

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

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

I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members a matter which came to my attention this morning and I will quote from today's date, April 3rd., a portion of the article in today's Daily News and then we will have the matter tabled. I will read only from the relevant part of that article.

"The deputy assistant chief also said he obtained photostat copy paper from four sources during the course of his investigation - a copier at the Constabulary building at Fort Townsend, and machines in the office of Liberal leader," who is then named, "the office of the Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the Department of Justice."

It is just with relation to that that I wish to draw to the attention of members of the House. I have ascertained that the law enforcement agency had permission to take the material from the office of the Leader of the Opposition. I am not aware that there was any permission given or asked with respect to the office of the Deputy Speaker.

I would point out section 19 of the House of Assembly Act and read it for hon. members, "The House of Assembly and the members thereof shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as are now held, enjoyed, and exercised by the House of Commons of the Parliament of Canada and by the members thereof." Therefore I think we have to ask ourselves to what extent the entry without permission of the Legislature of law enforcement offices in the precincts of Parliament is consonant with the rights of Parliament as understood in

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): this instance in the House of Commons, to which the House of Assembly Act refers.

And the Hansard of the House of Commons for September 4, 1973 is very relevant to this matter. That was the instance in which on two occasions Ottawa policemen, and members of the RCMP went to the Parliamentary office of Flora MacDonald, who is the Member of Parliament for Kingston and the Islands, seeking certain information concerning disappearance of files.

This was without the permission of the House or the

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

Speaker. The question of privilege was raised by the member concerned in the House of Commons. The matter was referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. That Committee found the question of privilege to be well founded and the report of the Committee on Privileges of the House of Commons states, "It is well-established that outside police forces shall not enter the precincts of Parliament without first obtaining permission of Mr. Speaker who is custodian of the powers and privileges of Parliament."

I wish to point out that I refer to this matter not because it was the office of any particular individual, in this case the hon. member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) who at that time was Deputy Speaker, but that this and other areas are areas of the House of Assembly and it is the privileges of the House of Assembly, not of any individual who might hold a particular office; for a particular period of time, it is the office of the House of Assembly which is at stake. In connection with that I have written the Chief of Police, I will read hon. members the letter and I think until there is a reply to that letter, and until any further information which might be relevant has come to my attention, which I will communicate to the House, little more is to be done about it: "Dear Chief Brown: I am writing in connection with the following report from the Daily News of today's date." I then quote the report, then quote the part I just read. "It is a firmly established principle that for law enforcement officers to enter in an official capacity the precincts of the House of Assembly they must have the permission of the House. My inquiries have verified with respect to the office of the Leader of the Opposition that such permission was granted. I am not aware that permission was granted with respect to the office of the Deputy Speaker. The House of Assembly has always wished to co-operate fully with the legitimate

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) inquiries of law enforcement agencies in the Province. The House of Assembly does, however, require that this be done in such a way which is consonant with the authority of the House. I would appreciate hearing from you on this matter in the near future, and would welcome any additional information which you can furnish the House of Assembly."

And when I have a reply, and when and if any further relevant information is available to me, I shall communicate it to hon. members.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 475, approximately 500 residents of the Foxtrap area concerning electricity rates in this Province. This petition should be much larger than the one I am presenting today; it is just that the people who did have circulated felt that it was time to get it in as quickly as possible and I am sure that other areas, as has been demonstrated in the past, will want to express their concern about electricity rates.

MR. J. NOLAN: The petition to the hon. House of Assembly in Legislative Session. the undersigned residents of Foxtrap humbly request members of the House to hear the prayer of the petition by the undersigned residents regarding the enormous increases in electric rates in this Province. The residents, Mr. Speaker, humbly request and point out to all members that within a very short period of time they have helplessly stood by and witnessed enormous electricity rates in this Province dictated by the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, a corporation owned and paid for by the taxpayers of this Province. Within a relatively few short years, citizens of the area and throughout the Province have witnessed the cost of heating and light for their homes escalate to a point, and in many instances beyond, what they are paying for in rent or in mortgage payments. The undersigned residents humbly ask all elected members of the Province to show their real concern publicly for what has now become an economic burden that is rapidly imposing an economic strangle hold on most citizens in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and in many instances is forcing needy citizens to forego many necessary items for their homes and their families in order to provide the heat and light necessary in their residences. The undersigned citizens in duty bound will ever pray that the prayer of this petition will not merely be considered as an expression of anguish and concern from the citizens who had signed this petition, but represents without a shadow of a doubt, Mr. Speaker, a plea that represents a cry for aid from countless citizens in every community in Newfoundland and Labrador.

This is now, Mr. Speaker, as was admitted recently on television by the hon. the Premier while he was running for that position, a great social problem that is facing countless citizens of this Province. Anyone can pick up their papers any day at all and see where people are losing their homes because they cannot afford to make the necessary mortgage payments and so on. There is no question that citizens are going without because of this burden that

April 3, 1979

Tape No. 675

DW - 2

MR. J. NCLAN: is provided and which they have to have, heat and light, basic necessities.

So it is a social problem now that has to be faced. It is a problem whereby people look with great suspicion upon Newfoundland Hydro realizing that it is a creature of the government, and it is also aware of the fact that the government has to either approve or deny the Newfoundland Hydro to go for further borrowing and so and further taxing or increases in rates.

Since Newfoundland Hydro is the main producer of power in this Province, it may be well enough for those to castigate and perhaps justifiably Newfoundland Light and Power, who are oftentimes

MR. NOLAN: the retailer, but the producer is the one who calls the shot; they own the cow, so to speak. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that every member of this House of Assembly, no matter what side he sits on or what partisan differences we might have, has the duty now to speak out on, one, the actions of Newfoundland Hydro, whether you agree with what they have been doing, are doing and plan to do or not; what programmes, if any, he is prepared to bring in in this House to help alleviate the problem that is so graphically demonstrated in this petition by the people of Foxtrap, who in my opinion are merely voicing the expression of anger and anguish and understanding that they are looking for from people in every single district in Newfoundland, whether they be in a Liberal district, a P.C. district or any other district. This is something that every man and woman will be counted on, because it is one of the very urgent matters that each family must face today. And they do not care who is responsible, they do not think about it in partisan terms; all they know is they are being hit and they are being hit hard. They believe that those who are in public office have a duty to report to them, tell them why it is and what, if anything, we are prepared to do about it. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I join with many members of the House who have in the past, as I have and others, in presenting this petition on behalf of the 475 residents, and I plead with them for those in the administration to address themselves to this problem that is one of the most serious social problems that we have in this Province today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask now that this petition be presented and tabled here in the House and passed along to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER:
(Mr. Ottenheimer)

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the petition so well presented by my colleague from Conception Bay South (Mr. J. Nolan). There is no doubt, Sir, that increasing electrical rates in this Province, together with such other basic necessities of life such as, say, use of medication on a chronic basis by people in our Province, particularly the elderly, as well as things like municipal taxes and school taxes particularly for the elderly and others on fixed income - electrical rates, Sir, being among those kinds of basic requirements of life - are putting a tremendous burden on the people of this Province.

I well recall a number of years ago when Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, then the Power Commission, and Newfoundland Light and Power Company, the private company which generates some and distributes a lot

MR. W. ROWE: of power in this Province were encouraging schools, were encouraging domestic users, encouraging people to use electricity, to put in electrical heat, electrical heating devices because electricity was going to be so much lower in cost than other forms of heat and fuel and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at the point now where we have some people in the Province, a great number of people in the Province, particularly elderly people, who are finding that the need to pay high electrical rates and the cost of electrical power consumption is eating into their ability to adequately shelter themselves, clothe themselves and give themselves food. Not to mention, Sir, the other basics that I have already outlined, namely, for example, the need to use medication, prescribed drugs, chronically or on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government should give great consideration to bringing in a policy of putting a freeze on any further increases in electrical rates in this Province until such time as a full investigation and enquiry is had into what the effect of increased rates are having on people, particularly those on fixed low incomes in the Province, and also until such time as the government can give some indication to the people of the Province what electrical rates are going to be in the future in conjunction with the development of the Lower Churchill and a possible recall of power from the Upper Churchill. These spiraling electrical rates, Sir, represent one of the most serious problems facing the people of this Province today. And it is incumbent on the government, I believe, to take action, Mr. Speaker, not to sit back passively but to take action on trying to keep the rates down and indicating to the people of the Province what policies are going to be implemented, including whether there is going to be any success in recalling, or renegotiating, I should say, the contracts with some of the industrial users in our Province to bring more income into Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

MR. W. ROWE: so that possibly
a subsidy could be applied, a greater subsidy applied to the
domestic use of electrical rates.

Mr. Speaker, I
support the petition wholeheartedly which has been presented by
the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) on behalf of some
475 residents of the town of Foxtrap.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member
for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,
I rise to support the petition, Sir, presented by my colleague,
the member for Conception Bay South, on behalf of four hundred and
seventy-odd citizens in the district of Conception Bay South who
are very concerned about the ever increasing electricity rates
in this Province. The people who signed the petition, I understand,
reside

Mr. Neary: in the community of Foxtrap. That must be just about every voter, I guess, in that community. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time we have had a petition before this hon. House on electricity rates. Back in 1975, petitions were tabled in this hon. House bearing the signatures I believe of some 75,000 Newfoundlanders, 75,000, the largest petitions ever tabled in this House were tabled in 1975 in connection with electricity rates. And practically every day, at least every week since then, a petition has appeared on the floor of this House signed, no doubt again, by the same people over and over again who are becoming frustrated, who are becoming fed up with the increases in electricity rates in this Province. Yet, Mr. Speaker, these petitions appear and have appeared and will continue to appear in the future practically every day, and nothing is done about it. So some times, Sir, I wonder if it is not just an exercise in futility, if we are not just wasting our time. The prayer of the petition so far seems to have fallen on deaf ears. The government, the administration have done nothing about the increases in electricity rates.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the only way, the only way to deal with this situation at the present time is to put a freeze on electricity rates for the next five years. Put the freeze on for five years which will give Newfoundland Hydro and the government an opportunity to assess the situation, to evaluate the situation, to see where we are going in the field of energy in this Province, and to see if anything is going to be done about the development of the Lower Churchill, and about the rivers and streams here on the Island of Newfoundland that should be developed. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to go in the direction of nuclear power in view of the fact of what has happened down in Harrisburg down in Pennsylvania. We are not going to go in that direction. I would suggest probably we are not going to go in the direction of building another thermo generating plant, although this administration and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the present Government House Leader, strongly condemned the construction of the thermo generating plant at Holyrood when it was

Mr. Neary: being built, before construction started. My hon. friend and the Tories of that day, in Opposition, objected vehemently to the construction of that thermo generating plant. Now we are told it is an essential part of the production of electricity in this Province, that Newfoundland could not survive today without that thermo generating plant, so we are told. And now it is shut down for a couple of months and everybody is concerned about it. I have not seen the hon. gentleman get up and apologize for the previous much maligned administration.

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

The hon. gentleman should avoid debate and stick to supporting the petition.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

I do not know

MR. NEARY: if anything is going to be done about it. The only way that I can see to do anything about it, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the only way to clear the air - there is nothing on the Order Paper that can give us reason, an excuse to go to the country, to have a provincial general election. I do not think interim supply is the issue to go to the country on. But this is indeed an issue to go to the country on. We either do that, Sir, have a provincial general election - we know what the government are going to do. They are going to continue to rubber stamp the increases in electricity rates. This side is prepared to put a freeze on for five years. Now there is an issue worth going to the country on, and I would suggest to the hon. the new Premier that if he wants an issue, here it is - electricity rates. Go down to the Governor, go down to the Governor now, today, pass in his resignation, dissolve the Legislature and let us go to the country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of
(Mr. Ottenheimer) order has come up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: As entertaining as the hon. member may be to his colleagues, Mr. Speaker, he is obviously debating, roaming very far from the prayer of the petition and is very obviously out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On that point, there is no doubt that the arguments for or against dissolution are not directly concerned with the prayer of the petition which asks for a freeze on electricity rates, but not necessarily for a general election.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank

Your Honour.

Well, anyway, Sir, I hope the message will get through that we are prepared, the Liberal Party of this Province as stated a few moments ago by the Leader of the Opposition, we are prepared to put a freeze on electricity rates for five years. Now my hon. friend may ask, Where will the money come from? Well, Sir, the money will come from the Public Treasury. And where will the Public Treasury get the money? Well, they will collect the \$10 million that this administration has not collected from the bistro operators and the tavern operators and the cabaret operators in this Province who owe the government, who owe the Minister of Finance \$10 million in sales tax that this administration has not collected. We would cancel the Norma and Gladys foolishness; we would cut out the extravagance and waste, and that is where we would get the money, Sir, to put the freeze on. And I would submit, Sir, that that would be a good issue to go to the people on right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

(Mr. Ottenheimer)

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to rise in support of the petition from the 475 residents of the Foxtrap area in my hon. colleague's district of Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan).

