1,400 a year. But more important than that, Mr. Speaker, we in this Province do not have a grade twelve or thirteen so that a student going to university in Nova Scotia can expect to stay at home an extra two years. Here in this Province we have students - A student going to university in, say, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick would have a three or four year programme to look to whereas here we have approximately a four or five year programme our students must look to when they go to the university. So that the financial burden on this province with its high cost of living, the problems that students have in finding jobs and the threatened declining enrollment, the problems of the students here are much greater. The other thing, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I would like to say is that we have only one institution in this Province with a two year - the institution granted has a two year programme on the West Coast.. Let us look at Nova Scotia which has thirteen degree granting institutions scattered throughout the Province whereby students can go to those particular universities and stay at home. So that the cost to the Newfoundland student is far, far greater than it is in other Atlantic Provinces. Coupled with that, Mr. Speaker, the bursary programme at the university has been cut in half and this was something that was used for needy, academically deserving students and we have found in this Province that this programme was always one that was well used, and that has been cut in half.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing all I would like to say is that I feel that the moves made by this government will have the effect of declining enrollments. It has already been seen through the figures which I have presented here in the House today. I would like to finish on this closing note by quoting a statement by the Minister of Education when he said that the young people of this Province, and this was in one of his last messages, the young people of this Province will be the ones that will shape its future just as indeed we are shaping their future now. Mr. Speaker, I would contend that we are not shaping their future now, we are holding them back and I feel that the future is indeed in our young people and we must do

MR. HODDER: everything in our power to see that they get the proper education and we must change this policy -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: I was about to finish, Mr. Speaker, but we must change this policy and we must revert back to the system which we formerly had.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, presented by my colleague, the member for Port au Port. This is the second day in a row now, Sir, we have had a petition from young men and young women in this Province who are very concerned about the fact that they may not be able to take advantage of a university education because of financial reasons. I believe the total number of signatures on the petitions now, Sir, number about 2,000 I believe. Yesterday we had approximately 1,500 and today we had another 500 from Western Newfoundland from students who attend the regional college. So that drives the figure up to about 2,000 and I do not believe yet, Sir, we have heard a peep out of the Minister of Education on this matter. We hope today, the hon. gentleman is making notes there, that the hon. gentleman will get up and support this petition and tell us what action the government is going to take to restore the confidence of young people in this Province in the fact that they will be able to take advantage of our post-secondary institutions especially the university and get themselves the kind of education that they want.

Now my hon. friend made a very valid point, by the way, in supporting the petition and one that I have been pushing now for the last six or seven years in this Province and that is that we should introduce grade twelve into our high schools. My hon. colleague pointed out that grade twelve and grade thirteen are in the high schools in Nova Scotia and grade twelve, I suppose, could be considered the equivalent of first year university and the beauty about it that you can take your grade twelve while you live at home. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, Sir, that I again want to repeat what I have been

MR. NEARY: saying for the last six or seven years that we should have grade twelve in our high school system. It only confirms, Mr. Speaker, what I have been saying for years too that what we need in this Province at the present time is a fact finding committee, not a task force, that little miserable task force that the Minister of Education has appointed to look into cutbacks in the number of teachers in this Province, but we need a task force or we need a fact finding committee, Sir, to take stock of our whole post secondary education system in this Province and the sooner we do it the better.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting the petition I want to draw to the attention of hon. members of the House that every year there is compiled what they call a Presidential Task Force Report and this report is sent to the Minister of Education, the government of this Province, it is sent to the Government of Canada and the Student Aid Programme. And that Presidential Task Force that is done under the supervision of the President of the university makes recommendations in connection with the students' welfare, the student aid programmes and so forth and so on. And this year, Sir, the latest Presidential Task Force suggested that special bursaries be established so that students with low incomes and no incomes will not have to face the possibility of incurring large debts at the beginning of their university career. Now, Sir, that is a very good recommendation, but so far I am told that not one of the recommendations that have been made in the various Presidential Task Forces since they started has been carried out by either government. Now some of them may have been implemented but to the knowledge of the students that I have spoken to and the members of the House that I have conferred with, to the best of their knowledge it is not obvious to anybody that any of these recommendations of the Presidential Task Force have ever been implemented and there is a good recommendation for the minister to take into consideration, that special bursaries be established to assist students in the low income and no income bracket.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of following this recommendation, as members know the government reduced by one half the number of Centenary and Electoral scholarships. The government then reinstated some of the scholarships. It was my understanding, Sir, with the information that I was able to gather this morning that some of these scholarships still have been dropped and this has had a serious effect, too, Sir, on some of the needy and well qualified high school students who wish to enter university.

Another bone of contention, Sir, with the students is the appeals process. This is one of the chief areas of complaints as far as the student aid programmes are concerned. Students

MR. S. NEARY: complain that their appeals never reach the Appeals Committee but are being arbitrarily rejected by the appeals officers. And then, Mr. Speaker, another problem that they are having is the assessment that is made on the earnings that they have in the Summer time and even an assessment made on unemployment insurance, I am told, and I was rather shocked to hear that. And, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Minister of Justice, the Government House Leader told us yesterday, Sir, it is virtually impossible in this Province for any student to get the maximum grant that is given by the Department of Education under the student aid. It is impossible! The maximum a student can get is about three quarters of his grant. In Nova Scotia, Sir, it is just the reverse of what it is in Newfoundland; the grant is put first, the tuition comes second and the student loan comes third. In this Province you have to get the loan first, the tuition second and the grant third, just the reverse, and that makes a big difference, Mr. Speaker, if I had time I would explain it to hon. members but my time is up. But I am sure the minister understands what I am talking about.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition on behalf of the 518 students from Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest obstacles to going to university in this Province, and I suppose in other provinces but moreso in this Province, is finances. And particularly with low income families, the majority of Newfoundland families may be classified as low income families, thus the problem is more pronounced in this Province than in any other province. The move by the government to up the student loan to \$700 has aggravated the situation much more intensely and now students from low income families are discriminated against tremendously. It was mentioned in this debate that the government made this move in 1973 with the disastrous effect of a decline in student enrollment at the university.

MR. LUSH: There was a task force set up at that time and a study by the task force revealed that eighty per cent of the students in this Province answered that they did not go to university because of the expenses incurred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a revealing statement and certainly if the government were sensitive to the needs of the young people of this Province they would be governed by that lesson in 1973 when the study revealed that over eighty per cent of the students questioned said that they would not go to university because of the expenses incurred. And the government reversed its position at that time and yet the effects were disastrous because the enrollment of the university has not picked up during that time. It just went downhill to the effect now that we probably only have roughly about forty per cent of the student enrollment that we had back in the early seventies and it has not picked up because of the discouraging effect of the financial problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, somebody made mention of the maximum loan that a student can get. I think the Minister of Justice yesterday made reference to the fact that there was a \$1,000 in a loan for students. That is the maximum. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province ever arrives at that amount. Nobody! The maximum under the old programme was \$1,450, and the maximum under the new programme is \$1,450. The difference is that we are now forcing students to borrow \$250 more per semester, which is \$500 more over two semesters. Under the old arrangement a loan was \$450, the tuition was \$300, the allowance \$700, for a grand total of \$1,450. But that is if a student qualified for the maximum, if there was no contribution from the family and the student earned no money. That is the only way you can get the maximum contribution because in filing for the money if you have to put in what your financial status is, what your financial resources are, and then the amounts you get are determined by your financial resources. So if a person has no financial

MR. LUSH: resources, no contribution from parents or did not have a job, the maximum that student could get was \$1,450, that is the maximum. It was the maximum under the old programme. It is the maximum now under the new programme, as I said before, the difference being that the government is forcing the student to go more in debt. \$250 more per semester, \$500 over a year if a student attends two semesters which is generally what they do. And that expanded over a five year period, Mr. Speaker, has these results, that the total loan under the new programme would have been \$4,500, that is the total debt that a student would have accumulated. Under the new programme it is \$7,000. That is, we are forcing the student to almost \$4,000 more, \$3,762. Mr. Speaker, that is the - under a monthly payment under the old programme to pay back would have been \$58 a month, under the new programme it is \$91 a month to pay back at the end of ten years - or at the end of the university period, taking a ten year period to pay it back, \$91 a month.

Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous burden to be putting on the students of this Province and it is militating, it is discriminatory against the low income people of this Province, the people that make up the majority of our population; therefore this new policy, this policy if the government do not reverse it will be discriminating against the large majority of our Newfoundland students and depriving them of the right of a university education. I would hope that the minister will reverse this position immediately so that students will know that this programme will not come into effect and that they can make plans for the coming year.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition which I believe is couched in identical terms to the one yesterday which I had the privilege and pleasure of presenting myself. The one yesterday had 1,500 names attached to it, the one

MR. W. ROWE:

students should not be required to pay out more money than they already are being forced to do in order to get a university education or to incur greater debt than they presently or have been forced to do in order to get a university education.

I was surprised yesterday, Sir, to hear from the Minister of Education - I do not know if he said it during his short speech or whether he threw it across the floor by way of an interjection into the speech of somebody else - when he said that we have to cut our aid to students and our help to students at university because we cannot afford to pay the amount of money which other provinces are paying - something along those lines - or that we could not afford, Sir, to increase our help to students because we do not have the money and we are not in the fortunate position of other provinces of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would humbly suggest that the minister has his logic upside down or backwards or completely reversed, because, Mr. Speaker, the only real source of hope, I suppose, for Newfoundland and Labrador if we are to fully develop what we have here - the three major resources that are left to be developed, our fishery and our energy and our talent and intelligence - if we are to do that, Sir, then this Province of all provinces cannot afford to cut its expenditure on education. We have mentioned this on many occasions before that it is a province like ours or indeed a country which is developing, which is trying to drag itself up out of economic depression by its bootstraps, it is that kind of a country or that kind of a province which needs to spend a far greater proportion of its dollars, its financial resources, whether tax or otherwise, on education. The minister should not deceive himself, Sir, into thinking that because we are spending the same proportionate amount of money, say, as Ontario may

MR. W. ROWE: be spending on education, therefore we are doing an equally good job compared to some of these richer provinces. We should be spending, Sir, a tremendously greater amount per capita and proportionate to our income on education than these other fully developed provinces with more sophisticated economies. And it is a province like ours, Sir, which can ill afford to cut spendings on education, particularly can ill afford to cut on spending regarding post secondary education, trade schools, universities and other types of education, Sir, where necessary skills which will benefit all of our society can be attained.

Sir, I go further than my colleague, the member for LaPoile district (Mr. Neary), who has been adamant in calling for a full-fledged inquiry into post secondary education. I would say, Sir, and I am sure my colleague agrees, I think, Sir, the time has come for an inquiry into all aspects of education from kindergarten on up and even pre-kindergarten, Sir, all aspects of education in this Province, because, Sir, nobody can give me or anybody else in this Province a persuasive or convincing reason as to why our education system statistically speaking does not compare favourably with the rest of Canada.

MR. HOUSE: Who says?

MR. W. ROWE: I am saying, Mr. Speaker. I am telling the minister, Sir, that we have half the rate of graduations from university.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, I am talking - 'statistics' was the word I used. If the minister, Sir, shows the same intelligence outside the House as in the House, Sir, no wonder our education system is on the verge of bankruptcy.

AN HON. MEMBER: He needs to be re-educated.

MR. NEARY: Send them back so we will not cost the taxpayers any money.

MR. W. ROWE: Send that back. Notice, one minute remaining. Let me say, Sir, this, that we need to find out why there is such a high dropout rate in our schools. We need to find out why we do not have the same per capita rate of attendance at university and graduation or at trade schools. We need to find out why. Nobody has given me a satisfactory answer as to why in that sense our education system is inferior to the average across Canada. Nobody, Sir, has given me a satisfactory answer on that and we need to find out why. You only need to listen to some of the speeches in this House, Sir, from the minister and others and hear what I consider to be erroneous statements flung across the House. The Minister of Justice yesterday - I wish he were in his seat now - mentioning something, Sir, which was entirely wrong concerning the student aid programme. You only need to listen to these erroneous, half-baked notions,

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to realize that what we need is full-fledged research. We need a full research programme, Sir; we need to have the whole matter of education studied thoroughly by people who have interest in it, professionals, parents, teachers and so on and so forth in order to find out why our education system is low statistically compared to the rest of Canada and what we can do, Sir, to improve it and make sure that our young people have the same chance as they have in Ontario or Alberta.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition and I do so because like others in this Province I believe there is a crisis in education. The minister may throw up his hands and quote the number of dollars that are being spent and say, No, no this is not so. But beginning with the minister on up or down, depending on how you look at it, the minister himself knows there is a crisis in education in this Province. At least he believes there is a crisis in certain areas in education because he, who spent so much time in education himself, has admitted privately, and perhaps publicly, focused in on certain elements where there are real problems in education.

