

VOL. 4

NO. 3

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.

WEDNESDAY, 6TH. DECEMBER, 1978

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a resolution, seconded by my good friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan). The resolution reads:

WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador was the only province to give a railway to Canada; and

WHEREAS there is great danger that the railway service in Newfoundland is to be abandoned; and

WHEREAS there are over 2,000 employees directly working with C.N.; and

WHEREAS the user pay concept is causing great hardship to all Newfoundland consumers; and

WHEREAS the railway is being deliberately downgraded:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores the action of the C.N. Railway to curtail services and employment, and urges the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to have the Canadian National Railway service brought up to the same standard as in our sister provinces;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the actions in recent years of downgrading the railway are viewed by this House as a violation of the spirit and intent of the Terms of Union with Canada and specifically on Term 33 of the Terms of Union;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, if necessary, all members of this House of Assembly will present themselves in Ottawa to deliver this message to the Government of Canada.

I move that it be tabled now,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Answers to questions for which notice has been given.

MR. PECKFORD: Can we revert to Notices of Motion?

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have leave to revert to Notices of Motion? Agreed.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Facilitate The Development Of The Hydro-Electric Power Potential Of The Lower Churchill River Basin."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions on the Order Paper of December 5, 1978.

The answer to question number one is 'No, not to the knowledge of the appropriate officials in my department.'

MR. HICKMAN: consequently the second part of No.

1 is not applicable -

MR. NEARY: Or to the minister's knowledge?

MR. HICKMAN: -or the minister. I will add one rider in nebulous qualification that I am aware that two small files some years ago involving a very minor offence were stolen from a junior prosecutor's car but retrieved forthwith. But they were very minor and the police were very prompt in recovery.

The answer to No.2 is my department have no statistics on the matters asked therein and if the information is retrievable it would take approximately four to six months to acquire same.

The answer to No.3; one is no and consequently number two is not applicable.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. POWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the fact that the actual unemployment rate or the actual number of people unemployed in the Province has gone up since October, according to reports, from 30,000 to 31,000 people in the last month, in view of the fact that the unemployment rate is actually going up regardless of what the seasonally adjusted rates may say, there may be a marginal difference there, but the actual number of unemployed has gone up, would the minister care to explain to the House why the blueprint for development, which was suppose to create jobs and reduce unemployment in this Province, has failed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly what blueprint he is speaking about. If it is the Throne Speech and our efforts, if it is our efforts to do this, I think if you look at the adjusted rates or whatever it is you will see that last year at the same time there were 103,000 people in the

Mr. House: work force and this year there are 204,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: - and that means our rate has gone up by 5.7 per cent, the rate of people in the work force. We have added in the year according to these statistics 11,000 people, which is an increase of 6.7 per cent in the work force this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Would the minister give the House statistics - I assume he has the statistics and the figures on it; he did not seem to know what the blueprint for development was all about. I guess the government neglected to tell him about the blueprint for development enunciated in the Budget - would the minister indicate to the House - I am sure he has got these figures, if he does not he should - how many people left this Province in the past twelve months to seek employment elsewhere?

MR. NEARY: In Iran.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have these figures. I will endeavour to get them if they are available.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think I will direct my question, Sir, to the Government House Leader, because this is really a matter of government policy, and not the Minister of Social Services, who really I suppose should be answering the question but he does not seem to know anything about what is going on in the department; I want to ask the Acting Premier if he would inform the House of what procedure the government will take once the Government of Canada has announced that they are going to increase the family allowances by \$200 a child per year for those earning under \$18,000? And when the Government of Canada announced increases before, this Province took it away from people on social assistance. What procedure will be

Mr. Neary: followed now when the new increase of \$200 per child a year comes into effect the 1st. of April? Will this government take the increase away from those who are receiving social assistance in the Province?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland has not made any policy decision with respect to that matter as yet. It only recently passed Parliament a couple of days ago. It will not become effective until April of next year. Some reporters and political commentators in Ottawa, and I certainly am not prepared to say I agree with them, say that it has something to do with a contest that must be held at that time whether or not

MR. HICKMAN: the Prime Minister wants it. But at the appropriate time that decision will be made and also the other agonizing decision will have to be made and that is what is going to happen to Newfoundlanders as a result of the savage cut-backs in unemployment insurance benefits by the same government.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is aware, I would assume in his answers, aware that the Government of Canada gave increases previously and this government took them away, and the minister could not indicate what his government's policy would be at this particular point in time. But could the minister indicate to the House when the mothers of this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, can expect to get a decision from the administration, whether or not they are going to benefit by the increases or they are going to be taken away by the Moores Administration?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: The mothers of Newfoundland, as all Newfoundlanders, will be advised of any decision taken by this government as soon as conveniently possible and promptly and in great detail.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: With Christmas coming on, Mr. Speaker, I imagine all those earning less than \$18,000 a year, Sir, may commit themselves, over the Christmas period, may commit themselves in the way of credit and so on. Could the minister indicate if the mothers who may commit themselves financially in anticipation of receiving this \$200 a year per child from the Government of Canada, in anticipation of this if they commit themselves, could the minister tell the House whether or not a decision will be made before Christmas, before the mothers go out and spend the money in advance or in

MR. NEARY: anticipation of receiving it the 1st. of April?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, even to answer that question would be an insult to the mothers of Newfoundland because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that with the exception of the hon. gentleman opposite, every mother in Newfoundland knows that she holds the family allowances in trust for her children. And to suggest that the mothers of Newfoundland would go out and borrow money and commit that trust money that may be received in April, I suggest is an insult to every Newfoundland mother and I certainly would not be a party to aiding and abetting that kind of insult to these deserving mothers in Newfoundland who do such an excellent job in raising fine Newfoundland families.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, then the hon. member for St. John's West.