Mr. Speaker, we have presented many petitions on this subject from literally tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of people around this Province in the last year or so. And the real question is, When will the government get the message?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Young, the President of Hydro, has been out in the last week or so talking about this subject. I would suggest it is not his prerogative to lecture the public on the realities of life insofar as rising electrical costs are concerned. I wish he would take more time telling the public what the components are which make up the present cost of electricity. And I wonder would Mr. Young in so doing tell us what part the fiasco of '75, the \$110 million spent on the Lower Churchill, what part that cost is playing in present electrical rates? Is that one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the rates are continuing to go up? We heard very eloquently the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) a week or so ago tell us some of the other reasons the electrical rates are so high when he talked about the cavalier fashion in which the people in Hydro are enjoying the lap of luxury at our expense and the expense of every utility user in this Province.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, in this House I recall very well that the then Minister of Mines and Energy was very eloquent on the point of subsidization of electrical power, very, very eloquent. Indeed, he took the very firm stand, his answer will show, that he was very much against subsidization of the electrical rates through the Public Treasury. That was his stance here last Spring on the estimates debate. He was very much against it. Three weeks ago in a television programme I noticed he had changed his position on it and that he was now thinking about the possibility of subsidization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he is the Premier. Where does he stand on this particular issue? Where he stood three weeks ago or where he stood a year ago? The public

MR. SIMMONS: would like to know. The public would like to know what his administration intends to do about this particular issue. It is high time we made a move on this particular issue. The public of Newfoundland, I suppose there is hardly any other issue about which there is so much unanimity as this particular matter, unanimity throughout the whole Province for very practical bread and butter reasons. The people just cannot meet the cost any more. They just do not have enough dollars to pay out for this. It is taking an increasingly disproportionate part of their budget and they are feeling the pinch in every sense of the term. And if government wants to take an initiative that would be helpful to the people of this Province, helpful to the ordinary taxpayer in this Province, it should be along the lines of a subsidization of the electrical rates.

Mr. Young is right when he says that there are reasons why the costs are going up. Nobody is begging that particular question. I question whether he ought to take the role of the politician in the way he talks about it but that is an issue that the government should deal with, the government should deal with very quickly because, if he gets away with that statement, when he speaks to the Board of Trade on April 25th. God knows what he will say on the particular subjects. So somebody should put a rein on that fellow

MR. SIMMONS:

and give him some terms of reference, If he cannot read them, read the terms of reference to him because he obviously has not read his terms of reference up to this point in time. But I do not want to hear from some mandarin, however competent, I do not want to hear from the mandarins on this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear from government what they intend to do, not just when they are leading up to a leadership race where they have to attempt to -

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: - there is a certain order of business in the House and one of them is the presentation of petitions, and I refer you to Standing Order 92, "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegation it contains. In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes ." Now there is plenty of opportunity in this House, Mr. Speaker, to debate electricity rates, the policy of the government with respect to electricity rates. And I would submit to Your Honour that the hon. member is now, when he is going into Newfoundland Hydro and asking what the government's position is with respect to this, that and the other thing, is obviously entering into debate. Now we are all very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the hon. member's views and there will be plenty of opportunity for him to present them in due course. But it is getting the business of this House out of kilter completely to allow debates like this when petitions are being presented.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS: - what the member alleges to be a point of order. How did he get into law? How did he ever get into law?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, what he alleges to be a point of order - Mr. Speaker, I do not know if he realizes it is Hydro that produces electricity in the Province. That is the whole point! How can one talk about electrical rates, Mr. Speaker, without talking about Newfoundland Hydro? Now I can well understand, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very sore subject for the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and he does not want to hear the points to be made. But on behalf of the people of the Province, I intend to continue making them.

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

The point of order as submitted as I understand it referred to debate on petitions. Standing Order 97 it clearly states, "There shall be no debate on a petition." I realize that it is possible to speak relevantly without debate, and indeed to speak relevantly with debate. But by speaking relevantly, if it is debate, then it is out of order because of the debate factor, not because of the relevance factor. I point out to hon. members that there has been tendency to get into the area of debate when speaking to petitions and the fact of being relevant does not alter the fact that they may be debating. The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Simmons: Now we know the real reason the member got up.

MR. NEARY: Who brought the (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: He now learns he is right for the wrong reason.

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

MR. SIMMONS: He was right by accident again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Any further members wish to speak on petitions?

There being no further members on petitions, I

will call Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committees.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Petitions?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave to revert to petitions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions here bearing on the same subject. I could deliver them one at a time and speak five minutes on each one, but if members opposite would give me leave if I could have about ten minutes, I could deal with the three of them together.

MR. FLIGHT: Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is asking for leave to present three petitions at one time and the right to speak for ten minutes in toto. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I thank members opposite. These three petitions deal with the same problem, but do not have the same heading. They deal with the problem of deteriorating roads in the district of Port au Port. One of the petitions is from the community of Mainland which says, "Whereas the road from the community of Lourdes

Mr. Hodder: to the communities of Three Rock Cove and Mainland are in terrible condition, and whereas this road leads to prime fishing areas, and whereas each Spring the road breaks up causing hardships to residents and fish buyers who use heavy trucks, and whereas people from other communities are now fishing in this area subjecting the roads to even heavier traffic, and whereas students must travel twice daily over those roads, therefore we, the undersigned, request the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade and pave the road from Lourdes to the end of Mainland."

Now this petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by 855 residents of the communities of Three Rock Cove and Mainland, which I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, would cover every single living person in those two communities.

The other petition, Mr. Speaker, is from the community of Black Duck Brook requesting that the road from Lourdes to the community of Black Duck Brook on to Long Point on the Port au Port Peninsula be upgraded and paved with a similar heading.

And the third, Mr. Speaker, is a petition from the residents of the Point au Mal-Fox Island River area which says, "Whereas the road from Port au Port East to the communities of Point au Mal and Fox Island River is in deplorable condition, and whereas heavy traffic travel over those roads, and whereas there is a new fish plant in the area and this will increase the demands on the road, we, the undersigned

MR. HODDER: residents of the communities of Fox Island River and Point au Mal, fishermen, and all other parties in regular use of this road petition the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade and pave the road from the community of Port au Port East to Fox Island River."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members saw the demonstration in two of those particular communities which was shown on the National News just a few nights ago, but if they did they would realize that the people of this area are terribly upset about the road and the conditions of the road, Mr. Speaker, have become a national story. It is not a provincial story anymore, it is a national story.

Mr. Speaker, on every occasion that I have had a chance in this House of Assembly, and at every opportunity that I have had a chance to stand and speak about my district, I have mentioned those three roads. I have delivered two petitions from the community of Mainland over the past three years. I have delivered one petition from the community of Black Duck Brook and I have mentioned the community of Fox Island River at each time that I presented these petitions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to look at the first petition which I mentioned, the Mainland petition: The students of that community must travel twenty-six miles daily to and from - and these are all the students that are above primary grade - must travel from the communities of Mainland and Three Rock Cove to a school in Lourdes. The road is dangerous, it has dangerous curves. There are parts of that road now which the Department of Transportation and Communications tell me they will be trying to do something about. As well, the community of Mainland and the communities of Three Rock Cove are two of the fastest growing communities in the district of Port au Port. Traditionally the people of that area fish themselves in those communities, but now fishermen from other communities are travelling into those areas to fish and we

MR. HODDER: have fishermen, coming as far away as Stephenville, coming into some of those communities, the three communities that I mentioned which are covered by the petition, to fish. Now traditionally that particular road was a cowpath. Up until about fifteen or twenty years ago there was no road there at all and then there was a cowpath and now we have a road which can be used part of the year. The road to Black Duck Brook is a road which leads to a major fishing area on the Port au Port Peninsula. The area of Blue Beach, where the federal government is putting some \$2.4 million into building a natural harbour where fishermen of the area, fishermen from the whole district of Port au Port are travelling, where last year fish trucks were bogged down in fishing season on that road, in that area as well three million pounds of fish were trucked over those roads last year and the condition of the roads did not lead to a good quality fish.

Mr. Speaker, in the Fox Island River area the road is twisty, it turns, it has been paved, graded, and graded so often that the corduroy, the wood, I suppose of the original road, now shows through. And I might note that the first name on the petition from Fox Island River was the name of T.J. Hardy, who has established a fish plant in that area and who says he will not subject his trucks to that particular road if something is not done, and who has come out publicly to say this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the economy of the Port au Port Peninsula is to prosper then it must depend on a good transportation system. These unpaved roads at the present time lead to prime resource areas, areas where young people, areas where people who were formerly unemployed are going back to the fishery with a vengeance.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot continue to last. If the district of Port au Port is to

MR. HODDER: in a natural position for a market to the United States and I predict that in the near future that limestone will be taken from the Port au Port Peninsula. And if this government was on its toes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would already have happened.

But, Mr. Speaker, anything that is to happen in that district must first depend on the transportation system. The tourism potential of all of those areas have been eroded. The main trunk road system which joins those unpaved roads in itself now is deteriorating very quickly so that the whole road system is a shambles. And I might point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in the Sullivan Commission Report on transportation in Newfoundland that the roads in Port au Port were singled out as being some of the worst in the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are good people and these are people who want to contribute to the economy, and if, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be allowed to contribute to the economy then the roads must be upgraded and paved. And I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that not only are the roads themselves in bad shape but the fisheries access roads that lead to these roads need to be upgraded. And what we see here is a struggle by people who are trying to get back to the fishery and who are hindered in every way possible.

We also have the sight, Mr. Speaker, of school children arriving at school in the morning already tired out from a long, dusty bus ride. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, that these petitions be tabled and presented to the department to which they relate.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition presented by my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) in behalf of the people in his district who are concerned about the three sections of road.

His petition, while stressing the very urgent requirements in that area, could come from certain other areas of this Province, too, and again is the latest three petitions in quite a parade, quite a chain of petitions which have come before this House.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, we have had so many petitions is that the public does not know what the government's plans are on this particular subject, on the subject of road upgrading. Three or four years ago we were told that the administration had a five year road plan which it would soon unveil. That was three or four years ago and we still do not have the plan yet. Indeed, it was only on Friday of this past week I put a question to the Minister of Transportation in connection with the Interim Supply Bill, asking him if he could indicate some of the projects, that was my question, if he could indicate some of the projects that would be undertaken with the \$53 million, or some of it, that was being voted for transportation last Friday.

The minister's answer was that he did not know, the projects had not been decided. That was Friday. Later the same day I pick up the morning paper for that day and I find that the Department of Transportation has

MR. SIMMONS: called tenders on a number of projects, which the minister told the House he could not name because he did not know what projects were involved. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the minister does know where most of the money is going to be spent in this particular fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): Order, please! I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the same rule which I explained a few minutes ago is obviously operative. I know it is difficult perhaps to define with technical precision what is debate and what is legitimate comment but certainly a, if you wish, confrontation of views or an adversary presentation of views, that certainly has to be debate and I ask the hon. gentleman to avoid debate so that our rules and precedence are clear here.

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) ought today, in response to these petitions from my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), ought to tell us whether or not

MR. R. SIMMONS: the roads in question are part of the Government's upgrading plans for this particular year. Perhaps he did not know last Friday, in which case of course he knows since in view of the advertisement. If he knew last Friday, then of course he misled the House on the matter. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the petition, the petitions, all three of them. I would hope we could get the support of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) not only for these roads but for certain other roads in the Province which his predecessors have committed, like the Conne River Road in my own district which was committed by the now Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) and then reneged on by the now Minister of some other department out there - Mr. Dinn, what is his department these days?

MR. WHITE: Labour.

MR. SIMMONS: Minister of Manpower and Labour.

MR. NEARY: You cannot keep up with them.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, it is so inconceivable that he would be the Minister of Labour, but that is another issue.

I support the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that we can hear something from the Minister who, though not informed last Friday, looks well informed today with his many files, and I hope he can tell my colleague the roads will be upgraded and paved in accordance with the prayers of the several petitions he has presented today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add a word of support to the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague from Port au Port. He said just about everything that need be said on the issue of the roads on the Port au Port Peninsula. Anyone who spent any time on the Peninsula knows and has perceived a number of things. One, is that it is one of the most beautiful parts of our Province with tremendous tourist potential. Two, that it is an area which is ideally located and suited for the reactivation

MR. W. ROWE: of the Linerboard mill when that comes about. Three, there is other resource potential there as well. But fourthly, Sir, they will also know that it is an area which is unfortunately one of the most economically depressed areas of the Province at this particular time. The availability of employment is not very great in that area now.

One of the things which could go a long way towards improving the economy of the area on a short-term basis, and would also add to the general convenience and comfort of the people of the area, would be to commence work on the upgrading and paving of the remaining dirt roads. I think that would be a tremendous contribution and a boost to the economy while we are gearing up, hopefully gearing up, for some long-term permanent employment opportunities for the people of the area.