The smartest thing the minister could ever have done was to have the full-fledged enquiry which would have revealed it all. It is not only the minister, Students are complaining, teachers are complaining, parents are not happy. Parents oftentimes do not trust our educational system, they do not know what the money is being spent on, they do not feel the educational product is coming back into their homes in the form of instruction, whether it is the curriculum or otherwise that

MR. NOLAN:

applies to their child.

Now, Newfoundlanders have already made too many sacrifices in many ways, financially and otherwise so that university can be there. What we stand the very real risk of seeing now is going back to the early days of the university and before, when only those who could afford to go could go. We are going to have an elitist university again as sure as I am standing here unless we watch ourselves, and that means that those who have the dollars and who can afford to go they are the ones that will have 'open sesame' there.

Now this is not the way and not the reason why this university has developed to the point where it is today. We have to come up with new and creative ideas. What do you have to do if you are a young person now to get through to the adults, whether they are in politics or wherever they are in areas of responsibility, to make them understand what the problems you are facing are? One, getting into the university; two, being able to go to the university; three, being able to get grants or loans or whatever is available; four, the residential requirements and so on, and in addition to that, knowing that it is quite possible you are going to have an awesome financial burden before you ever get your degree. Before you step outside the university you are in hock, you are in debt.

Ninety-one dollars a month I understand is the payment, approximately, that will be paid. That is the amount I paid for a one bedroom apartment for about ten years after I was married. I paid a little more than that, \$126 a month as I recall it, but that is pretty close. Ninety-one dollars a month is a fair payment to make on anything. I know that things -

MR. WHITE:

Especially for ten years.

MR. NOLAN:

Yes, and without a job.

MR. NOLAN:

I mean, the burden is there because it is just not getting the education and being able to pay for it, the thing is when you come out of school, when you come out of the university where are you going to go to work? If there are places, if there are situations we have not heard them described in this session of the House. No programme, no plan, no nothing.

Who do the university students look to? Not here, unless you are sick. You would need to go back to school again if you do. It is sad, sad to see what is happening now. It is nice to be flippant about it and say that they never had it so good and so on. In some respects that is true but in other ways they never had it so bad. The whole economic climate, the whole social picture is changed from when we were going to school. They have problems today that all too few people, I am afraid - all too many people just do not seem to be able to associate with and identify with. There are some real problem there.

Now sometimes it may be the fault of the students. Maybe they have not communicated in the right way their fears and concerns but, my God, they have been trying. When we watch the Presidential Report that has been coming in year after year after year! Now look, no man should be in a better position to appreciate the plight of the student than the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN:

Surely the minister must appreciate, I mean he is not completely isolated. I mean, I know he has dug in on some things as a minister tends to do sometimes but I mean the guy did come out of school. He worked in the lumber woods. The gentleman did go through - I mean, he was not the elitest type that I referred to that went bouncing into the University and floated around for a few years. But now he is tangled up with the wrong crowd. See what happens is - why, there is nothing worse, you know - you get elected. You come into town and all of the sudden you are wined and dined by all the phonies who want to use you. What he does not realize is the minute he goes back to his district they will even forget his name, game over, you know, Wallace who?

So I plead with the minister to please pay close attention not only to the presidential task force that we referred to but to the very genuine plight that these students are faced with. Now he may get up if he wanted to and split hairs on a number of specifics where maybe even I have gone wrong on some of the things that I have mentioned.

MR. HOUSE: I am not going to split hairs.

MR. NOLAN: No, right.

MR. HOUSE: If you stay with that crowd you will not have any hair left.

MR. NOLAN: Well, I think the minister, with respect, something like myself in the last few years he has put on a little around the middle and lost considerable off the top. But with respect, Mr. Speaker, I do plead with the minister: See if there is not some way can be found now to help alleviate a trying situation. Everybody is complaining about the awesome burden of the cost of living and so on today. It is a mistake, it is a fallacy and it is a fraud to believe that it is not even more important to those students.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring his remarks to a conclusion.

MR. NOLAN: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. And as a man who has gone through the University route both here and abroad, I am sure you will be the first to understand. So thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to support this petition especially so since it comes from the Regional College in Corner Brook where most of the students from Labrador first go before they continue - this is like the fifteenth round in boxing.

MR. NEARY: Your turn to get a hair cut.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, most of the students from Labrador first go to the Regional College and I should say that - I did not get that one.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is another public tender job.

MR. STRACHAN: At least I would not like to go through the Department of Public Works.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: That is for sure. Mr. Speaker, if I could get on to this topic of conversation which has been a serious problem. Mr. Speaker, most of the students from Labrador go through regional college and most of them face not only the fact that they come from, and certainly in my part of Labrador and Labrador South and the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, generally come from fairly low income families. As well they have to face the problems of being away from home, the fact that they cannot travel home for long weekends. They are removed and remote from their families. They are faced with extra costs as well as the extra burden on the student because he cannot return to this family or have any association.

I know it is very difficult over the last few years to try to keep students from the Coast. Mind you, I should state that there is something drastically wrong with our education system where only less than 1 per cent of the students go beyond Grade XI education. But regardless of that I think that is due to some factors in our

MR. STRACHAN:

education system. I think the pendulum is swung a little too far to the laissez faire system of education. I think there is not enough serious responsibility put into education. But regardless of that point, many of these students leave home, come into Corner Brook into college and they are faced with serious problems of contact and serious financial problems. We have a situation, a very curious situation in which, as I stated yesterday, some of our native students manage to get funding basically through the federal-provincial committee. But this is a very strange route where some students on one side of a river, for instance, the Northwest River can get it and on the other side they cannot get it. Or brothers, for instance, if they are brought up in Hopedale and the other brother is taken to Happy Valley-Goose Bay and is brought up there he cannot get it because of these conditions which really make a farce of the whole application of the race law as it applies to education.

But outside of that the rest of our

MR. STRACHAN: students are faced with real financial burdens and I think that when finances become an obstacle towards education then this should never be. The people, and especially, as we feel in Labrador, the young people are our most important resource and I wonder how we can balance off the cost to the parents, many of whom cannot contribute to the student, who cannot help the student, who especially nowadays with the economic depression many areas there are suffering from cannot help them or assist them at all. I do not know how we can balance off the percentage saved to the treasury by the moves made by the administration opposite against the losses which have to occur and will occur with these students. I also feel strongly and having been educated purely myself by a bursary system in which able and qualified high school graduates coming from low income families are given bursaries to allow them to be educated and this is the only way in which I achieved my education. I think that there should be encouragement for a bursary system because bursaries do more than just grant money to a student. Bursaries also encourage the whole pride of winning, they encourage the striving by a student and also obviously give a reward to the student which lasts many years after he has left university, many years afterwards there is a pride of obtaining the bursary and getting through. I think that there should be a bursary system, a very healthy bursary system brought in to the people of low income families who can apply for these and win them and obviously therefore be able to carry on with their education.

Mr. Speaker, this is my second minute remaining. My first one was earlier on. Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition. I think that we must be very guarded that our education system does not become an elitist system, a system only for the rich, a system only for the people close to St. John's, people who are within travelling distance, who can handle these kind of things, who are in economically sound situations. It must take into consideration that people from the furthest parts of this Province who do not have the

MR. STRACHAN: finances and cannot afford the situation, I think we have to take that into consideration deeply. I heard yesterday statements that people from Labrador cannot pass remarks on a regional government bill concerning St. John's and I sometimes wonder whether the people in St. John's here have any regard or any education or any knowledge when they pass statements concerning education elsewhere in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde followed by the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the petition presented by the member for Port au Port on behalf of 518 students of the regional college at Corner Brook, more properly called the Regional College West Coast. Sir, the prayer of the petition basically said that under the present circumstances students are suffering a great financial burden and there is a resulting decrease in the enrollment at the university and the quality of education is suffering at the university.. The petition asked the same thing as the one did yesterday from MUN that the government reconsider the student aid programme and the amount of money being given to the university for operating grants. Now, Sir, I note that yesterday the Premier spoke presumably in support of that same petition so, Sir, therefore one can only conclude that the Premier will in fact and his cabinet and the Minister of Education will be reconsidering the student aid programme for the students at Memorial University and the Regional College on the West Coast. Sir, I am looking forward before this House of Assembly closes up sometime during this summer, I am sincerely looking forward to a statement from either the Minister of Education or the Premier indicating their reconsideration and what new announcements they have with respect to the student aid programme, Sir. Because if they do not cut back on the amount that they are requesting or requiring the students to borrow before they can get student aid, this university and

June 28, 1978

Tape No. 4913

JM - 3

MR. F.B. ROWE: the Regional College on the West Coast, Sir, will become a regional college and a university for the elite.

Sir, I have been told by a number of people that there is not as much concern, for example, in St. John's or on the Avalon Peninsula, there is not as much concern on the part of these students thinking of going to university as there is concerned expressed by students living off the Avalon. Sir, therein lies the

MR. F. ROWE: problem, that it is the people in the remote parts of the Province, distant from the university and distant from the regional college, who are deeply concerned. And, Sir, not only are we going to have a university and a regional college for the elite, but you might just as well drop the name Memorial University of Newfoundland and/or Labrador, and say Memorial University of the Avalon. Because this is what it is going to turn into, Sir, if the students living in Central Newfoundland, the Northeast Coast, the South Coast, the Northwest Coast and Labrador cannot afford to come into Memorial University or the regional college. You might just as well call the university MUA, Memorial University for the Avalon. And as far as the regional college is concerned, Sir, you might just as well call -

MR. NEARY: Memorial University for the what?

MR. F. ROWE: MUW, Memorial University for the wealthy. And as far as the regional college is concerned, Sir, you might just as well call it the regional college for Corner Brook and Stephenville because the people down on the Southwest Coast and the people up in Labrador and up on the Northwest Coast are going to find it very expensive and very difficult to get to the regional college in that particular case.

Sir, yesterday I mentioned the importance of indicating to students and guiding them with respect to what departments, divisions or faculty they enter so that they will have some idea of their job potential when they get out. There is no need to repeat that. I mentioned the fact there was a lot of catching up to be done in this Province because we only started the university in 1949, therefore a special drive is required in the students in this Province so that our students can catch up with the rest of Canada and the Atlantic region. I will not repeat that, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: However, Sir, I will bring up a new topic with respect to univeristy education and that is this, Sir, that all efforts must be made, and I am speaking from a person with seven years experience teaching university and six years experience as a student at the university, that there has to be an even balance between research and teaching at a university. I realize the importance of that, research, graduate studies and this kind of thing, and undergraduate studies. But, Sir, I am convinced that when the people of this Province are paying the bill for the university and we only have a young university, that in this particular case probably we should play a little more emphasis towards teaching per se and undergraduate studies and a little less attention to graduate studies, a publish or perish attitude and a whole lot of research.

Now, Sir, I do not want to be misquoted on this one. There has to be an even balance between graduate, post graduate research and publishing on the one hand, and teaching on the other. But with a young university with only half the per capita average graduating from this particular univeristy I think there is an extreme need in order to meet the relevancy of the needs of Newfoundland that we place a little more emphasis on undergraduate work and teachings, Sir, and with that in mind I give my full support to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte, followed by the hon. gentleman from Carbonear.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand up and support this petition signed by 518 people from the Regional College in Corner Brook and I am very glad to see that there is unity among the university students in this Province, both from the university in St. John's and from the university in Corner Brook.

MR. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the changes that were made in the budget with respect to student aid were made on March 17th., and if we look at the chain of events that has happened since that it has been a very civilized chain of events and nothing very serious has happened other than a mild public protest and we had a bit of a brief demonstration outside the university a few weeks ago. We had some public statements from some of the student union people after the changes were made in the budget and now, Mr. Speaker, the natural chain of events takes us to this House and the last couple of days when we have been speaking to petitions, that have been signed by the students at Memorial University. And the government just sits there and seems to repose in all of this and does not seem to take it all very seriously. It is just the Opposition speaking to another petition and bringing another petition into the House of Assembly. As I was sitting there a moment ago I was wondering what must be done in order for the public of this Province and the Government of this Province to realize what is happening in education in Newfoundland and particularly as it applies to university students and what they are going to have to pay, what they are going to have to pay to get a university education even with the grants and loans that are available to them. Under the old system, Mr. Speaker,

MR. F. WHITE:

and the figures were read a moment ago by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), under the old system a student obtaining a degree would have a total loan cost of about \$6,600. That would be the total cost to get a degree for ten semesters. Today under the new system since the change has come about it is going to cost about \$4,000 more. Now it is gone from \$6,000 to \$4,000 for a student in this Province to get a degree and then he has to take ten years and pay it back at \$91 a month. And in between he is buying a car and getting a house and a wife or a husband, whatever, and so on right down the line. So I just wonder how serious the students must become before the government and the people of this Province will pay any attention to them? Sooner or later they will be outside the Confederation Building firing rocks in through the windows and people will be saying, 'Why are they doing that? Oh, they are being radical, they are being militant, they are being violent!' And yet they put up for months and months and months of trying to get their point across by doing peaceful, sensible things to make the government aware of their plight.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is if we are returning to the student demonstration and the student radicalism of the late 1960s, I cannot blame the students.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of this petition by my hon. colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the 518 students from the regional college in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, the only way that I can best describe the topic, the discussions that have preceded me today, is that they do not surprise me and any further reductions in student aid by this government

MR. R. MOORES:

cannot surprise me.