I understand that all of the leadership candidates in the party opposite gave certain assurances at meetings and so on when they were there. My colleague can correct me if I am wrong, but the impression given certainly was that this work would go ahead and that the roads would be upgraded and paved at an early opportunity. I certainly support that. The amount of money that is needed now to upgrade and pave the remaining main roads in the Province, Sir, is not all that great in comparison with ten or fifteen years ago or twenty years ago, and certainly not in comparison with the amounts of money which DREE has been prepared to spend and this government, the Province, has been prepared to spend on roads generally over the last number of years, or compared to our annual budget. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) rise in his place

MR. W. ROWE: now in support of the petition, if he would - he probably will not; there is a tradition of not supporting these petitions on the opposite side of the House, Sir - but if he would perhaps he might give us some idea as well as to some of his policies and his position with regard to the upgrading and paving of the main roads, major roads left in the Province, particularly those, specifically those which we are dealing with now, the ones on the Port au Port Peninsula. The people of the area, Sir, should have this work done for economic reasons and for the reason that good roads, of course, are a necessity of life everywhere in the Province now and would add to, as we talked about in terms of Fogo Island on many occasions, of themselves would add to the general economic opportunities and benefits which presently exist in the area. So I support the petition. I wish we were in a position, Sir, to do something about it, because one of the, again one of the basics of life that an administration formed from this caucus and added to this caucus would do, would be to look after the road transportation needs in this Province. Sir, those are some of the vital necessities left, along with the electrical rates we talked about and a need to put a freeze on that, Sir, the transportation links in this Province are the vital necessities left to be done by a government in terms of social need and economic need. I support the petition, Sir, and I certainly hope that the minister will rise and support the petition as well and give us some idea as to

MR. W. N. ROWE: some of his ideas in the transportation field.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the minister, Sir, the new Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), would stand and support this petition and tell the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) what the government intends to do about upgrading and paving the gravel roads on the Port au Port Peninsula. I can confirm, Sir, I can verify what the hon. gentleman said about T. J. Hardy transporting fish from the Port au Port Peninsula to his plants in Port aux Basques and in Rose Blanche. His prime concern in transporting the fish and building up the economy in that area, getting back to the fishery and so forth, is to be able to maintain a good quality of fish. And it is quite a problem, Sir, with the condition of the roads on the Port au Port Peninsula at the present time.

It looks to me, Mr. Speaker - I do not know whether the minister's silence means that they are going to do the roads or they are not going to do the roads. I wonder if the minister could take a moment or two to tell us what plans the government have this year, what their programme is for upgrading and paving roads in this Province in the current fiscal year? It looks to me, Sir, barring any announcement from the minister, that it is going to be a long, hot Summer. We are going to see more demonstrations of the kind that we saw on television last week of the people down in my colleague's district protesting in view of the C.B.C. television cameras. It is going to be a long, hot Summer, Sir. And I hope,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that if they do demonstrate, that they will get results and that their plea and their prayer will not be met with silence from the minister.

MR. F. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
(Mr. Ottenheimer) Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the process, I just want to give my support to the petition presented by my hon. colleague, and certainly, coming from a district with so much gravel road, I can sympathize with the people who signed the petition. And, Mr. Speaker, the wonder of it is that we do not have more people throughout the Province demonstrating the way that this particular group did. It is one thing to have a bad road, it is another thing to go through the frustration and the anxiety of wondering what time the road is going to be done. And that is the frustration, Mr. Speaker, that is the anxiety. And I know in my own district people are now waiting for the announcement by the minister, eagerly awaiting the decision to see what roads are going to be done in Newfoundland this Summer. And I would hope that the new minister will certainly in doing roads abide by the philosophy as stated by the government in last year's Budget Speech where it is specifically stated that the government was going to be looking to need, and to develop those roads with resource potential. And my hon. colleague presents the need in terms of resource potential where fish is being trucked and hauled over the roads, the same circumstances that apply in my own district.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to go on record as supporting this petition wholeheartedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public
(Mr. Ottenheimer) Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
table an answer to an oral question asked by the member
for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) on the 29th
relating to the Department of Public Works and the
Auditor General's report.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
direct a question to the hon. the Premier.

Let me preface the question by
saying that some months ago when we met with Mr. Tamraz
of First Arabian Corporation, he indicated at that time
that he had not put in his proposal for the takeover of
the Come By Chance refinery anything to look after the
unsecured creditors resident in this Province or local
creditors in the Province, and he indicated that he would
be doing something about that in the future. What I would
like to ask the Premier, Sir, is, To his knowledge, has
the First Arabian proposal been altered in any way or
has he been given oral or written

Mr. W. Rowe: assurances by Mr. Tamaraz that the First Arabian proposal, if accepted, will contain sufficient monies to look after the unsecured local creditors in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, talks are ongoing on the whole question of the Come By Chance oil refinery and I at this point in time would not like to get into the detail of any particular proposal. I have undertaken, as this hon. House knows, that as soon as we are in possession of all of the facts on both proposals which will be - before the end of this week we will be making a major statement concerning the Come By Chance refinery to this House so that everybody knows the terms and conditions and the kind of support, if any, the government intends to give to either the proposals.

MR. W. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: On that question, Mr. Speaker. Well, can the Premier indicate what government policy is? As the Premier is aware there are a considerable number of unsecured local creditors around who have been having a very hard time of it over the last - what? how long is it since the Come By Chance refinery closed down?

AN HON. MEMBER: Three years.

MR. W. ROWE: Three years or so, over three years. Some of them hung on, some of them have not been able to hang on, some of them are having a very difficult time. I saw Mr. John Brake, I believe of M & M Engineering, if I am not mistaken, on television and also in the other media talking about the difficulty time his firm has had, and there are others in the same boat. I am wondering, Sir, if the Premier could give us an indication as to what government policy is? Will the government be insisting that local creditors, whoever may take over the refinery, local creditors will be in fact looked after from some source?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my previous answer, the whole question of the Come By Chance refinery and the various proposals—the position of the unsecured creditors, the local unsecured creditors and the whole issue—will be addressed in a major statement that government will give to this hon. House after all the facts and figures and negotiations and details on all the proposals are clear. Until that time I would not like to deal ad hocly with particular elements of either proposal or something that might be common to both proposals.

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

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. W. ROWE: Would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if the government or the Premier himself or some other member of the government has been asked by Mr. Tamaraz or First Arabian Corporation to put the money up themselves as a government to look after the unsecured local creditors as part of the deal for them coming into the Province and taking over the refinery if their proposal is acceptable? In other words, Sir, that they would be off the hook to that extent but the government, for some perhaps political reason, in order to make the deal jell and go ahead, the government itself would be willing to look after local creditors. Would that be a correct description of the situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the government is presently in the process of examining what information we have and in the process in the next couple of days of getting additional information. And, as I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition in the former two questions that hon. member asked, that I do not want to get into any of the detail of the Come By Chance proposals until such time as we can clearly and definitively state a position as it relates to all of the major factors -

MR. NEARY: You are getting worse than 'Frankie'.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that will go to make up any -

MR. W. ROWE: When is that likely to be?

PREMIER PECKFORD: And that is likely to be, Mr. Speaker, within the next week or so.

MR. NEARY: You are getting worse than 'Frankie', boy.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, Sir. In view of the fact, Sir, that the Deputy Chief of Police admitted before the Commission of Enquiry looking into the Teak, admitted illegally using a concealed tape recorder, will the minister tell the House what action his department is going to take on this illegal use of tape recorders by the Newfoundland Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been no illegal use of tape recorders to my knowledge by the Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House, Sir, if it is legal - and the hon. gentleman will say, well I am not suppose to give the House legal advice - is it legal in this Province or any province of Canada to conceal a tape recorder on your person or in your office, in your drawer, without advising the person that you are interviewing that his conversation is being taped? Is that legal in this Province? Probably in Russia, Sir, I do not know about here.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the law as it pertains to the interception of conversations is set forth very clearly in the Criminal Code of Canada. If my memory serves me correctly it is Section 178-11, and that law applies to the interception of conversations by a third person.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman, Sir, tell the House if he is aware of any other misuse and abuse of tape recorders and bugging devices and taping telephone conversations in this Province illegally? Does the hon. gentleman know of any other cases where conversations have been taped and people's telephones have been bugged illegally? We know the hon. gentleman will bring a report in another few weeks and lay it on the Table of the House of legal bugging and taping of telephone conversations, but what about all of the illegal stuff that is going on? Has the hon. gentleman heard anything about illegal use of tape recorders and bugging devices in this Province?

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

MR. T.A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of any illegal use of bugging devices or tape recorders in this Province and I repeat, as I indicated to the House some time ago, that the law is very clear indeed that any person wishing to intercept, and intercept means bugging by a third party without the knowledge of the other two, there is a procedure whereby an application must be made to the court and the court grants permission and then the person whose conversation was so intercepted must be advised within a prescribed time under the code.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, just mentioned interception by a third party. In this particular case of the Deputy Chief of Police, there was only two people involved, no third party. So that is illegal, Mr. Speaker, and that brings me back precisely to the question I asked the hon. gentleman in the beginning; What is he going to do about this illegal use of tape recorder to tape a conversation between the Deputy Chief of Police and one of his colleagues, not a third party?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that that and the allegations quoting from evidence, and I certainly will not comment on evidence being given before any quasi judicial body, but the allegations as just set forth by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) do not fall into the category of illegality. And that whilst I realize that his forensic abilities are wide, may I remind him that he took a completely different approach in this hon. House last year when he was referring to some conversations that he had in his possession with respect to another gentleman, an affidavit that was filed in the House. So I commend him for his alertness of shifting from one foot to the other and getting both in his mouth at the same time.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): A supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is fully aware that I did not tape any telephone conversations. I did not tape these conversations.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not say that, I said you said you had them in your possession.

MR. S. NEARY: Ah, the hon. gentleman is caught. I did tape those conversations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman condone the law enforcement officers in this Province acting in an illegal manner? Does the hon. gentleman condone that, because that is what we have, an illegal use of a tape recorder, a bugging device by the Deputy Chief of Police—not an ordinary rank and file member of the Newfoundland Constabulary. Does the hon. gentleman as head of the Newfoundland Constabulary in this Province condone that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to give the hon. gentleman a lecture on the law, I would direct him to Professor Leo Barry if he needs to be enlightened in that respect. He has not

MR. HICKMAN: indicated to me any illegal activity on the part of the Assistant Deputy Chief of the Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. OTTENHEIMER): Before recognizing the hon. gentleman for a final supplementary, and then the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I should point out to that it would be improper now for this to develop into a debate on an allegation of fact; In other words, one hon. member maintaining that a certain act was illegal and another hon. member maintaining that it is legal. Debate on that would be a debate on a question obviously ascertainable from those with the appropriate knowledge. I will point that out so that it does not develop into a debate on a question of fact.

Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is playing with words when he says it is not illegal. What I am asking the hon. gentleman, does he condone this kind of activity on the part of the Deputy Chief of Police and on the part of the Newfoundland Constabulary? And is the hon. gentleman aware that some of his colleagues were interviewed by the Deputy Chief of Police, I believe the Minister of Tourism - Is it Tourism?

AN HON. MEMBER: Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. S. NEARY: - Forestry and Agriculture now and his spouse, and maybe one or two other members. Were these conversations taped? If they were, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware

MR. NEARY: that that would be a breach of the privilege of a member of this House? So what I am asking the hon. gentleman is if he condones this sort of activity on the part of the Newfoundland Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that there has been no evidence brought to my attention of any illegal activity on the part of the Newfoundland Constabulary with respect to the strength of their evidence. I will leave that for His Honour Judge Soper to decide. And it would be very improper, highly improper for me -

MR. NEARY: That is not in his terms of reference. It is not in the terms of reference.

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

MR. HICKMAN: I am sure that any commissioner has to go to the whole credibility of witnesses and that includes the manner in which the witnesses have presented their evidence. And having said that, I am sure that hon. gentlemen would agree that it would be the height of impropriety for me, or any hon. member, to comment on matters that are presently actively before a provincial enquiry.

MR. NEARY: There is nothing before any court. Do not give us that malarky.

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

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) award again, best performance by a bungling cop.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall a couple of days ago I put a question to the Premier concerning the hiring practices with respect to hiring personnel for offshore oil and gas vessels, and in the last couple of days this has been in the news with respect to

MR. LUSH: hiring for offshore supply vessels. So a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody); I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House whether he has received any official representation in the last couple of days complaining about the hiring practices for offshore supply vessels?

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

MR. DOODY: No, Mr. Speaker, we have received no official complaints or representations or allegations or anything of that nature regarding the hiring for offshore supply vessels and/or rigs or platforms. It is a matter that has been very prominent in the press recently. I do not know how much of it is actual fact or how much of it is political rhetoric. I realize that there is an occasion ongoing right now which will determine the future of the political structure of the country and I think that perhaps part of this may have been coloured by that particular event. In any event, we have not received any formal or informal representation on behalf of any group. If we do we, certainly will be only too happy to look into it and to investigate and to make sure that the rights of the Newfoundland public as outlined in the regulations that have been set forth are fully protected. These regulations, as you know, are quite comprehensive. They make full and proper protection for the people of the Province of Newfoundland and certainly the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) as well as myself and the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Maynard), are fully aware of the contents of these regulations and we will make absolutely certain that they are enforced to the full extent for the protection of our people.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Ottenheimer): A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I have had representation from a couple of groups of people and the minister sort of indicated what the problem was here, specifically that I find that students at our College of Fisheries feel that they are being discriminated against and they are wondering whether or not the hiring practices that seem to be employed by the employers are not in contravention of the government regulations. So my question, Mr. Speaker, is would the minister indicate to the House that he would personally look into this to see that the hiring regulations are not being contravened by the particular employers?

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

MR. DOODY: Yes, Sir, I would be most happy to look into it but I would have to have somebody indicate to me what the accusations are or what groups are involved. It is pretty difficult to look into some nebulous situation with which I am not aware. If there is a particular company who is felt to be in contravention of the regulations, then that particular company, the name of it, and the occasion should be brought to our attention; then we can deal with it. To say that a contravention has taken place, that some company, nameless, has been in contravention

MR. DOODY:

of a regulation, nameless, and we should look into that, that is a pretty broad spectrum and that is pretty difficult to deal with. If the hon. member will bring to my attention the sources with which he has been presented, I would be only too happy to see that, in conjunction with my colleague from Manpower and Labour, we would be only too happy to make sure that the thing is looked into and the rights of the public are protected. We have no specifics to deal with, is what I am saying in effect.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister is certainly attempting to be evasive here because it is not very difficult to know the companies concerned. We were only talking about two systems of hiring in the last couple of days; we were talking about the government's own system, through the offshore oil and gas adviser, and we were talking about another situation for offshore supply vessels, so that is not very difficult, Mr. Speaker. It seems pretty clear that -

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a big difference.

MR. LUSH: Right! What I am asking about now is the offshore supply vessels and that should not be very difficult for the minister to look into, he should know the names himself. So again, my question to the minister is will he undertake to look into this to see that the regulations respecting hiring practices are not being contravened?

MR. SIMMONS: That is a fair request.

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

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

MR. DOODY: I am not being deliberately evasive, Sir, it is just difficult to try to pin down an allegation against a nameless company. It is not a matter of a company supplying all the offshore oil operations that are going in in this Province during the coming season -

MR. MORGAN: Name the company.

MR. DOODY: There are literally -

MR. NEARY: Name them all.

MR. DOODY: There are 13 or 14 consortiums, many of whom are dealing with individual supply companies. Offshore Oil Company is one of them, InterOcean is another one, there is the Lloyd's Something-or-Other Group whose name escapes me offhand, and there are dozens. I am not going around to each of them and ask them which one of them has broken the law. If somebody has an allegation to make against a particular company then let him name the company to me privately, or to the department which I represent, and we will look into it for them. And if the hon. member wants me to mail the answer to him, I would be most happy to do so. Or if they want it presented in this House I would be most happy to do that. But until such time as a company is named or an allegation is made, I am certainly not going out and cross-examine all the companies that are engaged in offshore oil exploration off this coast during the coming year.

God knows we have worked hard enough to entice them in here to get involved in this without giving -

MR. NEARY: All you know is Bruneau -

MR. DOODY: Would you ask the animated larynx to control itself, Sir? It is most difficult to try to have any decorum in the House while the

MR. DOODY: LaPoile prankster keeps making himself - I am awfully sorry, Sir, I will try not to interrupt you any further.

MR. SPEAKER(Ottenheimer): A supplementary. The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: The minister states that the oil and gas regulations are quite comprehensive: Could the minister state in the same line, not in hiring practices, but in the setting up of bases in this Province - the regulations state that they must come in and hire as much as possible locally and give as much employment and opportunity in this Province. Most of the oil rigs are drilling off Labrador, a great deal have been, over the last few years, off Labrador and yet there is not one supply base in Labrador; almost the supplies are supplied through St. John's. Could the minister indicate whether in the oil and gas regulations there is any attempt to try to share out within the Province, not only in St. John's, but to share out within the Province so that places like Happy Valley - Goose Bay, the Goose Bay area, for instance, which has a port with infrastructure to be able to supply the vessels - can be utilized and not only St. John's?

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

MR. DOODY: The effort is obviously there to persuade the companies to spread their bases of operations over as wide an area of the Province as possible. My understanding is that some of the exploration companies have used Skaglec, Nain, Cartwright.

MR. STRACHAN: Saglek.

MR. DOODY: Oh, you are familiar with it.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. DOODY: Oh, I see. Then you knew
the answer to the question before -

MR. STRACHAN: I know they (Inaudible).

MR. DOODY: I see. No. But they have
operated from there, from Cartwright, Happy Valley -
Goose. And there is another company now, as I
understand it, who will be setting up -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. DOODY: - an operation in Happy
Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, these people
do not want answers. There is no point in my trying to
give them.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for
Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir followed by the Fogo and Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, referring now
to the Auditor General's Report,

MR. SIMMONS: page 38. The item begins on the previous page. It is labelled "Unsatisfactory control over helicopter charter." I am referring specifically to the top of the page where it points out that the expenditures exceeded the original approved budget by approximately 220 per cent. I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if he could indicate whether that 220 per cent increase in the budget, overspending on the budget, related from any particular set of emergencies that he might be aware of or any particular circumstances? We know some of the details, from the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) travelling down to his premises and that kind of stuff, but that would not run up that kind of a bill by itself. What, if any, I ask the Premier, what particular set of emergencies or circumstances would have necessitated the fairly excessive amount of money that was expended here amounting to 220 per cent of the original budget for the item?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer)

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am getting the detail on that particular item as I am on many items in the Auditor General's Report. If the hon. member has some information concerning the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. Morgan) as it relates to illegal activities by that hon. minister with the helicopter in the past year or so that was referred to in the Auditor General's Report, I would be most appreciative of the information so that I could follow up on that also.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr.

Speaker. request of the Premier I would be glad to accede to, if I understand it correctly, if it is do I have any knowledge about illegal activities by the minister? Yes, I do. But he kind of watered it down at the end by saying, "Which appeared in the Auditor General's Report." Well, the Auditor General's Report does not particularly name the individual, no. But do I have some proof or some statements or some information of illegal activities

MR. SIMMONS: by Captain Morgan Dark?

Yes, indeed I do.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Order, please! It is unparliamentary for one hon. member to alledge illegality on the part of another hon. member. I think under a substantive motion of which notice is given this may be permitted. I do not have to decide that now because we are not in that situation, but I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the allegation of illegality with reference to another hon. member of the House.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have no compunctions about that matter at all. I withdraw, without any qualifications, anything which is unparliamentary. What I said to the Premier and what I said to the House perhaps I should not draw conclusions from. What I said in my preamble to my question is that the minister used a helicopter to travel to his business premises and I will let the House decide whether that is legal or illegal. My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier -

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Privilege.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has made a derogatory comment and cast an innuendo at me as a member of this House, first of all clearly indicating that he was aware of some illegal act I had carried out, or illegal activity; secondly, the charge was that I used a helicopter to travel to some business premises of mine strictly for that purpose. Both these are accusations totally untrue and therefore the hon. gentleman must be asked to retract or to verify his accusations. And I stand and ask that Your Honour request the hon. gentleman to retract these accusations and allegations against

MR. MORGAN: me unless he can verify them.
And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, he can not verify them
because they are untrue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Burgeo -
(Mr. Ottenheimer) Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: They have decided to hang together
rather than separately, Mr. Speaker.

To the point of privilege,
Mr. Speaker, I stated a fact, the fact stands, and
I submit therefore there is no point of privilege. The
member finds it an unpleasant fact. That does not surprise
me either. But one has to be responsible for one's actions
and he knows that even.

MR. NEARY: Let us have an inquiry into the whole thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to this matter,
hon. members will recall that when there was an allegation
of another hon. member acting illegally, the Chair intervened
to the effect that this allegation was unparliamentary and
the allegation was then withdrawn.

The second statement to which
exception has been taken, as I understand it, is the statement
that an hon. member used a helicopter to visit some business
premises. I do not consider that an allegation of illegality
or, as it stands, of an impropriety. It is, as I understand
it, a vague allegation that a helicopter was used to visit
a place of business. I do not see that the matter at this
point is of a nature or that the allegation is of a kind
that it is being alleged that an hon. member acted illegally
or improperly and, therefore, I leave it at that. I can
see perhaps coming so soon after in time the former

MR. SPEAKER: intervention by the Chair,
but as the matter is here, then I do not see that there
is any specific allegation of impropriety.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question.

MR. MORGAN: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary for the member -

MR. SPEAKER: A matter of privilege I will
have to hear.

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, I see.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman
first of all standing in his place said that he was aware
of illegal activity on my part. Mr. Speaker, then he also
said he was aware that I had used a helicopter, in other
words, for personal reasons. Mr. Speaker, he did not
indicate whether the two were tied together. His first
statement was that he was aware of some illegal activity.
He has cast the -

MR. NEARY: Are you questioning the Speaker's ruling?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if you could hold
that animated larnyx over there a second.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! Order!

I can only assume that this is somehow a different point.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that
you have asked the hon. gentleman to retract the allegation
of illegal activity on my part that was made by the Opposition
member. Mr. Speaker, he did not make the retraction;
instead, Mr. Speaker, he indicated that I had used a
helicopter which is not tied into the illegal activity,
and, therefore, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is he should
be asked to withdraw the charge of illegal action on my
part which he has not done to date.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think all
I can do here is to leave the matter in abeyance until

MR. SPEAKER: I see the Hansard, because my recollection of the facts could be correct or could be incorrect. I distinctly know the hon. gentleman was asked to withdraw because it was an initiative the Chair took. I was under the impression that he did, but I may have misunderstood, and when I see the Hansard then I will have in black and white in front of me what exactly transpired.

MR. MORGAN: Dirty innuendo again!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

A supplementary.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Dirty innuendo again!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary. That member should know all about innuendo, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) restrain the hon. gentleman.

MR. SIMMONS: It is all right. He is the expert on innuendo.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the Premier. And just for clarification, I understood that he undertook to get the information - he did not say this directly, but I think that can be construed - that he undertook to get the information about whether there was some particular set of circumstances which warranted the increased budget, the increased expenditure.

A further supplementary - and perhaps he will want to take this as notice too, on the same subject -

MR. SIMMONS: would the Premier indicate now or subsequently to the House, whether he has satisfied himself that there has been no abuse of government helicopter services?

The Auditor General makes a number of references to expenditures, the percentage increase to which I have referred, the matter of approvals without -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: The matter of approvals -

MR. NEARY: What is going on down there? Can we have ordered restored down there in the corner, please? Are they fighting with one another or what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Leadership games?

MR. DOODY: We are just little groups.

MR. NEARY: Are the little groups fighting among themselves, or what?

MR. SIMMONS: Continuing my question, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: A very comparable one. It is an excellent trip, I enjoyed it very much. Do you want me to tell you in detail now or later?

MR. NEARY: Was the bar open?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I am going to call Orders of the Day. The time has expired. I usually do not interrupt an hon. member, I allow him to get his question out, but this sort of developing into not a dialogue but a multi-logue. Orders of the Day.

MR. SIMMONS: I will tell you what, it was not a visit to my - it was not a visit to a beer parlour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the hon. minister -

MR. SIMMONS: It was not a visit to a beer parlour I own.

MR. SPEAKER: - have leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act."

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act," carried. (Bill No. 20).

On motion, Bill No. 20 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Court Act", carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the Hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies In Provincial Legislation That May Be Construed As Discrimination," carried. (Bill No. 23).

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Garnishment Against The Remuneration Of Public Officials," carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

(Inaudible) a beer tavern,

I do not have one. I do not have one.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please,
both hon. gentlemen.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill,
"An Act Respecting Amusement Rides," carried. (Bill No.24).

On motion, Bill No. 24 read
a first time, ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce
a bill, " An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And
The Conservation And The Use Of Ground-Water," carried.
Bill No. 21).

On motion, Bill No. 21 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture to introduce
a bill, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The
Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And
Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The
Province," carried. (Bill No. 16).

Motion, Bill No. 16 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a
bill, "An Act Respecting Government Printing," carried.
(Bill No. 25).

On motion, Bill No. 25 read
a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 8, the adjourned
debate on Bill No. 18. The hon. the member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the bill numbered 18, the bill, "An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House Of Assembly," this bill,

Mr. Simmons: as members will recall would provide a fourth seat to Labrador. We on this side are very much in favour of that fourth seat. It is a matter that we advocated back in 1973 and 1974. We felt then that the terms of reference given to the Boundaries Commission in 1973 were wrong in that they instructed the Commission to provide only three seats and a part of a seat for Labrador. We felt, and felt very strongly that Labrador should then have been provided with a minimum of four seats. So now we find ourselves six years later doing what we felt should have been done at least in 1973, providing Labrador with a fourth seat.

Let there be no mistake then, Mr. Speaker, that we think that the provision of a fourth seat is a very wise move. It is late in time, but it is a wise move. The record will show that we advocated it very strongly. The record will also show that the former Premier, the member for Humber West (Mr. F. Moores) gave an undertaking in this House, a public undertaking to the then member for Labrador South, who sat down here as a member of the New Labrador Party - that was the name, the New Labrador Party - Mr. Mike Martin, the Premier of the day, the member for Humber West, gave to Mr. Martin an undertaking in this House that if he would give his support for the Redistribution Bill, which we were then debating in 1974, then he, the member for Humber West, would see to it that the fourth seat would be created for Labrador. We all remember that undertaking, and of course we know that it was not followed through on. The Premier of the day did not keep his commitment on his behalf and on behalf of the administration which he led at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard, I believe, today or last night on radio the Premier talking about this subject and he mentioned, and I think this was an actual voice report, he mentioned that the number of seats could be reviewed in 1983. The Premier mentioned that the number of seats could be reviewed in 1983. Apart from the fact that he may not be around in any position of authority in 1983, I submit there is another very good reason why he should not

Mr. Simmons: make that kind of a statement, because it does not jibe with his action on this particular subject. If he feels there ought to be a review and he suggested a downward review, a review to provide a reduced number of seats after 1983, he left open that clear possibility and appeared to be supportive of the idea from the radio comment, which may well have been squibbed out of context, but the point is the impression is gone across the Province that the Premier is in favour of a review in 1983 with the possibility of a reduced number of seats after 1983.

Now we are very much in favour of that concept right now, except this is not a full-scale Redistribution Bill I recognize. However, the bill does make provision, Mr. Speaker, does make provision for the Boundaries Commission, or makes partial provision for the Boundaries Commission in 1983. And in Section (3) of this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, it makes reference as follows: "In the calendar year 1983 etc, the Commission shall divide the Province into fifty-two proposed one-member districts." I say to the Premier and to the House that if the Premier has some ideas about what ought to happen in terms of the number of seats after the 1983 redistribution, now is the time to write it into law. Because, Mr. Speaker, unless the changes are provided for in this House through an amendment to The Boundaries Delimitation Act of 1973 there can be no alteration in the number of seats after 1983.