In September, 1970, I entered Memorial University and earned a graduate degree and at that time, I believe it is fair to say that one of the best student aid programmes in all of Canadian history had been submitted, encouraged and executed by the previous Liberal Government in this Province. I was a needy student, as in the Newfoundland terminology, needy. My parents had no money; therefore, I had to rely heavily upon the student aid programme. In 1972, a year and a half later roughly, this government came to power and the then Minister of Finance, the hon. John Crosbie, a multi-millionaire, part of the St. John's elite, the blue bloods of this city, really laid it on to the students of Memorial. For the first time since the student aid programme in Newfoundland had started, a student whose parents were poor off by virtue not of themselves but by the economy of this Province, and whose offspring were equally as poor off, I had to pay tuition. I remember that particular term after overwhelmingly supporting the Tory Government on campus, by the thousands we flocked to the Thompson Student Centre to hear Premier Moores' voice on a tape recorded because he could not make the meeting. And within six months of coming to office I had to pay \$55 in tuition in addition to, of course, losing most of my allowance and having my Canada Student Loan increased to the maximum. I was forced by this government to take the maximum loan. And it has continued. This Minister of Education may not be a blue blood towney but he is certainly dictated to by them, as is fully indicated, Mr. Speaker, by the \$2,290,000 cutback this year in student aid. That is almost a 40 per cent cutback in the aid given to students at Memorial. I would say, Mr. Speaker, this government is pretty damned lucky that we do not have the radicalism of the late 1960s.

June 28, 1978

Tape 4913

EC - 3

MR. R. MOORES:

I would myself just fall short
of inciting civic disobedience with the student aid -

MR. R. MOORES:

cutbacks in this Province. And I know what I am talking about because for three years, in addition to holding almost every position on the student council at Memorial, I also sat on the Appeals Board along with the Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Roebathan at that time, and Doug Eaton of the University, Vic Young of Treasury Board, etc., etc. I know what I am talking about, that since this government has come to power they have done nothing for the students of this Province, particularly those who need the money. And I am sorry that my colleagues have not mentioned the one fact, the overriding fact of student aid, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not a gift. It is a loan and a loan is an investment. Initially when the Canada Student Loan Programme was started by the present government they were going to give students in Canada free education on a seventy-five-twenty-five basis. And the bankers of Bay Street in Toronto saw this as a great scheme to get money from the governments, guaranteed loan from the students, etc. and they interceded and intervened in what could have been one of the greatest loan schemes in all of the free world really. And this government, Mr. Speaker - I support the petition. Thank you very much.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise once again today to say a few brief words in support of this petition presented by my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) on behalf of some 500 or more students of the West Coast College in Corner Brook. Again, as I said yesterday, I would suspect that there are names on that petition from practically every community in my district because a number of the students in my area do their first couple of years of university studies at the West Coast College.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as one who has experienced Canada Student Loans and student aid and one who received a supporting income of fifty-eight dollars in his first year from his parents at

MR. RIDEOUT:

the university, I think I can have a few words to say about the feeling of the students or the feelings that they must have as this government goes forth in its headlong rush, apparently headlong rush, Your Honour, to bring this Province on a par with the rest of Atlantic Provinces when it comes to student aid.

The government's defense, the minister's defense, Mr. Speaker, although that was blown wide open today by my colleague when he made reference to the two semesters versus the three semester system, the minister's defense up to this point has been that this Province has only done what the rest of the Atlantic Provinces have done: We have raised the ceiling, we have made it possible for students to borrow more money and thereby cut back on the grants because we have brought ourselves on par with the rest of the Atlantic Provinces. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would not know but you were talking about a union looking for wage parity or something of that nature, that this Province must go forth in this headlong rush, depressed as we are economically, low income as we are, the average income in this Province is the lowest of any province in Canada, yet this government has seen fit to go forth on this headlong rush in education to bring ourselves on a par with the rest of the Atlantic Provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one area that we should be careful and be more cautious than the rest of the Atlantic Provinces it is in the field of education. We cannot afford, Sir, to flirt around with the kind of figures that the Minister of Education is flirting around with. We cannot afford to justify it by simply saying that the rest of the Atlantic Provinces have this level and therefore we can afford to have it. We cannot do that. Our situation in Newfoundland is different, Mr. Speaker. The average income of parents in this Province is lower than it is in many of the other Atlantic Provinces, therefore the economic hardship on the student is greater. There should be, there has to be some flexibility in the Canada Student Loan Plan and it is built in there and this Province has to take advantage of it. That is really what comes through in the

MR. RIDEOUT:

Presidential Task Force Report every year as it comes out. But I have yet to see any evidence, Mr. Speaker, that this government and particularly this minister has fought those battles at the national level so that the flexibility can be built into the plan in favour of Newfoundland students.

I think it is a sad day again, Mr. Speaker, for education that some 2,000 university students added onto the 10,000 or 12,000 parents who have protested against the education system in this Province have to once again come before this House and have their fears and their views portrayed by members in this House without any answer whatsoever from the Minister of Education. There are a number of

MR. RIDEOUT:

people in this House who have been through and who have experience but those students are talking about today what they talked about yesterday. The Minister of Education have experienced it himself but we do not hear any words of comfort from him, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is a sad day for education in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer
of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Falls followed
by the hon. gentleman for Stephenville.

MR. J. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, just so we have some balance. Mr. Speaker, I would like to sort of build on the remarks of my colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) regarding the flexibility and the student loan programme across the country. I think this is an area that has not been enlarged on. Number one, I believe there is an uniform amount of money which each student can borrow right across the entire country. I think it is \$900 per semester. Obviously the cost of education in this Province, bearing in mind the geographical distribution of travel costs, the higher cost of living, the overall cost structure in our Province necessitates that we have some kind of a regional consideration. Now whether the minister would like the comment made by my colleague when he said that there has been no big pressure brought to bear, I would like to hear his comments because I do know that there has been a consistent amount of pressure brought to bear on governments of this Province for the last twenty years to try to convince the federal decision makers, not the Bay Street merchants or the blue bloods that other members talked about, but the decision makers, the bureaucrats at the federal level who are not sensitive to the needs of the various regions, the far flung regions of our country, to have national programmes considered on a regional basis. This is one of the biggest weaknesses in the student loan programme, the cost of education in the Province, the fact that you have a golden opportunity with the unfortunate economic circumstances

MR. J. LUNDRIAN: we have by unemployment, a golden opportunity to redirect good investment into the educational systems is a reason to reconsider the loan programme and any other kind of an educational programme that we have in our Province today. The university grants, the federal grants another area where the university in our Province should be given more consideration. That is one point I want to make as an appendix to what has already been said, that we do need regional considerations for the programme, we need an upward movement of the amount of money that students can receive if they are attending universities in our Province.

Secondly, I would like to sort of take the opportunity to reflect on a move which is a recent and a new move by Newfoundland and that is decentralization of the university with the Regional College in Corner Brook as the prime and first example. Now there was quite a bit of concern expressed some years ago when the big decision was made to decentralize and build the Regional College at a considerable capital costs in Corner Brook. I feel it is one of the finest that has been made in recent post secondary educational history in our Province today, and I would encourage and maybe ask that we start to talk about moving further in the same direction. My colleague for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) of course will totally support the fact that we in the central region of the Province have a 150,000 people, a quarter of our population who are forced and compelled to take their suitcases and their few belongings and so on and move 200 miles to get a higher education. Excessive costs, and I suggest that the building expansion that has been going on at the campus in St. John's be brought to a steady standstill and we decentralize further when it comes to the regional system such as we have on the West Coast. That is another way to positively affect the costs of education for the people in a region in our Province such as the central region. You are talking about - and I understand, by the way, that there has been very serious consideration given at the university level to making another move such as has been made in Corner Brook and the quicker that happens the

MR. J. LUNDFIGAN: better because there is no reason for us to rest on our oars just because we do have a downturn in the economy. We are going to have an upturn next year or the year after or five years or ten years and of course we have to be constantly cognizant of the expanding need for the facilities of a post secondary nature. And I hope that the university in its wisdom will see fit to present to government the need for further expansion of regional facilities to further decentralize the university effort. These are the two points, Mr. Speaker; number one, more flexibility in the student loan programme across the country with the emphasis on the more disadvantaged provinces, the less fortunate and more costly areas such as Newfoundland and, secondly, a further move towards decentralization such as the Regional College that I know my colleague meant to enlarge on because I do believe he as a former teacher supports fully that concept as it applied to the West Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition of 518 students from the Regional College in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, the high school student who is leaving school today has very little incentive to continue his education because he has to look down the road a little bit and he realizes that he will incur a great debt to continue for five years in the university. Apart from that, at the end of his university training he has a very slim chance of receiving a job. And if he does have any chance of receiving a job he usually has to leave his home community or even his province. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that changes should be made in the student aid programme, incentives should be built into the student aid programme so that students will continue their education.

I think a university education today is only a start. At the end of their university training students are only beginning a start in whatever profession they take on. I know from my own experience, coming from a family of fifteen, the difficulty of parents trying to send the child to school. If it were not for the fact that the free tuition and student aid came out when I left high school, I would not have been able to take advantage of a university education.

I do believe, and the government stressed time and time again, that the people are our greatest resource and every effort should be made to encourage people so that they would continue their education, not only at the secondary level but at the university level and also the technical level.

Our system provides funding at the vocational level and I think the same type of funding or that programme could also be done at the university level.

MR. MCNEIL:
support the petition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I gladly

MR. SPEAKER:
Education.

The hon. the Minister of

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:
speak to the petition and I want to say first of all that I have received the pink paper that the students presented a few days ago to the Premier and distributed to some of my colleagues for further discussion and hopefully some action.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to

I do express my concern with the contents of this particular paper because it does, of course, come before the petition. The petition came after this paper, it was predicated on that. I am certainly concerned about the heavy burden on students coming out of university after five years owing \$7,000 if they qualify for the full loan.

As a matter of fact, I want to point out that there are students who do qualify for the full grant, for the grant besides the loan, and this is, of course, done through a process based on the student's needs and the income that the student has by virtue of his own working and his parental assistance.

I do not know what number but it averaged out I believe last year to something like just about \$1,000 per student that qualified. Now the principle, of course, is that a university education, and I was interested in what the member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) had to say about what the first premise was on the student aid because we have been, contrary to what people may believe, we have been having yearly negotiations based on these presidential reports with the federal government people but they have not increased our loan from the \$900 per semester, I suppose, since the inception

MR. HOUSE: of it. Now we are asking the students to take a \$700 loan out of that \$900 before they receive student aid and we do recognize that it is pretty burdensome.

Now there are a couple of things here that I do want to clarify -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: The couple of things I want to clarify are the fact that in the Maritimes - when I said yesterday that we are similar to the Maritimes I was factual on that, to my knowledge, and this was the knowledge that I have of their policy. There is no province to my knowledge that gives the grant first and the loan after.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ontario.

MR. HOUSE: Ontario may. I said that yesterday, I think. Ontario has a new policy this particular year. I do not have the full details on that but certainly I know that the Maritimes have not. People say that by virtue of the fact that we are poor therefore we should have a better student aid programme. But we have to look at the economics of it too until you get the money to pay for this kind of thing. I am sure

MR. W. HOUSE: that the Maritimes or Quebec or anywhere else do not prevent students from having money by virtue of the fact that they should not have it but by virtue of the fact that they have economic problems too.

The other thing I want to mention is about the grade twelve and thirteen that people talked about. There is no grade thirteen outside of Ontario and the grade twelve in the Maritimes, in Nova Scotia there is a measure of a grade twelve that is accepted as a first year university but that is going, by the way, I think now. In Prince Edward Island and in New Brunswick there is no grade twelve that is acceptable as first year university. Their grade twelve is exactly the same as our grade eleven in acceptance at the university. So it is -

AN HON. MEMBER: Since when?

MR. HOUSE: Prince Edward Island - I do not know since when. Right now in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick grade twelve is the same as our grade eleven for entrance at the university. You have to do a full four years or eight semesters to get a degree in these institutions.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, and as I say I am not going to be able to say that we are going to change this what we have been doing now. I am saying that I do sympathize and we will certainly be studying it. I want to say one thing, that we may be inferior in education in Newfoundland by virtue of the numbers of people who are going to our university, that is the percentage. But I do not think we are inferior in quality in our education at the university or at the trade school or at the fisheries college. I think the quality of our programmes there and the quality of young people who are coming out are just as high as they are in any other university in the Maritimes.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I do sympathize with, I do support the principle of the petition and certainly we will be taking some deep study of the brief. I might add that we did plan to implement the \$700 loan in this semester but we did go with the \$450 this particular semester and we will implement it now in the fall.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions for the Premier and various ministers of the crown but I see we have one, two, four, five, six junior ministers, Mr. Speaker, So therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the lack of ministers here I would, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 22 move that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M. and that the House do now adjourn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I understand that is a debatable motion, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not debatable, not debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe the hon. gentleman is correct. I just would like to see a copy of the Standing Orders. Mine have slipped out of my books. Standing Order 22.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to check with the standing order as the page is not in my book and I do not have them memorized.