And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is being somewhat less than honest with the people of this Province when he allows the possibility of a review in 1983, if at the same time he is not prepared to take the initiative now through a change in the wording of the bill presently before the House, Bill No. 18.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

He can do it now, Mr. Speaker, he does not have to wait until 1983, The odds of his being in a position to do anything about it then are very, very slim, I would suggest. to him. As a member of this House, which he may well be in 1983, he could, of course, move an amendment. Whether he will have enough on his side to support his motion to amend at that time is very much in doubt right now, but now he does have the majority at this particular point in time. He may not have it a week from now if he takes our advice. He may not have it a week from now if he takes our advice because if he takes our advice we will be in the midst of a general election within a few days. But today he has got the majority, today he has got the machinery to do something about the item he was talking about on radio this morning. He was saying quite unequivocally that he saw, he allowed the possibility of a review in 1983. If so, let him now write into Section 3 or wherever, to write into the appropriate section of the bill a provision that the seats after 1983 would be reduced if that is his feeling, if that is his feeling, and that is my point, Mr. Speaker. What is his position on this particular matter? Why does he use the radio, the airways to skate all around this issue? Why does he not tell the people of this Province whether he is for more seats, fewer seats or the same number of seats? He can not have his cake and eat it too, Mr. Speaker, on this particular issue. Is he for a reduced number of seats? - let him tell us. Is he against the reduced number of seats? - let him tell us. Of course, Mr. Speaker, as you know, he is having his problems these days, problems enough without talking about a reduction in the number of seats. It would be all-out war over there as it was in the case of the Salmonier-Conception seat, that short-lived seat in 1973, when the present member for St. Mary's-The Capes and the member for Harbour Main -Bell Island went after each others throats because they were concerned that one would knock the other off in a nomination. Well, that little fight was solved, but think of all the fights he would have, Mr.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Speaker, if he put his money where his mouth was in terms of what he said on the radio this morning. If he came into this House with a bill that would reduce the number of seats back to forty-five or forty-two, what a fight he would have on his hands. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, he skates around the issue and that is why he tries to postpone that particular problem until 1983. God knows he has got enough problems for 1979 just in terms of his own political survival.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, my time has run out pretty well and so I will conclude by saying that he is just a shadow of his former self, Mr. Speaker, since he lost the Leadership, just a shadow of himself, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island. The spunk has gone out of him, the guts have gone out of him altogether, he is not the kind of fellow he was at all. He used to be a good humored, light-hearted, friendly sort of fellow but now the nastiness comes through, Mr. Speaker. The veneer is gone, the veneer is gone -

MR. DOODY: The bloom has gone off the rose.

MR. R. SIMMONS: No, we have never thought of the Minister as being a rose.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah, ha!

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the principle of this particular bill and I am sure the committee will get a chance to make a few comments on it when we go through it clause by clause. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few words in relation to this particular bill, but first of all, Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees and wish you all the best in that particular position.

MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, without a doubt I, as most of my colleagues, support the principle of this particular bill and it is with some nostalgia that I do so because I had travelled, as a young fellow, and visited every single community in Labrador around 1952, every single community, many of which no longer exist.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are dating yourself.

MR. F. ROWE:

Yes, I am dating myself, that is correct. Many of these communities, Mr. Speaker, no longer exist

MR. F. ROWE: and some communities, of course, and towns and cities have since sprung up. And I can say that I have been in every single community and town in Labrador and I know the need for this kind of a bill and I give it my wholehearted support.

Sir, there are a number of points that I would like to make and they are as follows: Back there in 1973-1974 we had called for a minimum of four seats for Labrador when we were debating the Redistribution Bill at that particular time. So it is nothing new, Sir, but we will give the Premier and the administration credit for bringing this in at this time and we will indeed support it. But, Sir, at that same time the Premier of the time promised, made a pledge that he would set up a permanent Redistribution Commission that would be studying population shifts throughout the Province and community of interest situations, would study the situation with respect to communities dropping in population, would study the situation with respect to industrialization therefore a concentration of population in growth areas. But the Premier of the time, Sir, did indicate to this House and indicated through the various news media that it was his firm conviction that a permanent Redistribution Committee would be set up and would report to this House on an annual basis. That does not mean that we have to have redistribution every year, I am not suggesting that, Mr. Speaker, but the commissioner would report to the House and obviously at the appropriate time when redistribution is required it will be brought before this House. Now, Sir, when the Premier closes the debate I hope that he will relate to that particular promise that was made several years ago by the former Premier, that a permanent Redistribution Commission would be set up that would report - I thought it was annually but regularly is probably a better word - would report

MR. F. ROWE: regularly to the House of Assembly and we would have to look at the situation with respect to the very need for redistribution. But, Sir, even more importantly is the way that a commissioner's or a commission's report is dealt with. We saw in 1973-1974 a situation where a commission did a reasonably good job of redistributing the electoral boundaries of this Province. We could see the need for improvement of his report. We were hoping to have been able to take his report in this House of Assembly and make suggestions as to changes which should be made in his report. The elected members of this House knowing the people, knowing the constituents, knowing the situations throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would then, presumably, come to a consensus on any alterations that would be made to the commission's report. But, Sir, we did not see that. Instead of that, Sir, we saw the commission's report, the Redistribution Commission's Report taken down in the Cabinet room - I do not know whether it was even done by Cabinet or a small clique of Cabinet; all that we know is that the Electoral Boundaries Bill that was brought before this House of Assembly was as different from the report of the commission as night is from day, a completely restructured one. Sir, the government practically ignored the whole of the report of the Redistribution Commission that was presented at that time. Now I am not suggesting for one minute that the report of the commission should be taken lock, stock and barrel, the Redistribution Commission should be taken lock, stock and barrel and just accepted. But certainly this House of Assembly should have an input and not the input into boundaries and districts that were drafted up in the Cabinet Room after a large expenditure of money by a commission that was set up to do the job in the first place. It was a total waste of money, Sir, for that commission to have been given the job because the Cabinet went ahead and took the Province, carried it up the way they wanted to do it and then they used the majority to shove it through the House of Assembly. So

MR. F. ROWE: we had the spectacle of the district of Baie Verte-White Bay, the Baie Verte Peninsula in one area and then you have to drive 500 or 600 miles to get to the other part of the district up on the Northern Peninsula. We have the spectacle of the Straits of Belle Isle district, the largest geographical district and the largest district community-wise in the Province, and close to the largest district population size without hardly any- except for places like St. Anthony and Flowers Cove, and Cook's Harbour where you have the majority of the communities- without any form of local government whatsoever, an impossible task for a member, Sir. And I am not the least bit worried about the task of a member. What I am worried about, and concerned about, is what effect it has on the people who live in such a district. They cannot be served by a superman adequately under these circumstances.

So, Sir, I would like to see the Premier when he closes the debate, relate himself to these two particular points. Number one, the concept of a permanent redistribution commission that reports to the House regularly, which does not necessarily mean redistribution every time they report, just size up the situation, a report that is made to this House the same as the annual report from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. We take it, we consume it, we digest it, and at a certain point in time the government may feel that there is need for a redistribution commission to actually redistribute the seats in this Province.

And secondly, Sir, that when a report is made that the House of Assembly consider the

MR. F. ROWE: report of a redistribution commission, not the chopped-up version, the modified version that is done in the Cabinet room.

So those are two points, Sir, that I would like the Premier to relate himself to when he closes debate on this particular bill.

Sir, there is another point that I would like to raise since we are talking about the principle of redistribution, albeit that we are talking about Labrador here, and that is - I do not know how best to describe it, Sir. In this day and age I would submit that politicians are not exactly held in the highest regard throughout **the Western** world. That is bad enough as it is. We are the subject of cynicism, negativity and all kinds of other accusations. It is not a time, Sir, when a member, an elected person or politician, can sort of walk the streets with his head held high. There is an atmosphere throughout the whole Western world with respect to politicians at the present time.

But, Sir, I am not concerned about that. It is a sad commentary on democracy I would admit, but personally I am not particularly concerned about that. What I am concerned about, Sir, is the ability of a member to represent the people whom he represents. Now, Sir, we have situations - it is not so bad for Cabinet ministers, but we have MHAs on both sides of the House, Sir, who have constituents coming in here daily, delegations coming in here daily and we have the spectacle - I will give an example without naming the town. A delegation of five or six people coming in representing a town council

MR. F. ROWE: from my own district there two weeks ago. We set up, Sir, six meetings with various government officials in six different departments over a two-day period. They came to my office first - six men, Sir. The first thing I had to do was kick out or ask my partner, the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) if he would leave the office, so I could just accommodate - physically accommodate the delegation. There was not enough room physically to accommodate them in my office, not to mention people who come in with personal problems when you have to ask your partner in the office if he would mind leaving so you could discuss a personal problem which some lady or man or youth comes to you about. And that same group, Sir, coming to see their member - any member in this hon. House, Sir, from the backbenches over there or on this side - that same delegation had to have the door left open because they

Mr. F. Rowe: could not breathe in my particular office. There is not a window, there is a fan that either goes sub-zero or super-heated, it does not seem to maintain a normal temperature. Sweating like you would not believe, Sir. But after that preliminary meeting, and practically deoxygenated we then left for a director of some division of some department of government and we walk in, Sir, and you practically need snowshoes to get across the carpet and you sit down on a nice comfortable leather chesterfields, all kinds of nice easy chairs to sit on, a huge coffee table, in rolls a little tray of coffee, if we would like it, nothing wrong with that, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Velvet drapes on the windows.

MR. F. ROWE: Nothing wrong with that, Sir. But the spectacle of constituents coming in and visiting an elected member of this House -

MR. YOUNG: St. John's or not?

MR. F. ROWE: Now the hon. member - oh, he is in Cabinet - notice the change, Sir? What a change in the attitude of the hon. member now that he has got a nice office for himself. The hon. member knows full well what I am talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everyone does.

MR. F. ROWE: And everybody in this hon. House knows what I am talking about. When an elected member of this House of Assembly who is elected, by the way, I re-emphasize that, elected, not appointed, has to put up with conditions that are, to say the least, uncomfortable, inadequate, inefficient -

MR. NEARY: What are you going to do about it?

MR. F. ROWE: - sharing secretaries.

MR. NEARY: What are you going to do about it?

MR. F. ROWE: Now the hon. member can say, the Premier can say, oh you got much more than the Opposition had under the previous administration.

MR. NEARY: He is right, you know.

MR. F. ROWE: Right on. I agree with that. But I feel that every elected member in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador should be given

Mr. F. Rowe: the staff and the office facilities to enable him to serve his district in an efficient manner. And I feel very strongly, Sir, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: It is not a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. Minister of Public Works has a contribution to make he can stand in his place and if we can understand him we will listen to him and if he makes some good points we will applaud him for it.

MR. NEARY: He will be back in -

MR. F. ROWE: But this is not a joking matter.

MR. NEARY: He will be back in the embalming parlour before he knows what has happened to him.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Sir, I do not know why all this has evolved. This is not partisan in any sense or manner, in any sense. I am not blaming this on the present administration. I am not blaming it on the previous administration. The previous administration did not supply adequate office space or, you know, working conditions, efficient working conditions for members, MHAs. I think, Sir, it has just been an evolutionary process that has evolved in our Western democratic society whereby basically it was only the rich that ended up in the House of Commons in England.

MR. NEARY: Westminster.

MR. F. ROWE: Westminster.

AN HON. MEMBER: The upper crust.

MR. F. ROWE: You know, the rich got elected; they were the only ones who could afford to get elected. And I think this has just sort of evolved, and is slowly but ever so slowly changing. You talk about -

MR. NEARY: They will say we are better off than they were but there were only -

MR. F. ROWE: Oh yes, I brought that to the Premier's attention that we are certainly better off than they were. I will give him -

MR. NEARY: But there are more of us.

MR. F. ROWE: There were more of us. That is true too.

MR. NEARY: There were twenty-one of us.

MR. F. ROWE: That is true too, there were more of us. There were only three hon. members in Opposition at one stage of the game.

MR. NEARY: I mean what do you expect, the same -

MR. F. ROWE: There are twenty of us.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-one.

MR. F. ROWE: But it is a sad commentary, Sir, when an elected member of this House of Assembly, no matter what side of the House he sits on, whether he belongs to a political party or whether he is independent or any other party that presently sits in this House, it does not matter at all, it is very sad when an elected member does not have the same office infrastructure, for the want of a better word, does not have the same secretarial assistance, does not have the same travel opportunity as an appointed civil servant.

Sir, I represent a district where you would expect me not to have a complaint in the world. Trinity- Bay de Verde is an hour and a half's drive from the city, from where I live in the city, two and a half hours to the other extreme end.

MR. F. ROWE: But the fact of the matter, Sir, is that because of the proximity of the district to the city, I am expected to be there on many occasions to attend many functions. The hon. the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doody) knows exactly what I am talking about. And, Sir, the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) pointed out in dramatic fashion his air bills that he has chalked up while he has been representing that particular district. That is an extreme case, but there are many members in this House of Assembly who have huge expenditures going back and forth. For example, in order for me to have a member's clinic in most cases - and when you drive out there, number two, you have to hire a hall in order to hold a member's clinic. And if you were to adequately serve your constituents you eat into much more than the allowance that is given to you for the purpose of serving your district. So, Sir, I say call a spade a spade, give members salaries - I will not get into what I feel salaries should be, that is another question - but, Sir, we should be put on at least the same status as a civil servant, an accountable travel grant. You go to your district, you go to certain functions, you put your claim in, and if you put in a claim to attend a P.C. or a Liberal rally, obviously, the Auditor General might have a few comments on that - I would think he might - but if you are putting in a claim to go to meet with a town council for the purpose of talking about problems of water and sewerage or the establishment of a medical centre or something like that, it is an entirely different matter.

So I would ask the Premier if he would, while he is closing the debate - I know it is a little outside of the narrow confines of this particular bill under consideration - but, Sir, I am afraid that

MR. F. ROWE: because of the restraint placed on the members of the House of Assembly in this Province that unless they are filthy rich and can afford to go out and do this and do that or have their own private offices in some other part of town, they are just looked upon as dirt. It is simple as that. And, in fact, we have been treated by the system as dirt. MHAs in this Province and probably other provinces through the evolutionary process of members have been created by the system as pure dirt - there is no other expression for it. And there is only one way -

MR. NEARY: I think the hon. the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) wants to ask a question.

MR. F. ROWE: I am sorry. Does the member for Exploits have a question?

DR. TWOMEY: No, no.

MR. F. ROWE: And it all boils down, Sir, to the situation where we are basically put in the position where we cannot do the proper and adequate job for the constituents that we represent. Now I can hold office in a bathroom. I have run elections from some peculiar places, as the hon. the Premier knows from the Harbour Breton experience; I will not go into much detail about that because we had instances down there upon which we look back on now as a bit of fun.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And that is the truth!

MR. F. ROWE: That is the truth, right. But I can operate out of some pretty peculiar places. But, Sir, when it comes to receiving delegations, surely heavens, a member should have a place to be able to take a person to have a private conversation or a confidential conversation, or certainly have the physical space to accommodate four or five or six people, and we simply do not have it. So I would like the Premier to address himself to that

April 3, 1979

Tape 699

EC - 3

MR. F. ROWE: particular point as well when
he closes the debate.

And, Sir, just in quick review
I would simply say that I, for one, wholeheartedly support
this particular bill. I would suggest that the Premier
give serious consideration to the names of the districts
that are suggested in this bill.

The member for Eagle River

(Mr. Strachan) defined

MR. F. ROWE: what Torngat means there yesterday or the day before - Friday, was it? I think serious consideration should be given to that and also he mentioned the fact that the name Eagle River is really meaningless when applied to the district that is called that particular district. It is really meaningless. Now I know you might say we are quibbling over details here, Sir, but the people of Labrador have a long history of culture and tradition up there and names are extremely important; and if you have a misnomer on a district, that is not the right way to start off. I would suggest that serious consideration be given to changing the names as suggested by the people who represent Labrador who have spoken to that particular bill. But, Sir, it is a step in the right direction. We give it our wholehearted support and, Sir, I would suggest that the Premier - I know he is new at the job - not to give the impression - I heard the Premier on the radio either last night or this morning, I do not know when it was, saying, "If the Opposition did not agree with us or did not co-operate with us on the Interim Supply Bill, I will call an election. If the Opposition does not agree with us or does not co-operate with us on this particular redistribution, we will call an election." Does that mean that the Premier has threatened to call an election, Sir, if we do not agree with everything which he comes up with in this House of Assembly? Because if that is his state of policy, Sir, I would almost be inclined to disagree with the very next bill he introduces to the House. If the attachment - if the deal is that if we do not agree with the administration on everything he is going to call an election, we might very well disagree with him on the very next bill that he introduces into this House.

MR. NEARY: We will not (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: No, I do not think the Interpretation Bill will be the greatest issue, Sir, but let not the Premier try to give the impression to the people of this Province that the only reason that we are supporting the Government on certain things is because we are afraid of an election. No way, Sir! We invite the Premier to call an election any time at all, but let him not leave the impression that we are supporting this good legislation because we are afraid of an election, in no way whatsoever. We will support good legislation as long as it is good legislation and we will vote against any legislation that we feel is bad legislation; and in some instances, Sir, such as the bill, the Regional Government Bill, last year which contained parts in it that we violently disagreed with. Not only did we disagree with the Government on it and we fought against it, we managed to defeat the Government on it, and we shall do so again where we feel that it is not in the best interests of this Province. Anything that is not in the best interests of this Province we will fight against. Anything that we feel is in the best interests of this Province and in this particular case in the best interests of Labrador, we will support.

So, Sir, I hope the Premier has jotted down the three basic questions that I put to him. I need not repeat them, I take it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I remember them.

MR. F. ROWE: He remembers. That is good, Mr. Speaker. So, Sir, in closing I would just like to say that I support this particular bill and I am sure that there will be unanimous support on both sides of the House for this particular bill and we indeed welcome it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) Hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to have a few words, Sir, in support of this bill. As my hon. colleague who just took his seat indicated, there will be unanimous consent of the House in the passing of this piece of legislation. I think it will be a unanimous decision of the House, Sir, that Labrador be given an additional seat, additional representation in this House, but, Mr. Speaker, let us not be so naive or so stupid or so stunned as not to realize that this is a political move. Let us not be so naive, Sir, as to think that

MR. NEARY: out of the goodness and the kindness of his heart that the new Premier would like to give additional representation to Labrador in this House. It is sheer politics, Sir. It is a political move. It is a move on the part of the administration to try to beef up their image in Labrador. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members of this House that this piece of legislation, this bill giving additional representation to Labrador in this hon. House will just be putting another finger in the hole in the dyke, that is all it will be doing. It will have no impact, none at all, as far as quietening, as far as silencing the people of Labrador. Oh, yes, the few who kicked up a fuss prior to the Tory leadership campaign will be pleased with this. The pressure group that approached all the candidates in the Tory Leadership before the convention will be very very pleased about this, very pleased about it - it is a bit of a victory for them. But overall, Mr. Speaker, overall I am talking about, it will have no impact at all, Sir, on keeping the people of Labrador quiet. My hon. friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) knows that. We all support the bill, we are glad to see Labrador getting an extra member in the House, but what is it going to do as far as the talk of Labrador separating from the Island of Newfoundland? What is it going to do about that situation? Is it going to have any impact?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. NEARY: It will have impact, my hon. friend says.

MR. R. MOORES: That is nonsense.

MR. NEARY: Well, I think that is nonsense. As my hon. friend says, I think it is nonsense.

The kinds of things that will have an impact on the people of Labrador are not playing

MR. NEARY: little political games with the people, making little political moves because there was a Tory Leadership convention and the issue of a fourth seat surfaced again. And it would not have surfaced this time, Sir - the people of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, would not have gotten additional representation in this House but for the Tory Leadership. They would have had to go into the next election - if we had the former Premier, Mr. Moores, if he had still been here in this House and Premier down on the Eighth Floor there would have been no fourth seat in Labrador going into the next election. It was the leadership that brought it to light, that brought it up to the surface again. So for sheer political reasons the new Premier and the administration figured they would throw out a little goody to the people of Labrador, try to endear themselves to the people of Labrador after neglecting the people of Labrador for almost seven years -

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - after the very same hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Premier in this Province refusing to go down to Labrador City to a meeting to talk about occupational health hazards and silicosis amongst the miners in that mining community. After refusing on two occasions to go down to a meeting in Labrador City, the hon. gentleman now thinks he can make amends to the people of Labrador by giving them additional representation in this House.

So let us recognize it for what it is worth, Mr. Speaker, it is a political gimmick. It is meant to try to conjure up a few votes for an administration, Sir, that is faltering or an administration that is in bad shape in Labrador, especially in coastal Labrador.

MR. R. MOORES:

Now!

MR. NEARY:

It will do nothing to change one vote. It will not change one vote or the attitude of one person in Labrador West or in Naskaupi or in Eagle River, and I doubt very much if it will influence very many votes in the new district of -

MR. R. MOORES:

Torngat.

MR. NEARY:

No. Well, Torngat is the old district of Eagle River - half.

So, Mr. Speaker, everybody is going to vote for this piece of legislation, but

MR. NEARY: in so doing, Sir, everybody in their hearts and in their souls know that this is just a political gimmick on the part of the administration to try to beef up their image in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the real issues - what are the real issues in Labrador, Sir? What are the real issues? Well, Sir, I would suggest that the real issues in Labrador are social and economic, that the things that are causing the residents of Labrador to be so disgruntled today are social and economic issues. Hon. gentlemen will recall that back in 1977, in July - June - May, June, July of 1977, I conducted a survey, a poll, in the whole of Labrador to find out what was bothering the people in Labrador and what was the cause of their being so disgruntled. When I had the reports in, Sir, the questionnaires that were sent out, I wrote the former Premier of this Province and I sent copies of my survey to members of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have, Sir, a little quiet, I mean, I do not mind one or two conversations going on, but -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman is having difficulty in collecting his thoughts.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I sent out questionnaires to every part of Labrador and when I got the questionnaires back, Sir, I tabulated the results. I can tell the hon. gentlemen what the problems were at that time in 1977 that were bothering the people of Labrador. It was not the fact that they did not have enough representation in this House, it was the fact that they were being ignored by the provincial government in this Province. That was their beef. The issues, Sir, what were the issues at that time? And I will take them in order of the five most urgent needs in Labrador at that time, Sir.

MR. NEARY: The people wanted improved radio and television. They wanted better air service. They wanted better medical services. They wanted lower taxes, and they wanted a highway across Labrador. These were the issues. These were the five most urgent needs of the people of Labrador at that time in 1977, and I doubt if the situation has changed very much since that time. They may have improved their radio and television services because we now have private stations in Labrador West and in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay areas. The people are still not satisfied with their television programming in Labrador West and as a matter of fact in the whole of Labrador. There is a move on foot now to bring in cable television into western Labrador. No doubt that will be a welcome improvement, Sir, in the area.

Air services have not improved. The cost has gone up. People are complaining about the cost of transportation between Labrador and the Island of Newfoundland. It is cheaper for them to go over to Quebec province. Eastern Provincial Airways operating between the Island of Newfoundland and Wabush cannot pick up passengers and bring them to the province of Quebec, but Quebecair can pick up passengers in Wabush and Labrador West and bring them over to Quebec and bring passengers the other way from Montreal to Wabush. Eastern Provincial Airways is forbidden by the Canadian Transport Commission - the regulatory body - to transport passengers, even though, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Your Honour is aware of it, they had a service from St. John's to Wabush to Montreal at one stage and were not allowed to take on passengers in Wabush in Newfoundland to drop them off in Montreal or pick passengers up in Montreal and bring them back to Wabush, and they had to drop the service.

MR. DOODY: Is that not a federal agency?

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman asks: "Is it a federal agency?" and the hon. gentleman knows the answer to that. I want to ask the hon. gentleman what he did about it when he was Minister of Transportation and Communications in this Province, what the hon. gentleman did to try to pressure the Canadian Transport Commission, what he did to try to pressure them to let Eastern Provincial Airways pick up passengers on its way to Montreal and bring passengers back to Wabush?

MR. DOODY: It was enacted by the Government of Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: I beg your pardon.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Tell him, 'Bill'.

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, just to carry on, Sir, with the real needs, the real wants and needs of the people in Labrador, I have given the House the top five, number six is more jobs; number seven is sports and recreation facilities; number eight is better educational facilities; nine is a railway across Labrador; ten, water supply and sewerage; eleven, improved coastal boat service; twelve, more aid for the fishery; thirteen, better senior citizens' homes.

Mr. Speaker, these are the real wants and needs of the people of Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is sincere in trying to patch up the differences between the people of Labrador and the Government, Confederation Building, St. John's at the present time, if the hon. gentleman wants to smooth over the situation and try to keep the people of Labrador quiet until the next election is over, these are the things that the hon. gentleman should have looked at and these are the items that the hon. gentleman should look at before dissolving the House and going into a provincial general election. If the hon. gentleman wants to get the support of the residents of Labrador, if the hon. gentleman is worried about the NDP sneaking under their noses in Labrador West, these are the items that the hon. gentleman

MR. S. NEARY: should be looking at. Sure, it is good to have additional representation in the House, nothing wrong with it at all, but it is pure window dressing, Mr. Speaker. It will do nothing, do nothing, Sir, to smooth over the ruffled feathers of the people in Labrador unless it is followed up, followed up by action on the part of this Government to try to find solutions to some of the problems that I just mentioned.

My hon. friend from Naskaupi and my hon. friend from Mount Pearl and I had an opportunity to go to Labrador West recently for the Winter Carnival and while we were there we attended a meeting. I was invited at the last minute, I was not scheduled to go to the meeting, but the people wanted me to go, they wanted me to go. The hon. gentleman was there sitting at the meeting when I arrived and the member for Naskaupi was there and I had a call from the town hall, they wanted me urgently to come over and attend this meeting. They wanted me so bad they sent the town policeman over for me to take me from the Grenfell Hotel to the town hall in Wabush. And when I walked in, Mr. Speaker, I sat there and I listened, I listened to the comments of the people who head up the recreational groups in Labrador West as my hon. friend did and my hon. friend from Mount Pearl. I listened very attentively to what they had to say and the big problem at that particular meeting, Sir, was the fact that the minor hockey people in Labrador West had to cancel a provincial hockey tournament that was scheduled to take place in Labrador West because two communities, two towns had pulled out because they could not afford to send their teams to Labrador City and Wabush.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you do about it?