I will adjourn for a few minutes. This is a matter likely -

MR. NEARY: Count the House first, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A motion has been made under Standing Order 22. This is a technical matter as well and there is only one thing which I have to ascertain or to make an ascertainment, whether it is debatable. It is a technical, factual question of which I want to be sure because what is done is a precedent and that should only take a few minutes.

MR. NEARY: To help Your Honour I move that the House adjourn and at its rising not meet until tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I have a motion which is in order and all I wish to ascertain is whether it is debatable or not. It is in order. All I have to ascertain is whether it is debatable.

MR. NEARY:
and byways now and bring -

Can they send out in the highways

MR. SIMMONS:
her knocked.

Even if it is a debatable one, we have

MR. SPEAKER:
people who are here not to come or people who might be in the corridors
to come. I do not think that would really make any difference -

Well, if I adjourn I cannot require

MR. NEARY:

It does to me.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, in a voice vote there would always be
a division for which there are three minutes.

MR. NEARY:
can send out and get -

Yes, but it makes a big difference. They

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have to adjourn now for a few minutes
just to ascertain -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER:

I will adjourn for a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The motion made under Standing Order 22; no question of its being in order. What I wish to ascertain is whether it is debatable or not because I thought that somebody had stood and this is an area in which our Standing Orders are silent. They do not list debatable and non debatable motions. And in this we take our precedents from the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and again I refer to the same Standing Order of about a week ago when a different motion, but another one where this question came up was made, and that is Standing Order 32 of the House of Commons which lists the motions that are debatable and all others not deemed debatable. This is not a debatable motion.

So the question is that the House shall now adjourn. Those in favour "Aye". Contrary "Nay". In my opinions the "Nays" have it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Divide.

Call in the members. Three members rise and call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DIVISION:

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion please stand.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hodder, Mr. F. Rowe, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Lush, Dr. Kitchen, Mr. Callan, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Capt. Winsor, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor, Mr. R. Moores.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed to the motion please stand.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Social Services, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Lundrigan, Dr. Collins, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Power.

June 28, 1978

Tape 4920

IB-2

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that the motion is lost eighteen to seventeen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I had a number of questions for some of the absent ministers. At least we now have ten instead of six, and we now have seventeen members in the House on the government side instead of nine.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: We are improving things over here, Mr. Speaker, nine. And we were prepared, Mr. Speaker, to give them a day to get their ministers back to answer some questions. Now we realize the questions are less and less pleasant these days and the answers are even less pleasant but we have to put the questions nevertheless. So we will have to go to some of the over worked ministers who are presently in the House and I go first, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister whom I am sure has some answers for us, the Minister of Manpower.

I refer the minister, Mr. Speaker, to a statement which he made to the House on March 10th., 1977. That statement, Mr. Speaker, which concerned his reaction to a number of items in the Auditor General's Report of the preceeding year, that statement, because of information which has since come to light, that statement contained a number of inaccuracies, a number of untruths and a number of misrepresentations of fact.

In effect and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, unwittingly but perhaps the minister misled the House with his statement on March 10th., 1977. Will the Minister of Labour and Manpower therefore, Mr. Speaker, undertake now to make a corrected statement to the House, correcting the inaccuracies in his statement of March 10th. which had the effect of misleading the House at that time?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: First, Mr. Speaker, a gratuitous comment; yesterday it was mentioned and in case it is mentioned again today, I do not think in my six years here that I have ever had, nor do I presently

MR. ROUSSEAU: have, nor I hope will I ever have contempt for this House. I think the suggestion was made yesterday that -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, that was mentioned yesterday but it is not intentional.

MR. SIMMONS: It came through the minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well it is not intentional. I do not have contempt for the House and the people who have been here this long know better than that I hope. And it is not my intention to do so now nor is it my intention in the future as long as I am here.

Now in the second place I made the statement, and I am going to stand on the statement, that I am presently trying to determine next Wednesday or Thursday to appear before the commission. The statement I made last year was, to the best of my knowledge, accurate. I will be prepared at a time in the future, but after appearing before the commission of enquiry, to say what has to be said.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, now you could get the impression that the minister is somehow leaning a little too heavily on the commission of enquiry, because he knows full well that as important as the commission of enquiry is this House must take precedence in every respect. That commission in effect is a child of this House, or certainly of the government which is a child of this House, and we understand that he has to make certain statements before the commission. I am surprised he has not been called already, Mr. Speaker, to give testimony. But that begs the question of what he is going to say to this House. As a minister he is answerable to this House and while he can refer all he wants to the commission of enquiry it is peripheral, Mr. Speaker, to the questions I am asking here.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order.

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

MR. SIMMONS: I know it is a touchy question for the junior minister from Green Bay, I know that.

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

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I listened intently and I do not wish to interrupt the line of questioning of the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) but he was into his fifth sentence which in my view is going beyond the preamble stage of line of questioning which is acceptable under the rules of this House and therefore I ask that the Chair indicate to the hon. member that he is on the periphery of being out of order, that he is using and abusing the Question Period to making statements rather than asking questions.

MR. SIMMONS: And you call that (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: I will point out to hon. members Standing Order 31, subsection (c), "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same; and in answering any such question, the Minister is not to debate the matter to which it refers." The point of order submitted was with respect to the first part of that Standing Order and obviously it is correct that the only material which should be introduced is that which is necessary to make the question intelligible,

MR. SPEAKER: or as the Standing Order says, 'except as far as is necessary to explain.' I would ask hon. members to bear that in mind. I do not think at this particular time I can go any further than that.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what we are most interested in is when the minister is going to realize his obligation to this particular House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - the Minister of Labour and Manpower. When is he going to start answering to this House? And in particular, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower this question, in relation to the statement I have made reference to, does he still stand by that statement a year later?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am attempting now to work out a date with the Commission of Inquiry for, I hope, next Wednesday or Thursday, to appear before it.

MR. S. NEARY: It will not be in the Hansard.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, it will not be.

Mr. Speaker, I said that sometime in the future I will make a statement in the House and I will appear before the Commission of Inquiry, and I am not going to do it piecemeal in the House. Now we can spend a half hour, and that is going to be my pat answer. It is not contempt, it is the way I feel. It may well be wrong and people may well disagree with it - good. That is my opinion and that is what I am going to stand on, and I think I can be as right as anybody else feels they can be.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course it is contempt,

Mr. Speaker, absolute contempt.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must ask the hon. gentleman not to debate the answers.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if it takes a half hour of questions we will give the minister a half hour of questions. Now he is answerable to this House, Mr. Speaker, and will he answer the question about this statement? We want to know as members of the House if he still stands by this statement. Does he vouch for the accuracy of it now a year or so later? Can he answer that question for us? I understand he wants to appear - I do not know if he wants to, but he is going to appear before the Commission, and that is another issue, but that Commission is not the House of Assembly. Will he give answer to the House of Assembly about the status of this statement? Is it still accurate to the best of his knowledge?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: He will know, Mr. Speaker, at some point in the future.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister in that particular statement said, and I quote him, "It is unfortunate that the issuance of several orders for what is basically the same job or at least the same building, tends to create the impression that it is a deliberate attempt to circumvent the Public Tender Act." "Such," he says, "however, is not the case." Does he still stand by that statement that there was no deliberate attempt to

MR. SIMMONS: circumvent the Public Tender Act either by him or his officials?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I said at some point in the future I will make a statement in the House concerning that and concerning other matters as well that I am sure the members are interested in.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what is most significant is that the minister is not answering a very direct question like that. The answer ought to be simple, I submit, and perhaps he would like another chance to answer it.

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

I do not know why he does not answer some questions. It would serve his interests a lot better in the long run, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the period under discussion now, it is my understanding that the present Minister of Manpower on many occasions bypassed the normal chain of command, his deputy minister, and went to a more junior official - more junior in the sense that he was junior to the deputy minister - went to a more junior official on a number of occasions and gave instructions with respect to assigning work or giving out work to various contractors without tender. Will the minister confirm that he did indeed pursue that practice of bypassing his deputy minister of the day and giving direct instructions about contract awards to other officials in his department?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, again, my desire to keep out of the political arena, I will make my statements at the Commission of Inquiry.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the original questioner for a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister digs himself in deeper and deeper and deeper. I do not understand it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: A point of order. I think, Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled on a previous occasion no more than a few minutes ago that there should be no debate on an answer given. There was an answer given by the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower and then immediately the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) rises and makes statements, provocative statements, based on the answer given, which is completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would point out to hon. members that the Question Period is by its nature and by the rules confined to hon. members who are private members putting questions to

MR. SPEAKER:

the ministry and ministers replying, and that the area of debate is precluded from the Question Period. It does not mean that matters may not be debated at a different time under a relevant motion, but that there should not be debate during the Question Period. I would call this to the attention of the hon. gentleman.

The hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One further supplementary to the minister, and again I say to him friend to friend if he would answer some of these questions he would leave much less in doubt, Mr. Speaker. This one is a supplementary on the same subject, Mr. Speaker, and there are many others we will get on to in the next few days as soon as the minister realizes his responsibility to the House, his first responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, did the minister at the time of giving all these instructions that work be farmed out to various contractors, friends of the government without tender calls, that work be broken up into smaller amounts? During that period was the minister operating on the assumption that he had the authority to override the provisions of the Public Tender Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to answer any question in piecemeal fashion. I will answer that at the Commission of Enquiry and make a statement at a further point in the House.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Both hon. gentlemen are up on supplementaries. I will hear the hon. member for LaPoile and I will hear the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte after.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a supplementary. Did the hon. member ever have a visit from Mr. J.V. Ralph the deputy minister of the department, informing the minister that he was breaking the law by bypassing the Public Tendering Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, since that statement was made at the Commission of Enquiry I think the right place to set it straight would be at the Commission of Enquiry.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, let me put a question to the minister as it directly relates to his present position as Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. Mr. Speaker, will the minister agree that at the present time with the highest unemployment rate that we have had in years in this Province, Mr. Speaker, with the number of strikes that are on the go throughout this Province, does the minister think that it is really fair to the unemployed in this Province and to the strikers in this Province to have a Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations who has a lot of other things on his mind, particularly what went on in the past or what did not go on in the past, and does he think that despite the Premier's blessing is it fair to stay in that portfolio, one of the most sensitive in the Province with unemployment rampant and strikes all over the place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Now or at any time in the future when the Minister of Labour and Manpower feels he cannot handle his job as Minister of Labour and Manpower he will not continue in the job. At the present time, as I said yesterday, the question is hypothetical, I believe that I am fulfilling my duties as Minister of Labour and Manpower. If I am not I will be the first to know it and when I know it then I will take the appropriate action.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to justify the statement, the one he just made in answer to this question I am putting to him now. How does that jibe, how does his statement now jibe with his statement on Friday that he might have to resign, that he was not sure if he was going to resign or not until he went

Mr. White: and saw the Premier? Then obviously he must have had some reservations with respect to the matter. Is it only because the Premier gave him his blessing that he is staying on now?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I can assure the hon. the member that it is not only the Premier who is given the hon. member here his blessing, but anyway quite apart from that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: Not the whole crowd over here, a lot of other people as well.

On Friday as a matter of fact I was rather surprised to hear the news report. I did not say I was going to resign. I said obviously, in answer to a question, that I would consider it, and consider the question and talk to the Premier. I think which was the obvious thing to say. I believe I also said that I would not take any unilateral action, in any event that I would make no decision on Friday because I did not have the opportunity to speak with the Premier. Since the Premier is the gentleman who decides who will and who will not serve in his Cabinet, then I think it is only common courtesy that one would speak to the Premier before any action might even be contemplated let alone taken.

MR. WHITE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I know the minister's desire to remain in Cabinet and to stay within the framework of Cabinet Government as he plans to do. Would the minister think that it might be a little more fair to the unemployed and the strikers in this Province if he went to the Premier and asked to be relieved from the very important Portfolio that he has and maybe sit as a minister without Portfolio, or in some other department that is not as sensitive? Would not that be fair?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, again that is a hypothetical question.

June 28, 1978

Tape 4923

IB- 4

MR. WHITE: What is hypothetical about it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: You know, there is an assumption that the minister cannot fill his duties. Now it has been four or five days, I guess, and I must say, you know, quite apart from everything

MR. ROUSSEAU:

else I have heard a lot of comments and that is going to assist me in making up my mind as to what I can do. When I feel that I can no longer dispense my duties as Minister of Labour and Manpower in this Province with effectiveness and with a clear mind in respect to the duties I have to perform as Minister of Labour and Manpower, I certainly will consider it.