MR. S. NEARY: I will tell the hon. gentleman what I did about it; the hon. gentleman knows full well what I did about it and I will tell the House what the hon. gentleman said to me and I will tell this House, Mr. Speaker, how the hon. gentleman and his colleagues got into Wabush and how I had to get in and get out.

MR. F. ROWE: Ah, very interesting.

April 3, 1979

Tape 703

SD-3

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, and further to that,

Sir, apart from having been very disappointed, having to cancel

MR. NEARY:

this provincial tournament the first time to be held in Labrador West. You can imagine the disappointment in these people, but then, Sir, they had to cancel sending their own teams out to the Island of Newfoundland to participate in the minor hockey provincial play-offs that were taking place because they could not afford to pay the high transportation costs and because this Government had put the boots to the transportation allowance for bringing sports people out of Labrador West.

I sat there, Sir, and I listened.

I did not hear anything about our representation in the House - yes, I did. I did hear something about representation in the House. They were very critical of the fact that nobody had raised this matter in the House. I heard the excuses and I heard the weasel words, not from my hon. friend, the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), who, I have to say, Sir, was a thorough gentleman in this particular instance. I heard the weasel words, Sir. I heard the excuses and if I had to have a barf bag, Sir, I am afraid I would have had to barf, and finally I had after sitting there for about an hour and a half, without saying a word, I finally had to say, "Well, I do not know if you gentlemen remember what I said in the last session of the House of Assembly; this very same Government that has put the boots to your recreational grant to transport sports people from Labrador to the Island of Newfoundland, this very Government, the same one that cut down your grant, was the same Government that bailed out the Aquarena over here that will cost the taxpayers of this Province - all over the Province, not just in St. John's - about a half million dollars in this fiscal year." That is the very same Government that will not let you take your hockey players down to the Island of

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland or have your provincial tournament here in Labrador City - Wabush. That is the same Government, and I said if you remember the minister at that time after I had raised it in the House and outside the House made a statement, it was published in the newspaper, that he would do the same, his Government would do the same for any other part of Newfoundland that they did for St. John's and the Aquarena. And I said that statement has never been challenged. "Now is your time", I said to these people, "now is your time to challenge it", because I felt that policy was nothing but rank discrimination against the rest of this Province. Three or four or five hundred thousand dollars it will cost the taxpayers from Wabush and Labrador City and Port aux Basques and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and all the other parts of this Province to keep that Aquarena going and there was no consideration, no compensation, no financial assistance given, or consideration given to the other parts of the Province. The minister made his statement and he made it publicly and I said to that group, "Now is your chance to challenge it", and my hon. friend says, "Yes, and it is a long walk back to St. John's", my hon. friend from Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor). I did not have to walk back to St. John's, Sir. No, and I did not use the government aircraft either. "Long walk back to St. John's", that was his answer. He lost his cool, and the people at the meeting got a great chuckle out of it.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Playing politics with me on this one?

MR. NEARY: Ah, playing politics, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman says, "Playing politics". Mr. Speaker, did Mount Pearl - did the district of Mount Pearl get equivalent compensation to what they are getting over at the Aquarena? Did they get any consideration, any financial consideration?

MR. N. WINDSOR:

They are quite happy.

MR. NEARY:

They are quite happy, are they?

Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman the people in other parts of the Province are not quite happy. That kind of policy, Sir, is what is causing the friction between the Island part of this Province and Labrador. That is what is causing it. That is the kind of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, that is upsetting the people in Labrador West.

MR. HICKEY:

Your friends developed the Aquarena, friends of people on that side of the House.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says - whose friends? My friends? My friends built the Aquarena? Friends of people on this side of the House? Is my hon. friend kidding? I mean, he has to be kidding.

MR. F. ROWE: He cannot make up his mind if he has a mind.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not the way I heard it. I hear that these bloodhounds were in there during the Tory leadership baling it out right, left and center.

AN HON. MEMBER: There you go.

MR. NEARY: My hon. friend better take a look on his side of the House.

MR. HICKEY: I look to both sides.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, they might have accused the hon. Minister of Fisheries during the leadership, they might have accused him or they might have tried to smear him, not accuse him, by saying that he was bought off by the big fish companies. But if I was the hon. gentleman I would take a look a little further down the ranks and see who bought off the other leadership candidates.

MR. RIDEOUT: There you go.

MR. NEARY: Ah, we heard it all, Mr. Speaker, when we had our leadership, John C. Doyle and John Shaheen and all this nonsense and garbage. I would like you to, Sir, take a look right now at some of my hon. colleagues on the opposite side to see where their donations for their leadership campaigns came from and how they could throw their big booze parties. We do not hear very much about that now. My hon. friend, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) might get a little rude awakening.

MR. RIDEOUT: A small sum from Green Bay.

MR. NEARY: I am prepared, Sir, any time at all to debate that issue with anybody in this hon. House. We heard the hon. the Premier say \$15,000 of his was collected down in Green Bay. Quarters and nickles, I suppose, and dimes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I could show you if the hon. member wants to know what came out of Green Bay.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not want to see what came out of Green Bay. I want to see what came out of other places that we have been hearing about.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member wants to he can see it anytime.

MR. NEARY:

My hon. friend need not be one bit ashamed. It will all come out in the wash. If the hon. gentleman just has a little patience it will all come out in the wash. It is not the big fish companies that we need to be worried about. So, Mr. Speaker, the real issues in Labrador again, improved radio and television, better air service, medical services, lower taxes, highway across Labrador and so forth. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I followed up. If my hon. friend is interested in sending a telegram to the former Premier who at that time was responsible for recreation in this Province because he had demoted some of his ministers who were running for the leadership, had kicked them out, so the former Premier was acting Minister of Recreation, I sent him a wire and I told him it was urgent to try to get this provincial hockey tournament back on the rails or at least get the two teams from Labrador City and Wabush area here to the Island of Newfoundland - no response from the gentleman who brought democracy to Newfoundland! No response from the gentleman whose administration, half his administration is under investigation; the gentleman who outlawed the Public Accounts Committee and brought democracy to Newfoundland, who refused to give us a list of secret loans made by the Rural Development Authority and the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation, brought democracy to Newfoundland!

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what the people of Labrador thought of their government back in 1977. One of the questions, Sir, that was put on the questionnaire, "How do you feel about the provincial government in St. John's?". And they had a choice. They could mark very helpful, satisfactory, useless or no opinion. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see how they voted. This poll is pretty authentic and if I were the hon. gentleman I would not sneer or snicker at the people of Labrador. They would be very well advised to pay attention to the results of this poll. Very helpful, 0.8 per cent. Satisfactory, 24.7 per cent. Useless, 50.6 per cent. No opinion, 23.1 per cent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) raised a very interesting point yesterday in his trying to deal and cope with the district of Eagle River. Well, one of the questions on the questionnaire says, Do you think that MHAs, representatives of the government, should tour Labrador communities annually to discuss people's needs? And the answer was, Yes - 74.9 per cent, No - 2.8 per cent; twice a year to hold a special assembly in Goose Bay - the hon. gentleman might pay attention to this one, this is a very good suggestion - twice a year to hold a special assembly in Goose Bay to deal with Labrador problems before attending the House of Assembly in St. John's, Yes - 69.2 per cent, No - 4.5 per cent; Do you think Labrador should continue as a part of Newfoundland? - 61.5 per cent said yes - 14.2 per cent, no; Become Canada's eleventh province? - Yes, 20.6 per cent, No - 25.5 per cent; Be joined with Quebec Province? - Yes, 4.5 per cent, No - 36.0 per cent; Become a Canadian territory governed by Ottawa? - Yes, 19 per cent, No - 25.1 per cent. And on and on it goes, Sir. And if you take 'Become Canada's eleventh province' or 'Become a Canadian territory' and add it together, Sir, it almost amounts to 45 per cent of the respondents voting that way, which is something, Sir, that the hon. new Premier should take account of. The hon. gentleman should take notice of it. It is something that Confederation Building should take a hard look at, that almost 50 per cent of the people who were polled back in 1977 thought that either Labrador should become Canada's eleventh province or become a Canadian territory governed by Ottawa. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit, Sir, to this hon. House that this bill giving Labrador additional representation in the House, as good as it is and as worthwhile as my hon. friend thinks it is,

MR. NEARY: that it will do nothing, Sir, to squash the feeling amongst the people of Labrador about Confederation Building, St. John's and the Island of Newfoundland. And all we need are a few more examples and a few more episodes as took place recently in Labrador West when they had to cancel their hockey tournament and are now starting to look towards the Province of Quebec. It is cheaper to send their teams to Quebec; they can send them over more cheaply by Quebecair; they can have them housed down as far as Moncton in New Brunswick - people take them into their homes. It is cheaper to send them to Moncton than to bring them to the Island of Newfoundland. A few more situations like that, Sir, and I would say that we have had it as far as the people of Labrador are concerned no matter where they live.

If we do not recognize the native land rights in this Province, what is going to happen in the Northern part of this Province, in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, the Lower Churchill? What is going to happen if we do not recognize the native land rights in these areas? And so far we have no commitment from this government, where they stand on native land rights in this Province, none at all. I have heard some weasel words and wishy-washy statements from ministers saying, 'Oh, yes, sure. We hope Ottawa will do something about it.' What is the Province going to do about it? Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat what I have heard so often, Sir, in this Province, that if we had a big population in Labrador, she would be gone long ago, but I believe it is true; it is worth repeating. It is a good thing they do not have the population in Labrador. As it is we are going to have trouble.

April 3, 1979

Tape 706

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say
this to hon. members of this House, Sir: There are two
issues in this Province that have

MR. NEARY: more newspaper clippings, more comments made on them than any other issue I have seen since I came into this hon. House seventeen years ago, and if the hon. the Premier does not believe me, go down in the Legislative Library and look at the piles and piles of statements, newspaper items, comments, brochures, books that have been written about two issues in this Province - the two big issues. Number one is the seal hunt. No, number one is not the seal hunt. It is one of two. Number one is the Quebec - Labrador boundary in Labrador and the other one is the seal hunt. More newspaper clippings on these two items, Sir, than any other thing in the Legislative Library and I presume it is the same in the library over at the university in the Arts and Culture Centre, and yet we come into this House and joke and carry on about it. We think, "Oh, no, nothing is going to happen". Well, we are going to have trouble, Sir, with Labrador. Even with the population we have, we are going to have trouble. Maybe the trouble, I hope - I hope the trouble will develop along partisan political lines. I hope that as a protest, they will not start a movement to pull out or to separate from Newfoundland. I hope first of all that they will elect representatives to send into this House that they think will really give them the kind of representation that they have been longing for for the last several years since 1962 - the kind of representation that they had been crying out for and longing for, because, Mr. Speaker, that may be able to bridge the gap between various parts in Labrador and Confederation Building. There is a complete breakdown in communications at the moment, a complete breakdown. If there is any communication at all, it is probably between my hon. friend's district and Confederation Building - not too much because they think the hon. gentleman is a very nice fellow and they like him, but they do not think they are getting the treatment from

MR. NEARY: government that they should be getting. And I will be going down there Friday night and I will be talking a little more when I get down there. I hope my hon. friend is there and we will spend an hour or two together chatting about it, because as a Newfoundlander, Sir, I am very concerned about Labrador. These are the two items, Sir, two items that have been the subject of more controversy in the last several years, the Quebec - Labrador boundary and the Labrador situation generally and the seal hunt.

The seal hunt we can overcome, but we are not doing very much. Mr. Speaker, this Government decided that they would send off around the world ministers - ministers to try to curb the criticism that we were getting about the seal hunt. Well, what did they do about Labrador? Did they think it worth their while to send ministers down to Labrador to spend the money - to find out what the problem is in Labrador - that they spent on the seal hunt? And I have to laugh, Sir. Recently I had to join with one of the ministers - I do not know which one it was now - in giving Marc Lalonde a flick about - Jim McGrath it was - about his attitude towards the policy of keeping Canada united and Labrador and Quebec and this sort of thing, and I think probably he was misunderstood - I do not know - I do not care whether he was or not, but it gave me an opportunity for the first time in my life, I suppose, to agree with Jim McGrath. I did not agree with McGrath because I think I picked it up before he did.

MR. DOODY: You were his campaign manager -

MR. NEARY: I was in - oh yes, Mr. Speaker, I was never a Tory. I was a campaign manager on Bell Island for Jim McGrath because I liked the fellow.

April 3, 1979

Tape No. 707

GH-3

MR. DOODY:

Because you agreed with him, eh?

MR. NEARY:

Well, maybe I did, but since he got elected this is one of the few times that I had to agree with him, because we have to watch every move. We have to watch every statement. If you ignore it, Sir, the next thing you know they will be moving in and taking her over. So, we have to watch every move that is made, Sir. We have to watch every statement. We have to hang on to every word and not let them get away with a thing, because if you do, Mr. Speaker, I guarantee it will not be too long - it will not be too long before Labrador will be gone - will be gone. So, what I hope will happen, Sir, and I do not care if they send to this House

MR. NEARY:

a Tory, a Liberal or an NDPer. I could not care less as long as they can bridge that gap between -

AN HON. MEMBER: It would be a Tory.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend might be very surprised.