Now, the other thing, Mr.

Speaker, today I am contemptible. I stood up here on days, and I remember the member from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) and the member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) saying to me, You know, not too long, not too long. If you answer a question too long it is not the right way to do it. If you do not answer it, you are in contempt. I mean, is there a happy medium in this place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon.

member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister it is not a question of guilt or innocence. The former principal of the District Vocational School in Burin knows what I am talking about, Mr. Etchegary, a man who had certain public charges against him. The charges were ultimately disproved, he is an innocent man, declared innocent today and is now holding a very responsible position with the federal government. It is not a question of guilt or innocence, it is a question of whether or not the minister can perform adequately and I say to him he is a bit too close to the forest to see the trees, and I ask him in all sincerity whether he can, as my colleague has put to him in another form, whether he can be effective in this particular role? He is not probably hearing the question. He is too psyched

MR. SIMMONS: up on the question of possible guilt or innocence and that is not the question we are putting to him. The Vice-president of the United States, Mr. Agnew, resigned over far less than the minister has been accused of, far less.

MR. WHITE: Jack Davis.

MR. SIMMONS: Jack Davis was asked to resign over far less.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
I would ask the hon.

gentleman to bring his question to the point.

MR. SIMMONS: The question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is will the minister agree to vacate his post as a minister of the Crown until such time as this matter has been cleared up publicly, this whole ream of charges against the minister of unethical behaviour and so on? Until it is cleared up once and for all will the minister vacate his post in the public interest until such time as that matter has been cleared up? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That question was asked on Friday. I gave an answer to it. I talked to the Premier and I think the Premier made the position quite clear yesterday. That is the position of the Premier and until such time as the Premier decides otherwise then it looks like I am going to remain as a minister of the Crown. When I decide that I cannot no longer function as a minister of the Crown, then I will take the proper action myself. But until either one of those two things come into effect -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile on a final supplementary, at least for this time. It will not preclude hon. members from coming back. The member for Bellevue after.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman give us some indication of the discussion that took place between the hon. member and the Premier? What was this discussion all about? Nobody is accusing the hon. gentleman of taking pay-offs or anything like that. Was that what was discussed with the hon. the Premier or was it the fact that the law was broken, that the Public Tendering Act was by-passed and that there were several other crimes that were committed in the performing of the minister's duties? It is not a matter of the minister putting money in his pocket, it is a matter of the law being broken. Is this what the Premier discussed with the hon. gentleman or did the Premier ask the hon. gentleman if he was on the take? If that is what it was we are not accusing the hon. gentleman of that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: You have to get your innuendo in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be a rather serious matter and I would like to answer my questions and I am answering them as best I can under the circumstances. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think one thing might be said in the House; when anybody speaks on the other side of the House, in six years I do not interrupt them no matter what way they speak, so I would appreciate very much the same kind of courtesy.

The Premier's discussion with me was a private one, as the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) should know having been a member of a previous cabinet. The question was only related at that time to my statement in the House of Assembly on Friday about whether or not I would consider resigning, and that is all that the conversation took place about.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did indicate I would next recognize the hon. gentleman from Bellevue followed by Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir if he has a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, go ahead, boy, go ahead.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Tourism but he is not here so I will ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications a question or perhaps two if I can get them in.

MR. CALLAN: The Minister of Transportation and Communications, could the minister tell us if the First Arabian Corporation have been promised by the provincial government, by ECGD, Kleinwort-Benson, Peat Marwick or any other source that they can get the refinery for \$12 million? Was that promise made to First Arabian?

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

MR. DOODY: The First Arabian Corporation have certainly not been given that assurance by the Province of Newfoundland. I have every reason to believe they have not been given that assurance by any other group, either the Kleinwort-Benson, the receiver nor the Export Credit Guarantee Department of the British Department of Finance. There is no such guarantee or no such offering; no such undertaking has been given to any party that I am aware of.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister can tell us, has the First Arabian Corporation in the dealings that this government and others have had with it, or other parties have had with the First Arabian Corporation, could he tell us whether or not they have agreed to repair the refinery for approximately between \$40 million and \$60 million from crude oil credits, crude oil credits from an OPEC country without giving that OPEC country letters of credit?

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

MR. DOODY: I am not sure that I follow the line of questioning, Mr. Speaker. I will try to rephrase it and I will stand open to correction. I think the hon. member asked me if the First Arabian Corporation had undertaken to repair the refinery at a cost of \$40 million to \$60 million out of the proceeds of the sale of crude oil for which no letters of credit would be given.

MR. CALLAN: OPEC.

MR. DOODY: An OPEC country for which no letters of credit will be given. I do not understand what the question is, Your Honour. I know there appears maybe in the area of \$40 million to \$60 million and even that is misleading because it would not be only repairs, it would be bringing the refinery up to the standard which it was originally designed for and it would also entail the demothballing costs as it were. As to letters of credit for the sale of crude oil, I am quite certain that the negotiations or discussion with First Arabian have not reached that degree. How they would undertake to finance the repairs and finance costs and the restoration of the refinery to its original design is a detail that has not been discussed in that detail to my knowledge. If it has reached that level of discussion with the British they have not brought us up to date as yet and I doubt very much if they have reached that level of discussion.

I think that that is the answer, if I understood the question correctly. The letters of credit bit has thrown me. I am not quite sure what that means.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me put that question in another form, Mr. Speaker, or perhaps the minister can take it as another question. Is the deal or the proposed deal from the First Arabian Corporation, is it any better than the one that was proposed by Ultramar? How does the deal stack up?

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

MR. DOODY: Well, the proposal by Ultramar was one in which the company undertook to use the facility at Come By Chance as a storage and transfer depot with the possibility of somewhere down the road of its being converted back to its original design, that of a refinery. But there was no undertaking that this would be so. My understanding of the present discussions with First Arabian are quite

MR. DOODY: contrary to that. The discussions are centred around the production of refined product at the refinery as the end result of the discussions. The object is to get an operating refinery out there and not a storage depot. So the discussions are quite different from the discussions with Ultramar as I understand it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated I will recognize the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay next, followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile and Terra Nova.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I wonder if the minister, in view of the fact that a town in this Province is suffering economic death and stagnation because of the procrastination of his department in issuing cutting permits, and of course I am referring to the town of Roddickton and the Canada Bay Lumber Company, would the minister tell the House what efforts have been made by him and his top officials to ensure that cutting permits are being issued to that company so that 200 or 300 men who are currently unemployed in that community and have been for the last eight or ten months can get back to work in the woods?

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

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, probably I could get the hon. member to clarify-cutting permits to individual people or cutting permits to the Canada Bay Lumber Company? Canada Bay Lumber?

MR. MAYNARD: It is my understanding that within the last few days, Mr. Speaker, my regional people in Corner Brook met with the officials of Canada Bay Lumber Company and they are now in the process - that is Canada Bay Lumber Company - in the process of installing some machinery that will allow them to, number one, cut smaller timber, which was one of the problems. We had to forego the regulation of cutting down to a four inch top for some time but that is being resolved now and I also understand that they are going to cut pulpwood, anything that is not good for saw logs is going to be turned into pulpwood and it would appear to me that the situation if it is not resolved now it is in the process of being resolved in a very short period of time.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, what the minister says is very true, but I would ask the minister this question - I know what he says is true, but how can that be jibed with the fact that the company was informed yesterday by telegram from the minister's department that no cutting permits would issued under conditions that existed last year when in fact those conditions do not exist and had been agreed on by the minister's people and the Canada Bay Lumber Company?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: I am not aware of any telegram from my office yesterday. There may have been a telegram from some of the officials and I am not aware of what has said so I cannot very well comment on it. But it certainly did not come over my desk.

MR. RIDEOUT: Final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: If the minister would check into that, if he would? And the final supplementary is this, Mr. Speaker; the minister made reference to the fact that Canada Bay Lumber Company

MR. RIDEOUT: has been fortunate enough to find sale for a couple of thousand cords of pulpwood in Corner Brook but in order to make that feasible there will have to be some relaxation of royalties and stumpage fees. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether his department looks favourably on that and the question whether the company had been so advised to date?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: No. The final details of how it is going to be worked out, Mr. Speaker, have not been sent back to my office yet, it is still being dealt with on the regional level. I would assume that I will get a report on it within a very short period of time. Certainly within reason if there is anything that we can do to get the operation going up there we will do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker my question is for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Rousseau). In view of the fact that Ontario now has put a piece of legislation through their House retaliating against the Province of Quebec for bringing in mad-dog legislation forbidding Ontario construction workers from working in the Province of Quebec, and Ontario retaliated and will implement their legislation unless the Prime Minister intervenes, is this Province contemplating bringing in a similar piece of legislation as the Ontario legislation to retaliate against Quebec for bringing in their mad-dog legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, we have considered - I have personally considered it on a number of occasions, government has considered it. It was a topic that was brought up at the Bartlett of Commission of Inquiry in the recommendation from the Bartlett of Commission of Inquiry was that no such action should be taken. I indicated in the House that perhaps the way to go would be and it was also indicated in the commission that perhaps the way to go

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: would be to test it in the courts.
As I understand it, the Government of Ontario has not passed that bill through the House but they have asked the Federal Government to go to the Supreme Court with them. Obviously we would watch that with a great deal of interest. It is certainly a cause of concern for this government, for the people who work in this Province. We try to do it now by gentle persuasion. That may not be enough. Certainly it is not a door that is closed. It is a door that will remain open and be considered by this Province. but as a result of the Commission of Inquiry report by Judge Bartlett the decision was taken at that time not to commend with any action.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister is not aware that it says in yesterday Telegram in an item concerning this, 'Quebec law will limit employment.' It says, "On Thursday Ontario Labour Minister Betty Stephenson introduced a bill to impose similar restrictions on Quebec workers in Ontario."

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is not passed yet.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, it is introduced. I am asking the minister if this government is going to introduce a similar bill as to the one introduced in the Legislature of Ontario or will the government make a statement of intent supporting Premier Davis in Ontario in his move to try to get the mad-man Premier of Quebec to retract, to withdraw, to backtrack on this mad-dog legislation that he has brought in in the Province of Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is not now at this point in time the intention of this government to bring in a bill of that nature. However, it would be the intention of this government to give every possible support to the Government of Ontario. We would like to see this tested in the courts and it is a possibility that we might

MR. ROUSSEAU:

have pursued but we will certainly give every encouragement to Ontario should they decide to do it.

I have not had a chance to talk to Labour Minister Stephenson since that. I did talk with Mr. Pierre Mark Johnson, the Minister of Labour in Quebec, in British Columbia in February and he indicated to me that their new legislation would not be detrimental to Newfoundlanders working in Quebec. I have not had a chance yet to see the full impact of the legislation but, as I say, we have no present intention of introducing it in this House of Assembly. That does not mean that at some point in the future we may not and, number two, we will certainly give every moral and vocal support to the Ontario effort in conjunction we hope with the Federal Government to test the constitutionality of work permits.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR.SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day, the House proceeds to Motion 9. The debate thereon was adjourned by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR.F.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we have before us at the present time a private member's bill which essentially says that this House support the proposal of the Nordsee company to purchase fifty-one per cent interest in Ocean Harvesters Limited. That is the essence of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Sir, I am sorry that the bill was introduced as a private member's bill instead of a government bill because, Sir, obviously we are not going to have a chance to debate this bill fully. This is only the second opportunity, I believe, the second day that we have had an opportunity to debate this bill. If it had to have been brought in as a government member's bill we would have a greater opportunity to debate this and in fact in greater detail.

Now, Sir, let us look at the history of performance of the Minister of Fisheries with respect to the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters merger. Sir, back there in December of 1977 or the latter part of last year when the Ocean Harvesters-Nordsee merger was first announced or emerged, the Minister of Fisheries first public utterance at a press conference on TV and through the media was that he was unsure of the deal and that more public debate was required respecting the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters merger. That was his very first reaction. More public debate was required, more debate in the House of Assembly and he was unsure of the particular merger. First utterance, number one, Sir. Utterance number two from the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, after a caucus where we had a number of members opposite, Sir, voice some concern over the Nordsee proposal, not only concern, Sir, but outright opposition to the Ocean Harvesters-Nordsee proposal, after that I believe the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), Your Honour, the President of the PC Party, the present member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) and a number of other people, Sir, voiced some concern, wanted more answers. Well, Sir, they had their caucus and after that caucus, Sir, to a man everybody fell into line. Now true, Sir, the people of Newfoundland did not get the answers, the people of the House

June 28, 1978

Tape No. 4927

AH-2

MR. F. ROWE: of Assembly did not get the answers but the members of the PC caucus got, presumably the answers. But they were whipped in line. And after that, Sir, the other members and more importantly the Minister of Fisheries himself stood lock, stock and barrel behind the Nordsee agreement. Reaction number two, Sir. What was the Minister of Fisheries action number three or reaction number three? A couple of months ago, Sir, headlined in the papers was the fact that the Minister of Fisheries disagreed violently with the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters merger and that there would be trouble, Sir - these were the exact words of the Minister of Fisheries - there would be trouble if that particular agreement went through as proposed by the Premier of this Province, there would be trouble. That was reaction number three.

The final reaction, Sir, was the one that we witnessed here last Wednesday afternoon

MR. F. ROWE: when we saw the Minister of Fisheries stand in his place in this hon. House, Sir, and support this private member's bill. Sir, I am only sorry that the Minister of Fisheries is not here at the present time because I do not want to appear to be taking advantage of his absence, but I am not misquoting the minister and I am not misrepresenting him. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the Premier sat there like a kidnappee put on the 'phone with a gun at his head by the kidnapers and was saying what he was told to say. Sir, the Premier sat there in his seat like a coiled cobra ready to strike if the Minister of Fisheries deviated at all from the party line with respect to its stand on Nordsee. Sir, I never saw such a pathetic spectacle in my life when the Minister of Fisheries, having a few weeks beforehand said, 'There will be trouble if this bill goes through,' or 'if the government goes through with this merger there will be trouble,' and in fact enunciated that the government should put in 4 per cent or 5 per cent or 6 per cent equity into this merger so that Ocean Harvesters and the government together would have local control over the merger. This was subsequently proven false, Sir, because we discovered that there was another individual operating apparently out of Detroit who had 11 per cent to 15 per cent interest in Ocean Harvesters. So even with 5 per cent or 6 per cent government equity meant we still did not have control.

But the fact of the matter, Sir, we had a Minister of Fisheries get up and speak for a full forty-five minutes, Sir, and I timed it very carefully, a full forty-five minutes, and did not refer to this private member's bill at all. And I will list off what he was talking about. The minister, Sir, did not mention the Nordsee/Ocean Harvesters merger nor this private member's bill; he talked about the 200 mile limit which has nothing

MR. F. ROWE: to do with this whatsoever, Sir, and as a matter of fact, tried to take credit for the 200 mile limit. He talked about joint ventures. The minister elaborated on the office in London in order to identify European companies which might charter ships or trawlers to this Province and then blamed Ottawa for not coming back with the correct response. And under a series of back and forth questions we found out why Ottawa did not come back with the right response, because the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, wanted 12,000 to 15,000 metric tons over and above the foreign and local quota on the Northern stock banks in order to engage these trawlers. So make no wonder, Sir, he did not get the right response. He talked about the total allowable catch. He talked about - this is the Minister of Fisheries now speaking about the Nordsee/Ocean Harvesters merger - talked about Ottawa giving away fisheries in the 200 mile limit to foreigners and, Sir, everybody knows that, number one, we would not have the 200 mile limit if we threatened to kick the foreigners out altogether, we would not have it; this is an international agreement amongst foreign countries. We would not have a 200 mile limit for Canada if we did not allow a certain allowable catch to the foreigners. And, Sir, in fact if you refer to the total allowable catch over the years, in 1977 we saw that the total allowable catch for the foreign effort was 90,000 metric tons and the domestic or local effort was 70,000 metric tons. This year, Sir, 1978, the foreign effort has been reduced from 90,000 metric tons down to 35,000 metric tons and

Mr. F. Rowe: the domestic effort has gone from 70,000 metric tons up to 100,000 metric tons. And I would submit, Sir, by next year we might be able to reduce it, we will reduce it further, and we might be able to eliminate the foreign effort on the Northern cod stock altogether: quiet, peaceful negotiations, not gunboat diplomacy, Sir, quiet negotiations. And then the biggest and most foolish thing of all, Sir, the minister attacks Ottawa and says, 'We do not want to be lumped in with the rest of the Atlantic Provinces. We want total jurisdiction over all of the fishing rights in this Province.' That sounds good, Sir, to the people out in the field trying to score a cheap Brownie point, political Brownie point. But, Sir, while the minister was saying that we do not want to be lumped in with the rest of the Atlantic Provinces, a few months previous to that he and the minister for Nova Scotia waltz up to Ottawa with a joint proposal, a joint proposal to Ottawa. So, Sir, the hon. minister was speaking out of both sides of his face. On the one hand he says, 'We do not want anything to do with the rest of the Atlantic Provinces. Nothing to do with them. We do not want to be lumped into with them.' And on the other hand he is waltzing up to Ottawa holding hands with the Nova Scotian Minister of Fisheries with a joint proposal to Ottawa. Sir, you cannot have your cake and eat it too.

And, Sir, he also tried to score political Brownie points by suggesting that, you know, we want jurisdiction over our natural right, the fisheries in this Province. And equated it, Sir, with offshore mineral, oil, and gas rights. Well, Sir, if that is his argument why does he pick June of 1978 to put it forth? Why was it not put forth and argued for back in the early months that they took over the administration of this Province? The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the federal government is making every effort possible to decentralize matters pertaining to the fisheries. The proof of the pudding is sitting in a building that is being built over in the White Hills at the present time.

MR. F. ROWE: Four hundred and seventeen federal people are working in this Province, Sir, four hundred and seventeen people.

MR. W. CARTER: So they should be.

MR. F. ROWE: Exactly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Now if the hon. minister wants to interject, Sir, \$300 million come into the fisheries from the feds, \$300 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: - and we get a miserable \$18 million from the Provincial Minister of Fisheries.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: - for the development of the fisheries.

So, Sir, how can the hon. Minister of Fisheries stand up and say, we want full jurisdiction of all matters pertaining to the fisheries. Can the hon. Minister of Fisheries come up with the \$300 million?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Can the hon. - Mr. Speaker, I will ask for the protection of the Chair because I do not want any interjections from the hon. minister. He will have an opportunity to speak at his own time.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I am sure hon. members will hear and be guided by the hon. member's wish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. It sounds great. And it is irresponsible of any member of this House, and any minister to stand up and beat around the bush for forty-five minutes and not mention the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters. I have not mentioned a thing about the Ocean Harvesters - Nordsee now in the last ten minutes because I am reacting to a forty-five minute speech made by the minister where he did not mention Ocean Harvesters. And when we granted him leave to speak for a full hour he finally mentioned Ocean Harvesters Nordsee merger. Sir, it was a pathetic spectacle when we have a minister of the Crown sitting there, Sir, with the Premier slumped around in his seat staring at the Minister of Fisheries like a

Mr. F. Rowe: coiled corbra, Sir. And if there was one deviation from the party line on the Nordsee merger that corbra would have struck, Sir, and the minister knew that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I met a number of gentlemen, and a number of people from Harbour Grace who were more vociferous in their argument going down in the elevator with me, more vociferous in their support of the Ocean Harvesters-Nordsee merger than the minister was on that particular day.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, it was a pathetic spectacle because the minister, Sir, did not have his heart in the support of that bill because he was supporting something that he had publicly opposed a few weeks beforehand.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Sir, it was a sad, pathetic

spectacle.

Now, Sir, that is the history of the minister's contribution. What has happened concerning Ocean Harvesters - Nordsee merger since it had first been leaked or proposed? The first thing that happened, Sir, is that the Premier and some of his ministers publicly approved the merger without providing a single answer, no debate, no explanation. The Premier of this Province personally endorsed the Nordsee - Ocean Harvesters proposal and went one step further, Sir, jumped aboard a plane and was sneaking around in Ottawa without our knowledge, without the people's knowledge, attempting to lobby with FIRA, the Foreign Investment Review Agency, trying to lobby FIRA into agreeing with the Nordsee - Ocean Harvesters merger.

Then, Sir, there was a great amount of division which I mentioned earlier within the P.C. Caucus. Then, Sir, they were whipped into line after that weekend caucus meeting, after the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) came out publicly criticizing the deal. His exact words after the caucus, Sir, "That was a super-fantastic idea or deal." Super-fantastic, a complete about turn.

MR. POWER:

(Inaudible)

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Now, Sir, the hon. member will have an opportunity to speak to this bill.

MR. POWER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

on a point of order -

Sir, if he wishes to speak

MR. SPEAKER (Collins):

Order, please!

MR. F.B. ROWE:

- I have no choice but to yield.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins):

A point of order has come up.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the member to withdraw statements which are totally and absolutely

MR. POWER: incorrect. I never criticized the Nordsee deal, I asked for more information which I received and which I thought was a good idea. I ask the member to withdraw those statements.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will not withdraw that statement. I heard distinctly on the public airways the member for Ferryland criticizing and questioning -

MR. POWER: Questioning?

MR. F.B. ROWE: - the Nordsee deal and unless he can provide documentary evidence that I am misrepresenting his language I submit he does not have a point of order, Sir, it is simply a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. POWER: Typical Liberal philosophy, you are guilty until proven innocent.

MR. SPEAKER(Collins): Order, please!
Hon. members will recognize that this type of matter comes up frequently and one has to draw a distinction between a misrepresentation, which is a deliberate act, and a misinterpretation which may be a different view taken by one member of certain remarks as opposed to another member. Unless there is something very clear-cut about the deliberate misrepresentation, I think the Chair does have to take the view that it could well be a misinterpretation of fact and therefore a difference of opinion.

The hon. member.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Sir, we had division in caucus and I would submit, Sir, that we still have division on the other side with respect to the Ocean Harvesters - Nordsee merger. I cannot understand how a minister of the Crown can go public on T.V., radio and in the newspapers and say one thing and come into this hon. House and say the exact opposite. Sir, completely rudderless,

MR. F.B. ROWE: directionless and lost at sea, the Minister of Fisheries. I cannot comprehend it. I have never seen the like of it in my life, how a minister of the Crown can say one thing to the media and another thing in the House of Assembly and get away with it and that is supposed to be a reflection of our Western democratic parliamentary system. Incredible!

Sir, I have sampled around this Province to the best of my ability. I have not heard one fisherman who is in favour of the Nordsee - Ocean Harvesters merger, not one fisherman, Sir. I have not heard one fish plant worker with, of course, the exception of the people in the Harbour Grace area who, of course, think that this will mean more jobs for them and I will speak to that later on. The Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union are against it. I have not spoken to one member of the fishing industry who is for the Ocean Harvesters merger, not one. But they are scared, Sir, because if this merger goes through,

MR. F. ROWE: obviously they are going to have to do something similarly for purposes of competition. So the fishing industry is against it, many editorials and letters to the editor, Sir, are against it, and the average person who I talk to in terms of conservation of the Northern cod stocks and in terms of foreign ownership are against it. So, Sir, the only people who I have heard who are for it basically are the PC caucus and a group of people who were desperately in need of jobs in Harbour Grace. It is as simple as that. But the rest of the Province for all intents and purposes are totally against it.

Now, Sir, what are some of the questions we can ask about this Nordsee proposal? Sir, do we want in this Province, do we really want foreign ownership of our fish plants where major policy decisions affecting our own fisheries would be made from outside our Province and outside of the Nation of Canada. Sir, do we really want that? Or do we want, Sir, to be masters of our own destiny, something that the Minister of Fisheries has borrowed from the Liberal Opposition? Do we want to be masters of our own destiny if we are to become the world capital of the fisheries in this Province? Because, Sir, foreign investment is one thing, foreign ownership is an entirely different question. And that is one basic fundamental principle that we are asking ourselves with respect to this bill. It is a question of whether we want foreign or local or Canadian ownership and if we allow this merger to go through, Sir, we are opening the door, the thin edge of the wedge is creeping in to this Province with respect to foreign ownership of something that we rightfully own.

So if the hon. Minister of Fisheries wants to talk about jurisdiction, wants to talk about jurisdiction, we want provincial jurisdiction over the fisheries in this Province.

MR. F. ROWE: I submit, Sir, that he should not be criticizing Ottawa and the control that they have over the fisheries; he should be questioning this Nordsee proposal. How can a minister, Sir, criticize Ottawa, who is providing \$300 million a year to the fisheries in this Province, 417 employees of the Feds working in this Province, \$300 million compared to our \$18 million and he criticized Ottawa because they have some control, some jurisdiction. And then he does not criticize the concept of foreign ownership creeping into this Province, which is exactly what the Nordsee-Ocean Harvesters merger represents.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: That is question number one, Sir. Question number two, Sir; if this proposed takeover is approved in Harbour Grace will this not be the thin edge of the wedge which will likely lead to future takeover by West Germany, Japan and other foreign companies?