To bridge the gap between Labrador and Confederation Building, this House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, the government in its simplicity over the last six or seven years put a public building down in Wabush and then put a bunch of civil servants in the building without any authority. Hon. gentlemen are aware that you cannot even get a provisional license in Labrador City and Wabush and yet they have people there giving you a driver's test and you have to send into St. John's and you have to wait for the mails and you have to wait to get a provisional license back before you are allowed to drive. What kind of foolish nonsense is that? Is it any wonder that they are talking about regional government in Labrador and they are not talking about the kind of regional government that we discussed in this House last year and debated and then defeated the bill. That is not the kind of regional government they are talking about, Sir. They are going a little further than that.

So as I say, Sir, I do not care whether it is a Liberal, an NDP or a Tory as long as they can bridge that gap and we can hold our own in Labrador. I have a sneaking suspicion that the NDP might be getting a foothold in Labrador, certain parts of Labrador. I will not say where. I am not going to get frightened over that, not a bit in this world. I guarantee if the NDP put a member in this House from Labrador whether it be in the North, South, East or West that you would hear the rights of Labradorians and the rights of Labrador upheld. I guarantee you that.

If I was representing Labrador in this House I would not rest, Sir, until the government recognized the problems of the people of Labrador and did something about these problems and not just ignore it. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope when the hon. gentleman closes the debate, Sir, that he will go a little further than just play these little political games with the people of Labrador by saying, "Oh yes, there is an election

MR. NEARY:

coming up now. We want to get your votes again. So we are going to give you another district so you can have representation in the House." Well, he is going to get no argument from me on that. That is just a little infant step. And it may get the hon. gentleman a few votes and a bit of credit. I do not know. Maybe it will. But, Sir, I will guarantee you this from what I know in my travels around Labrador in the past several years that that is not going to solve our problem. We have to go a little further than that. So I hope when the hon. gentleman is closing the debate that he will stand and tell us what this government is going to do for the people of Labrador, spell it out in black and white, take forty-five minutes. It is worth it. It would be one of the best debates that we will have in this House for this session. Let the hon. gentleman not just get up and deal with the matters that have been raised where the answers are obvious and play little political games with the House and with the people of Labrador. Tell us what the hon. gentleman's administration is going to do for the people of Labrador to try to solve the problems that I outlined in the beginning, improve radio and television, better air service, medical services, lower taxes, highway across Labrador, more jobs, sports and recreation facilities, better educational facilities, railway across Labrador, water supply and sewerage, improve coastal boat service, more aid for the fishery. And tell the House and the people of Labrador West what the hon. gentleman's administration is going to do about the \$90 school tax that the people in Labrador West have to pay as compared to an average of \$75 across the Island of Newfoundland when they have the highest costs of living in the Province, the highest transportation costs, the highest gasoline costs, the highest fuel costs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that IOC are going to unload their telephone service and they are going to dump it over on the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. So up goes the price of telephones

MR. NEARY: in Labrador City. The Public Utilities Board are dealing with that matter right now, and that will mean an increase in the cost of living. And then when Newfoundland Light and Power takes over the distribution of power, another increase for the people of Labrador City, and yet we sit here in our comfortable pews and say to ourselves, 'It is never going to happen. The people of Labrador will not vote to separate. They will not kick up their heels; we will deal with them; we will give them another district; we will give them another member in the House - that is how we will handle it.' Well, as I say, Sir, perhaps I am -

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you expect to do all of this?

MR. NEARY: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I am living in a fool's paradise, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen may not like what they are hearing, but the administration, Sir, have let down the people of Labrador badly. And the hon. the new Premier knows that his administration will suffer the consequences unless he can do something to prop up the image of the Tory Party in Labrador. And the way he intends to do it is to bring in a bill in this House to give additional representation to Labrador. Good! I support it. It is going to be passed by the vote on both sides of this House. Both sides are going to vote in favour of it - it is going to be a unanimous vote - fine, good. But I want to know is how far more the hon. gentleman is prepared to go, or is this it before the next election? Is this what the hon. gentleman - is that his policy to try to solve the problems of the people of Labrador and keep Labrador as a part of the Province of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Cross) If the hon. the Premier speaks now he closes the debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just did a count. I think there are nineteen on this side of the House listening to the hon. member opposite and two or three on the other side. I hope that is not indicative of the support that the respective parties give to the whole question of Labrador development, if it is, the hon. member is all alone over there in the views that he just expressed in the last ten or fifteen minutes.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, let me say I thank hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for the manner in which they have conducted themselves in addressing themselves to this very important bill, a bill to increase representation in Labrador.

I do not know where the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been over the last several months and even over the last two or three years - he has not been in Newfoundland and he has not been in Labrador. Now I do not know where the hon. the member for LaPoile's residency is or where he spends most of his time, but he obviously has not been in Newfoundland, he has not been a part of this Province. Because if the hon. member had been in Newfoundland and Labrador over the last couple of years, he would have seen the additional support that this administration, that this government, has given to Labrador. He would have seen it in spades. And I suppose one of the key things in this - and I think every Newfoundlander, both on the Island and in Labrador, recognizes this - that the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) over the last year has done more to bring Labrador back into the mainstream of this Province than any other single person.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is absolutely no question about that. He is back and forth to Labrador regularly; he is in his district; he responds to a lot of the needs of the local organizations, The Inuit Association, The Indian Association, The Labrador Resources Advisory Council. And, Mr. Speaker, just the other day, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor), when he visited the Combined Councils meeting in Labrador, announced a regional office of that department in Labrador, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Let it go on record, Mr. Speaker, that we have in the past couple of years established a regional office for the Department of Rural Development which does the whole coast there. And there is a gentleman there, Mr. McGrath, who has assistant deputy minister status, who can make decisions in Labrador for Labradorians. There has been a lot of work done on the whole question of Labrador, making it a part of the Province.

I do not know if the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or members opposite know about a DREE proposal - \$150 million, I think - a \$150 million proposal that has been put together by the Department of Rural Development and other agencies of this government to present before DREE for provincial and federal funding for development of the Labrador Coast - a Labrador coastal agreement - to deal with what? To deal just with transportation? To deal

PREMIER PECKFORD: just with water and sewer? To deal just with medical services? No, Mr. Speaker, to deal with all facets of the Labrador coastal development strategy. Did we take that proposal and did we get in some cavern in the Confederation Building and concoct it and send it off to Ottawa and have a group of bureaucrats in Ottawa who have never seen Labrador before approve it and reject? No, Mr. Speaker, we did up that Red Book and the hon. present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Doody) is familiar with this document. We presented it then to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council whom we fund \$90,000 a year and ask them to go to every single community affected in Labrador and say to the people in those communities, "What do you think of this proposal? Is this the kind of proposal or the kind of development that you want to see? If not, please tell us and we will consult with you and find out." As a result of that democratic exercise, a proposal now is realistically put together after consultation with the people of Labrador for a proper development of the infrastructural needs of coastal Labrador.

One can go on, Mr. Speaker, endlessly of the various initiatives taken in the last two or three years to try to ensure that the Labrador part of our Province feels more a part of the whole mainstream of the Province. Our native agreements, Mr. Speaker, with the federal government, these native agreements are what a lot of provinces and individual groups across Canada have been looking for, bloc funding. It is not done according to any particular formula, except by population, and various community councils in those native communities get a bloc sum of money. For example, the Community Council of Nain or Hopedale will get two or three hundred thousand dollars a year with no conditions attached, for all intents and purposes,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and that community council, that local group, that local government has the responsibility then to determine within certain broad parameters how that money is to be spent on their grounds - in their conditions.

You know these are attempts to give some flexibility, some autonomy to local communities along the Labrador coast and, therefore, reflect in some small way some positive initiatives that have been taken by both levels of government to try to involve the people of Labrador.

The landing strips, Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, on the transportation side it was this Government that started landing strips before the federal government and the provincial government signed an agreement on it, we could not wait any longer, Mr. Speaker, and we decided to move on our own and spend a fair amount of money - close to a million dollars or more than a million dollars - on a landing strip in Cartwright. Now since that was begun, other landing strips in the hon. member for Eagle River's community of Nain - the landing strip has been completed, I guess by now. In Makkovik I think it is just about completed and other ones are going to be done.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) here has done more for fishery development in Labrador than any other single man since 1949 on fish-handling facilities and plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Labrador Resources Advisory Council which is an agent representing the people of Labrador, funded by this Government to the tune of ninety to a hundred thousand dollars a year, to say to us critically, constructively, critically to the Government, "This is what you are doing wrong. This is what you are doing right. We advise that

PREMIER PECKFORD: this is the way that you should go on this. This is the way you should go on something else." Here is an outlet for the people of Labrador to have some say in resource development matters and not surprisingly we have gotten some really good reports from them. It was the Labrador Resources Advisory Council that the Department of Mines and Energy consulted on the oil and gas regulations. As a matter of fact, it just so happens that one of the few groups in the Province that responded in a responsible way and with a lot of detail on the oil and gas regulations was the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, and now we have another group, the Combined Councils, who are all getting together in Labrador, where the Minister for Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) went and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) were a week or so ago to respond to some of the issues there, and other people.

I hear there was a meeting before the Leader of the Opposition turned up by a group down there to consider whether they would stay in the hall when the Leader of the Opposition came in, but that is his problem not mine.

But, in any case, and I do not think there was any such meeting as to whether they were they were going to greet the Minister for Rural Development or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As far as I know, they almost kissed these two gentlemen so there is a difference in the way that the people of Labrador respond to different political parties and I think that personified itself two weeks ago.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, you know even on the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, here is a tangible realization, if you will, of a desire on behalf of the Government, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

to try to bring on stream some power developments. Studies are ongoing in Labrador now to determine whether in fact we can have Lake Melville open for a longer period of time than hitherto has been possible. Is the technology available? Can we do it feasibly, financially and all the rest of it? So great strides are being made and this particular act, Mr. Speaker, does not pretend to address itself to many of the other problems that exist both in Labrador and in the Province. It is an attempt to make a small but important political reform to give the people of Labrador additional representation. For that I make no apologies. There will be other initiatives when the budget comes down and in the next several months as we are dealing with Labrador and dealing with other parts of the Province. But surely we should not detract from the whole impact of this bill which is simply to increase representation, to give another voice through this House, to impress upon hon. members from all over the Province the importance of the needs of Labrador.

Now there were a number of hon. members opposite who mentioned about other things, other than the whole question of the number of seats in the House. There are a number of members who mentioned about the salaries of members, that they were not high enough and they should be higher, and there seems to be some feeling around the Province along those lines. That will have to be looked at and we can look at it and see whether the members of the House of Assembly are now being paid sufficiently or not and the amount of travel allowances. There is some regional considerations given now to travel allowances. Somebody in St. John's does not get as much as somebody in Labrador. Yet it could be true and no doubt it is in the hon. member for Eagle River's (Mr. Strachan) position that that is still not enough for him to do justice to his district. So there has to be some consideration to that.

The whole question of a permanent commission to look from time to time regularly at the whole redistribution of seats is a good idea

PREMIER PECKFORD:

brought up by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe). The whole question of members' offices, the whole thing of office space in this building for the government and for the members of the House of Assembly is an ongoing problem that we have. Perhaps there will be some relief in sight as some of the other departments move out of this building. I might relax some space for us on that.

The main issue at stake here, Mr. Speaker, in this bill is simply that this administration this day and yesterday, now clearing it up today, has moved to try to give some semblance of action as it relates to Labrador problems, not that that is all the problems. There are other problems in Labrador West that nobody even mentioned as it relates to the IOC in Wabush and the environmental problems with dust down there. The whole question of more decentralization of regional offices out from the center not only to Labrador but to other parts of the Province who feel sort of left out, the whole question of a railway or the trans-Labrador highway which is extremely important and must be addressed. There are a lot of problems.

On the coast it is different. In Southern Labrador you have a partial highway now which is completely inadequate to service the needs of the Straits people, totally inadequate. And everybody who has been down there recognizes that and the amounts of money that are going to be needed there, \$150 million DREE agreement, \$300 million or \$400 million or \$500 million trans-Labrador highway, \$200 million or \$300 million railway, water and sewer system for one community, \$1 million or \$1.5 million. We have got to address this through DREE because the Province cannot handle it itself. We have got to address it through the Ministry of Transport. We have to address it through whatever way we can to ensure that improvements in Labrador are made. And here is one improvement, an improvement to increase the amount of representation from that part of the Province and I am proud and happy today, April 3, 1979, to move second reading to this extremely important bill which we do not apologize for but are extremely proud about and will brag about around this Province for years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For Additional Representation For Labrador In The House Of Assembly," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 18)

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

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the adjournment motion, I would like to inform members of a communication I have just received from the Chief of Police related

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Ottenheimer) to the matter which I drew to the House's attention this afternoon, dated today, "In reply to your letter received earlier today concerning the obtaining of photostat copies from a machine located within the precincts of the House of Assembly by the Deputy Assistant Chief during the course of an investigation on October 2, 1978, I have been informed upon questioning the latter that he had no knowledge of the fact that he was within the precincts of the House of Assembly, even though I am convinced that there was no attempt to violate the precincts of the House of Assembly, I consider it nevertheless a most unfortunate incident. On behalf of the Newfoundland Constabulary, I extend our profound apologies. (Signed) J.R. Browne, Chief of Police."

I hope hon. members will agree with me in that that will conclude the matter,

and I am sure the hon. members would agree with me also in thanking Chief of Police Browne for the efficient and speedy and satisfactory manner in which this matter has been dealt.

The question before the House is that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'. Carried. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m.