Now, Sir, I have it on good authorities, from members of the industry, that if this merger goes through, that for competitive reasons alone other members of the industry - there are people, Sir, running around, foreign countries, the Japanese, the West Germans, other foreign countries, running around with brief cases loaded with money, Sir, willing to buy out other local firms. And we will get to the reason why after, Sir. We will get to the reason why. Well the reason is simple, these foreign countries, Sir, have the markets. They have redundant ships because of our imposition of the 200 mile limit. Now what do they want? Do they want to develop the Newfoundland fisheries for Newfoundland's sake? Not on your word, Sir. They have the markets, they have surplus ships. We have the fish. So they are coming in by the back door, Sir, coming in by the back door. And their interest in the

June 28, 1978

Tape No. 4931

NM - 3

MR. F. ROWE:

development of Harbour Grace is about as high as my interest in the development of Taiwan. If I could go to Taiwan and buy out a plant because I got a market here and I could use something that we have here as a surplus, I would go to Taiwan and buy them out. This is what the West Germans are doing, this is what Nordsee is doing, this is what Unilever is doing. It is as simple as that. And they will buy out one by one, right up the Northeast Coast, right along the Southwest Coast, right up the Northwest Coast, right along the Labrador Coast, one to one

MR. F. ROWE: we will see foreign control. Question number three, Sir: What would be the effect of this proposed takeover on the inshore fishery? What would be its effect on the depletion of the cod stocks, particularly on the Hamilton Banks? Now, Sir, we fought long and hard, provincially and federally, both parties, PC and Liberal, members on both sides fought long and hard for the 200 mile limit. But, Sir, it was the federal government, the Liberal Federal Government and the present Minister of Fisheries with his officials and some experts from Newfoundland who finally, not through gunboat diplomacy but through agreement with other foreign countries got the 200 mile limit. Their formula is this, Sir, anything that happens in the fishery is this, the inshore fisheries first, the near-shore or mid-shore fisheries secondly and then we will look at the deep-sea fisheries. That is their formula, Sir, that is Romeo LeBlanc's formula; inshore first, mid-shore, if you want to call it that, secondly, deep-sea thirdly. That is his formula, that is his belief and that is the nature of Newfoundland rural society, Sir. And is this foreigner, Sir, allowed to come in through the backdoor? The Minister of Fisheries complains about us giving him - what was it this year? 35,000 metric tons compared to 90,000 metric tons last year. We dropped the foreigners from 90,000 metric tons last year to 35,000 metric tons this year and we are going to drop them further next year. And the minister accuses Ottawa of giving the foreigners fish out of our total allowable catch and at the same time he supports a bill which will allow Nordsee to come in here and to take fish through the backdoor, illogical Sir, to say the least.

Sir, this merger, Sir, if it is allowed to go through is simply an indirect method whereby a foreign country could be allowed to cut into the Canadian fishing quota. It is as simple as that, It is an indirect method, a backdoor method whereby a foreign country will be allowed to cut into the Canadian fishing quota. Sir, what happened to the Minister of Fisheries' great proposal to set up a Crown corporation to lease or buy trawlers from countries such as West Germany? That all of a sudden has died. Sir, I cannot understand why we had such a fuss over there when it was first announced why the provincial government was

MR. F. ROWE: so eager to rush into this deal and have it concluded before all the facts are known, once the boys are whipped into shape.

Sir, I ask this basic and fundamental question as far as the development of the fisheries are concerned: Is it not better for the fishing industry, the Fishermen's Union, the fishermen themselves, the processors and the provincial and the federal governments to first determine the direction of the fisheries by a comprehensive overall plan. The fishing industry, the Fishermen's Union, that is the fishermen and the processors, the provincial and the federal governments to first determine the direction of the fishery by a comprehensive, overall plan and then supply the investment necessary to implement the plan, thereby keeping the destiny of the fisheries in our own hands and operated in our best interests. Now, Sir, this is a concept that the Fishermen's Union has come up with. They have proposed a development corporation which is not dissimilar to that quote that I just made, Sir, that was made some six months ago on television and radio - on provincial affairs, I am sorry!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is television and radio.

MR. F. ROWE: Which was television and radio and a subsequent release. But the union has come out since with the concept of a development corporation, which is not that different from what we are talking about, engaging the industry, engaging the Fishermen's Union, engaging the feds and engaging the provincial people. And it will be the responsibility of this development corporation to co-ordinate the efforts of the individual companies in negotiating better access to world markets. Reasonable, Sir. The corporation would

MR. F. ROWE:

also assist where necessary in the acquisition of technology if that were needed. Such a corporation should also be a source of new investment capital for the industry. So, Sir, basically - unfortunately I could go on for hours and hours on this, Sir, and I would like to. I do not suppose I would be granted leave. I have fifteen minutes left, Sir, and I will never get in what I want to say here. I do not know if I can get leave at this stage or not.

MR. PECKFORD: We have other speakers.

MR. F. ROWE: You have? Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to try to summarize. I would normally expect the same courtesy -

MR. PECKFORD: You are wasting time.

MR. F. ROWE: What is that?

MR. PECKFORD: You are wasting time now (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, that is the kind of arrogance I would expect from that hon. minister. Last week we granted leave to the Minister of Fisheries and we get an insult from that hon. minister, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: Even his arrogance has no pride.

MR. F. WHITE: You will get a dirty letter from him now.

MR. F. ROWE: I will get a dirty letter now tomorrow, I suppose, Sir.

I would advise the hon. minister to read the editorial in today's Daily News - or was it The Evening Telegram? We have fought long and hard for the 200 mile limit and this merger, Sir, violates a couple of very basic principles. One is the danger of overfishing the Northern cod stocks, which by the way, Sir, may be a misnomer, because the Northern cod stocks run from Cape Chidley to Cape Pine - Cape Pine in the South to Cape Chidley in the North, a huge complex, Sir.

MR. F. ROWE: And the other principle that is violated, Sir, is local ownership of our basic and natural and one of our last remaining renewable resources. And, Sir, we all know how this is being done. It is being done very simply, Sir, very, very simply. Here is the situation: We have gained the 200 mile limit. Nordsee, therefore the West Germans and other foreign countries, are losing access to fish within that 200 mile limit, down from 90,000 metric tons last year to 35,000 metric tons this year and, hopefully, further down next year. There is a danger that they were overfished. That danger is always there because we are not convinced there is a surplus.

Sir, we were talking about surpluses. In recent weeks, Sir, we hear from the South Coast and the Northeast Coast that the fisheries are a failure so far this year- the inshore fisheries, the trap fishery. What is the trap fishery like this year? A complete flop! And we are talking about surpluses! The last thing we should be talking about, Sir. So this concept of Romeo LeBlanc of holding her back is one that we fully subscribe to. And the last thing we need, Sir, is overfishing of that stock and the last thing we need is foreign control over our industry. Because, Sir, why are the West Germans and the Japanese and the other foreign countries so interested in coming in here? It is very simple, Sir.

Sir, this is a very, very important bill and there is not a quorum in the House, and I would ask for a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) A quorum call. Call in the members. The bell does not ring, but time will be as of now.

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

I would ask the Clerk of the House to count the House.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I am informed a quorum is present.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say -

MR. PECKFORD: He was just arguing he did not have enough time but he found time for a quorum call.

MR. F. ROWE: Look, Mr. Speaker, will you please silence that hon. walrus over there, Sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was simply saying that this is an obvious movement to get into Newfoundland because, Sir, these people have the ships, the surplus of ships, they have the market, we have the 200 mile limit, and we have the fish. It is as simple as that, Sir. Sir, this is not as the union has stated over and over again, Sir, this is no partnership between Unilever and Newfoundland and Labrador. This is no partnership between Newfoundland and Labrador, this is a new domination, a new domination, and it is only the beginning, Sir, of a total and new domination of the foreigner over our fish stocks.

Now, Sir, there are a number of misconceptions regarding this Ocean Harvesters-Nordsee proposal. Sir, it has been stated that there will be 450 new jobs if this merger goes through. If you listen to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) I think he has up to 1,000 or so, and another person in Harbour Grace has up to an excess of 2,000 people when he talks about spinoffs. But, Sir, that is a misconception, 450 new jobs based on the offshore effort on the Northern cod stock. Sir, the 27,000 metric tons of fish involved in their particular proposal for 1978 represents 55 million pounds of fish for which there will be some 120 to 150 offshore jobs, and these jobs will be filled by foreigners, Sir. It will be filled by foreigners. It is as simple as that. Fifty-five million pounds of fish is one half million pounds annually for one hundred and ten longliners, which is in excess of 400 jobs, Sir, I can assure you of that. That same amount of fish,

Mr. F. Rowe: 55 million pounds which will provide 120 to 150 jobs for foreigners could provide jobs for people crewing 110 longliners. Now, Sir, is that 450 jobs for Newfoundlanders? And longliners can land in Harbour Grace just as well as these five West German ships, Sir.

Another misconception, Sir, is this Nordsee merger supposed to solve the glut problem? Sir, the government has already released a report with all the recommended solutions for the glut problem around the Province, so we do not need Ocean Harvesters here to solve the glut problem. As a matter of fact, Sir, this year we do not have a glut problem. We do not even have a mini glut problem. We do not have any fish so far this year. So we do not need Ocean Harvesters to solve that problem, Sir.

MR. F.B. ROWE: And another misconception, Mr. Speaker, is this whole concept that the West Germans are going to invest \$50 million new dollars into Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, Sir, the fact of the matter is that the new investment proposal for the plant is \$2.4 million not \$50 million. What is essentially being said here, Sir, is that the trawlers represent an investment in this Province. The trawlers do not represent an investment, Sir, in this Province; the trawlers are surplus trawlers which represent a domination in this Province, an exploitation in this Province, not an investment in this Province.

Sir, one of the results of the 200 mile limit is proper management, is that these vessels now have less and less places to fish. If we have any need for them we can enter into arrangements to lease or purchase these trawlers from their owners when the time comes. But the time has not come yet for the lease of these particular trawlers.

Now, Sir, there is another misconception that the only way we can keep Harbour Grace alive is by having West German Nordsee investment in Harbour Grace. Sir, in fact, we have recent evidence of considerable investment in the fishing industry from Canadian sources. For example, we have witnessed the acquisition of a Canadian company, namely, National Sea by H.B. Nickerson Limited. And other companies in this new climate, this post-200 mile limit climate are busily making new financial arrangements to generate necessary capital to expand their operations in Newfoundland and the Atlantic Provinces in general.

Sir, let the House be assured that with the acquisition of the 200 mile limit we got people on the mainland and people in Newfoundland who are busily gathering together capital for investment in this

MR. F.B. ROWE: Province because they know now full well there is a good future in the fishing industry in this Province and we do not need the Japanese or the West Germans or the Italians or anybody else to come in here and invest for that purpose.

The misconception, Sir, of the need for new markets. Sir, the markets are there. It is as simple as that. They need our fish, Sir. The European countries need our fish. Why do we have to have a middleman in the name of Nordsee in order to sell our fish? We have the fish, Sir, and the markets are there. What we have to do is build up the trawler fleet, lease the trawler fleet, rent it - do anything! - but we do not need a takeover bid. We do not need to allow a foreign company to come into the backdoor to catch fish within our 200 mile limit. They are simply, Sir, working out a formula whereby they, in the name of a Canadian company, can catch part of the 100,000 metric tons of the Canadian TAC from the Northern cod stock. It is as simple as that, Sir.

Now, Sir, as I said, I would have loved to have gone into this in further detail. I skipped over and I have abbreviated a number of points that I would have liked to have elaborated on, but, Sir, I would sincerely suggest that hon. members opposite reconsider their stand on this Nordsee merger.

MR. CALLAN: It is a waste of breath to suggest anything to that crowd.

MR. F.B. ROWE: No, Sir, "Long as the light holds out to burn, / The vilest sinner may return." I think that is a quote from a famous gentleman who we had for Premier for twenty-three years. I submit, Sir, that we are passing over the control of our fisheries, the control of our own destiny to foreigners, being hewers of wood and drawers of water, it is as simple as that, and, Sir, if we agree to this Ocean Harvesters merger

MR. F. ROWE:

And, Sir, if we agree to this Ocean Harvesters merger with Nordsee I submit, Sir, that it is not a partnership between Ocean Harvesters and Nordsee, it is completely domination. It is a beginning of foreign takeover of our fishing industry and I am have told this by fishermen, fishermen union people, fish plant workers and people in the fishing industry. If it starts in Harbour Grace it will spread like a black plague throughout Newfoundland and Labrador and we would have given up our ownership of one of our natural resources. And the Minister of Fisheries has the audacity, Sir, to support a bill like this and then criticize Ottawa because they have a bit of jurisdiction over the Eastern Atlantic Seaboard with respect to the fisheries!

Well, Sir, I thank God for the fact that the federal government has some jurisdiction because yearly they pump in \$300 million where we do not have the Atlantic Provinces squabbling amongst each other. Sir, can you imagine if we did not have central control in Ottawa what would happen? We would have five Atlantic Provinces with a continuing fish war on their hands. Who should be fishing where? How much the quota should be for each province? We need that central authority. But, Sir, that does not mean to say that we do not need more decentralization of administration of that authority here in Newfoundland. And I think the federal government have responded in kind in that respect in that the \$300 million is coming in here. They are building a new building down there. We have 417 federal employees in the fisheries in this Province and are making a great contribution to the development of this fishery, Sir, and as long as we have Romeo LeBlanc sitting up there in Ottawa, who has the last say on the issuing of these licences, I just hope, Sir, that his decision will be consistent with his philosophy of conservation of the Northern cod stock and in terms of local control over our fishing industry

MR. F. ROWE: and that he will reject outright the issuing of the licences to this merger if it occurs and Sir, I would think that if hon. members opposite think twice some of them will see fit to vote against this particular bill. It should have been a government bill. It was made a Private Member's Bill to protect a private member in his own district. Unfortunately it should have been a government bill, get more details and more debate, but it was not. It was brought in as a private member's bill. We are going to have limited debate on it. We are into the Summer, the hon. members opposite are going to try to close the House and Sir, we to a man will vote against this bill adamantly, because, Sir, it is not in the best interests of the Province and the development of the fisheries in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Sir, and we will stand against it with the rest of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you, Sir.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to listen to the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) and his few remarks there today, to listen to what he had to say, and I was more particularly interested in what he was going to recommend. I knew he was going to be against the bill. I knew he was going to be against the resolution. I knew of his stand. I knew what the Leader of the Opposition said, I knew what he said himself and his public pronouncements. That did not surprise me a bit to know that he stood in his place and was against it. What I was listening for was what he was going to do about the problem? What was he going to do about the problem? What alternative did he recommend?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: No, I know you are not in favour of anything. I know you are not in favour.

MR. NEARY: When we become the government -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Negative Neary, reactionary Rowe, suspicious Simmons. You know these are the types of people who are leading this progressive Liberal Party in this Province today, Mr. Speaker. One of the biggest problems we have in the Province today is the attitude that emanates from the aspiring group who want to become the ultimate government of this Province. Total negativity, against everything, piggy-backing on the lack of knowledge -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOODY: You have got them all upset now.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - no alternative. They have been listening to the negative Neary attitude which has become, Mr. Speaker, the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: There he goes. There he goes.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right. Get out and -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw to Your Honour's attention that you never call members of the House by their first or last names. And if the hon. gentleman is going to get flustered I would like for Your Honour to draw to the hon. gentleman's attention that even though he loses his cool, his blood pressure goes up, that he must not refer to hon. members by their first or last names, that he has to refer to them as hon. members.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

I am not referring to the hon. member by his name. I am taxonofying or

MR. LUNDRIGAN: qualifying or classifying the hon. gentleman and I am giving him a title, Mr. Speaker. I could have called him a reactionary politician or I could have called him a negative politician and, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I will not rule on the taxonofying aspect, but the use of an hon. member's name, surname or first name, should be avoided and the hon. member described as from what district he is. Now the making of attributes toward a member as long as they are not unparliamentary, then that is a different matter, such as there could be a matter in which there is a difference of opinion, it is debatable, but the use of the member's name itself, last name or first name, should be avoided.

The hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, we are seeing in this Province today, and I am a little nervous, I might say, Your Honour, that the kind of negative attitude that we have had on this particular issue is going to cause the decision makers eventually to perhaps cast a jaundiced eye on the whole affair. What we are seeing here is a representation on the part of a very poor province, a very economically weak province, a very capital poor province, poverty poor Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, very little retained earnings in all of the coffers of all of our industries, of all of our businesses in this Province, a very capital, pauper poor province telling the rest of the world to 'Go home, we do not need your capital.' We do not have the capital, we do not have the financial capability, we do not have the strength, the money has to come from somewhere, Your Honour.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quorum call, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am informed a quorum is present.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentlemen across the way make me a little bit nauseated when it comes to the style that they use on issues of substance and issues of importance. What they are saying, they are assuming first of all that the people along the Northeast Coast of the Province are wary of any foreign involvement in the fisheries in our Province and they are quite correct, there is a wariness. They are also assuming that the people of the Northeast Coast are not completely conversant with the offshore versus the inshore, the inshore versus the Hamilton Bank, the 2J-3KL relationships of cod, offshore/inshore relationships. They are aware that it is going to take a long time before everyone in the Province is as conversant as Mr. Len Cowley or Mr. Art May, these experts. It is going to take a long time. So what they are doing is they are coming in and they are picking on these issues. They are emphasizing the fact that the people have a wariness and they are trying their darnest to insure that there is a kind of broad, negative attitude on these particular issues instead of taking the responsible position and trying to find what is good, if there is any good- and I contend there is a massive amount of good in the proposal that we are debating - instead of trying to find what is good about it, looking at the total value to the Province and going that route, providing some leadership, they have gone into a total cocoon led by the member who has been pretty well in Opposition since he has been in politics - he was here but he was not in government; he was on the front benches but it was not in government; he never took part in government; he never helped make any decisions - a totally negative attitude. It has rubbed off on both sides of him. It has rubbed off on

Mr. Lundrigan: the member, who needed very little leadership in it, from Burgeo - whatever, Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and away we go, a total negative attitude. Mr. Speaker, the first thing they talk about is local domination. Two months ago the same hon. member said we might consider the case if there was some participation by the Province, if there was some kind of involvement where you did not have the company dominating with a fifty-one ownership. Now I understand that there is a proposal which looks like the Province are willing to participate to an extent -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, do not wave this at me. The member when he spoke, the day he spoke indicated clearly that the precise wording of this resolution is a little out of date. There have been material changes in the total approach since the proposal has been made.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did not the minister -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Never mind why the minister. The member knows quite clearly that there is a willingness on the part of the Province to participate which means that there is no foreign domination, 46 per cent or 47 per cent by the local company, 5 per cent or 6 per cent by the Province which has the controlling interest as a result.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Now the member knows that. That is misleading,

Mr. Speaker. Number two, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not think the hon. member - in Beauchesne it states quite clearly that a member cannot accuse another member of misleading the House, Sir, -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Deliberately -

MR. F. B. ROWE: He said that was misleading and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - is the word and I did not use it.

MR. SPEAKER: On that particular matter certainly the allegation of deliberately misleading is unparliamentary. However, hon. members back and forth have accused the others of misleading. As long as there is no deliberate it is not a matter the Chair can enter into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The business of the offshore resource, the Leader of the Opposition, the member who spoke, the two reactionary members, Mr. Speaker, in their places know quite clearly and quite well that there is a quota established of 135,000 metric tons to be taken on the resource in question, 80,000 tons maximum, given all of the advantages of good weather, all the advantages of warm water, all the advantages of a good inshore effort, the maximum that will be taken this year will be 80,000 tons; last year it was 65,000 tons taken by all of the inshore fishermen. The maximum effort we can gear up to take the fish will not allow us to take the 135,000 tons. There will be as much fish taken under 2J - 3KL this year by foreigners as will be taken by the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast, and the member knows that. And the proposition was clearly that the amount of fish, the 20,000 metric tons, would not be in any way an impediment to the inshore effort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The member knows that. And eventually what will happen is that the offshore effort, foreign effort would be phased out totally and completely, and that all of the fish will be landed, through some kind of an arrangement, in our Province. That was the reason for it. He knows the difference of what he is saying. He also knows, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government very conservatively established the figure of 135,000 metric tons, very conservatively, scientifically established it. And there is what he perpetrates on the people of this Province.

He talks about the inshore fishery being jeopardized. There is an immediate plan starting tomorrow morning with approval to expand their facilities in the area. There is an agreement that is willing to be made by the company in question, which will be a new company, a Newfoundland-European company, to expand the facilities with the preference

Mr. Lundrigan: and priority given to buying the inshore fish. That has been the agreement. That is written into the agreement. The people in Ottawa are totally conversant with it. He knows that. He is aware of the market conditons. He stands up here and talks about the market conditions that we have today as if we can sit back and relax and rest about it at the same time as the American market has peaked cooling out. They are going to become more confident in their own market to provide their own needs in their own market. The biggest problem we have today is the marketplace. We do not have the expertise in our Province today, and there is no reflection on the fishing industry, to interact in the same way as we need do with the European marketplace. This company is a company of seventy-nine years of age, a company that has hundreds of millions of dollars worth of resources, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of facilities, 400 market outlets that daily provide fresh product for the European marketplace, a company that is looked on in the world community and the fishing industry as the foremost of its kind in the world. Now here is who we are telling to go home, saying that it is a black plague that would spread across this land of ours if we get the participation of the Europeans with our own Newfoundlanders. And a Province that if you took all of the retain earnings of your Ocean Harvester, and your Fisheries Products, and your Crosbie empires, and your Lundrigan empires and you built it all into one it would not be enough to build a breakwater in this Province. No retained earnings, capital poor Province, and here we have got an opportunity to marry with the marketplace and management expertise and capital, new dollars coming into our Province, \$50 million worth of trawlers that the member scoffs at because they happen to be excess - he does not say whether they are good, he does not say whether they are efficient, whether they can catch fish - they are excess therefore you give them the thumbs down, that kind of an

MR. LUNDRIGAN: attitude, Mr. Speaker. New technology: We do not even know fully the meaning of new technology, of developing new technology. We are talking about a new school to get involved in marine resources, a new advanced educational institution, we are talking about our Memorial institution here becoming prominent in marine resources and here we have a golden opportunity to have a company that is willing to put their resource, their technology capability at work in our Province today and the members say, Thumbs down, black plague, boot them out, as if there is something unholy or sinful about foreign participation in this Province.

I wonder what the people in 1900 and - well, 1899, I guess was the first time that we had the famous A.N.D. Company looking to participate in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - I wonder what the Premiers of those days said, the statesmen of those days? Do you not think we are getting more reactionary? Do you not think we are going more into a shell? We can least afford to do it. The least time in our history that we can afford to have this paternalism, this kind of parochialism, this narrow-mindedness, isolationism, bar yourselves off. Alberta cannot afford it. Alberta the other day supported the Husky move, said, Yes, we need more capital. Husky Oil or Occidental. Occidental moving in on Husky in Western Canada. Sixty-six per cent of Husky, by the way, is owned by the U.S. Most people do not know that it is owned by the U.S. They say, Fine, we need new capital. We do not give a hoot where the capital comes from as long as we got the taxation policy that can take the balance. As long as we have the licencing policies that can ensure that they live by the law of the land we can get the revenue, we get the employment, we get the tax base. They do not give

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a hoot where the capital comes from. Capital is a machine, it is an implement, it is an instrument, it is something you use, it is a resource and we do not have it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a black-letter day in this Province when we get a political party called the Liberal Party - that is not a Liberal Party Mr. Speaker, that is a reactionary party, that is a backward looking party, that is a negative party, that is the black plague, Mr. Speaker. That is the black plague, that is the negative influence that we have in this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Taking advantage of what they think is the psychological mood of the people along the Northeast coast. That is the kind of leadership, that is the kind of leadership that this Province can well do without because that is the kind of leadership that is going to starve the people of the Northeast coast, put them in the doldrums, economic doldrums for the next decade. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is our golden opportunity. Not an opportunity to say to Nordsee, You come in and do what you want, lay down the law. We have put the clauses in there, technology displacement from Europe to here. Full development of the resource, the business of new product lines. I stood in the factory in - what is the name of the town? Bramerhaven, is it? - I stood in the factory, Mr. Speaker, with eleven or twelve hundred people from all around Europe processing herring into all kinds and varieties, more than you could count in an hour, herring. The most modern, the latest technology processing herring. We do not have a herring plant in our Province today to fully process for the European marketplace. We are never going to have a herring plant to process for the European marketplace. We do not have the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: history, the knowledge, the processes and all the rest of it that needs go into it. We do not have the capital. We tried it on the West coast and it never lasted long enough. The bank moved in before we had the doors opened, closed her down, sold it out. And here is a company that is willing, it is part of the agreement, to put in a herring plant as one of their conditions as they start to get off the ground and get moving with hundreds more new jobs involved.

I say that this is a bad business, bad leadership, negative for the Province. If this deal goes under, and the way it is going today with the bureaucrats up along and the kind of negative feedback that we are getting from here, the negative leadership we are getting from here it could well go under, it could well go down the drain. If this goes down the drain this little foolish part of the world, this little Province of ours, this little rock is going to be looked on as about a fifth world country, reactionary and negative.

MR. PECKFORD: And the Liberal Party is the (Inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do not want any foreign investment, do not want any new dollars. Here we have a Department of Industrial Development that is spending half their budget, half their revenue running around the world trying to get people to come here to invest. I would like to see the impact this will have on your stock market and on your bond market and on the borrowings in the European and the New York marketplaces.

Mr. Speaker, I say to members, do not have the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) say for us to reassess our position. If there are any sensible members left on that side of the House, let them stand back and let them look at what leadership is about because this is not leadership that we are seeing from that

MR. LUNDRIGAN: three or four people who
are dominating the Liberal Party in this Province.

I move the adjournment,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has
moved the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the
House adjourn until tomorrow at 2:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its
rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 29, 1978,
at 2:00 p.m.