MR. S. NEARY: As a result, Sir, of the cutbacks that were made before when the mothers of this Province lost the increase in the family allowance, there are children in this Province today going to school with no shoes on their or very little footwear, no overshoes, very poorly clad and so forth and so on and they may be forced, because of this government's action of cutting back the mothers' allowance to go out and get credit in anticipation of receiving the \$200 a year. Now will the minister indicate, because of his government's own action of taking this away before, will he indicate whether or not they can now go out and buy clothes for their children, buy footwear and the things that they need to go to school and so forth and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite is hoisted on his own petard and I do not propose to let him down.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West followed by the hon. gentlemen for Bay of Islands and Windsor - Buchans.

DR. H. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Housing and it concerns a most serious situation which was aired on the CBC programme last night Here and Now and an earlier installment which appeared sometime previously dealing with the CMHC's Virginia Park housing project in the East end of St. John's. I personally have written to the minister, national minister in charge of Urban Affairs, to ask him to set up an investigation into this whole question both into the quality of the building standards that were allegedly used there and also into the question of possible impropriety in some of the negotiations that may have to be taken place. Now my question is this-I intend to inspect these houses, to visit and to look at them and to bring along with me someone who is skilled in the whole area of housing standards and look at this-and my question is this to the Minister of Housing, will the minister accompany me in this inspection, would he carry out his own inspection, what action does

DR. H. KITCHEN:

he propose to take with respect  
to this very serious question with respect to housing in the East  
end of the City of St. John's?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Housing.

MR. T. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I can only tell my  
hon. friend that immediately when this came to my attention I asked  
my officials

MR. HICKEY: in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to document to the greatest extent possible this situation at Virginia Park. I do not know much about it other than what one could view on television, anymore, I suppose, than he himself knows. I have asked for that to be done. I have asked as regards to our position in attempting to help the people in question and I have also asked for meetings to be arranged between ourselves, myself and some people from the corporation, and Central Mortgage and Housing, to determine once and for all their position before we take it to the federal level - or the ministerial level, I should say, in Ottawa. And finally the only thing I can tell my hon. friend is that we are as appalled as he is at the conditions, number one. I do not think there is any question in terms of establishing what has happened to the homes. CMHC talks about certain criteria with regards to brick, that it met certain standards and so on and so forth. That is academic as far as I am concerned. The facts indeed are that the brick is crumbling and whether they met standards or whether they did not is immaterial at this point in time.

The only other thing I can say is that if at some point in time it will do any good I am certainly not opposed at all to visiting the area. Indeed I intend to and if necessary I welcome him along, or I can go with him. I am not opposed to that either. The thing is that in all of this there are one group of people that I am sure he and I share the same view that must be foremost in our minds and those are the homeowners. No stone should be left unturned, indeed no stone will be left unturned by this government and by my ministry to ensure that some relief is forthcoming and forthcoming from the people who are responsible. At this point in time I can only say that to the best of my knowledge that is the Federal Crown corporation and not in any way this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, the question is largely one of urgency, too, because it is very important to establish the facts, I think, before Winter sets in too hard. The information that seems to be coming forward is that the houses are deteriorating almost on a daily basis. Every time a frost occurs the house gets that much worse and not only is it brick, apparently, involved but other aspects of the construction. So I am wondering if the minister could assure us that the whole procedures will be speeded up so that action can take place very shortly on this matter and any visitation that we can do will happen virtually immediately, in the next day or so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Housing.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I can again tell my hon. friend that as recent as yesterday I informed my officials at Newfoundland and Labrador Housing that I wanted immediate action on this, I wanted whatever personnel were necessary to be put on it, to put on paper and to establish clearly the position, and to determine for me what measures should be taken and what steps should be taken to bring it to a successful conclusion.

I might say to him in reference to what was aired last night that there are a number of issues and a number of question raised here. Certainly I do not minimize the importance of some of the other questions that were raised in those two programmes, but I think he will agree that first things first are the homeowners, the conditions of the homes, and whatever remedy is necessary to sort that matter out. The other things are certainly items which are of great importance but certainly must take second place to the one I just outlined.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for the Bay of Islands next, followed by member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Communications, I will keep Transportation for another day. It is

Mr. Woodrow: based, Mr. Speaker, on reports I have received. I have received numerous complaints from the residents on both sides of the Bay of Islands of experiencing crossed telephone connections and service interruptions on a regular basis.

MR. WOODROW:

Coupled with these problems there is the very unrealistic exchange rates which force residents to pay long distance rates to communities located as near as five miles away. And here are the questions:

There are two questions, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to ask the minister if he would intervene to Newfoundland Telephone Company on behalf of the area residents for an improved telephone service with a view to the elimination of long distance exchange rates where possible? Secondly, if he would request that Newfoundland Telephone charge its approximately about 1000 subscribers perhaps a \$1.00 extra a year in lieu of the are long distance charges?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, having had some experience with telephone systems and knowing about that particular problem, the problem with respect to what the member is talking about, extended area service in the Bay of Islands region, basically the main exchange in Corner Brook did not have the capability of switching, and this was up to 1975, all of the different telephone exchange numbers in the Bay of Islands area so at that point in time it was virtually impossible to switch all of the different code numbers in that area. Since 1975 I understand they have changed I believe at least one area code and I believe will have to change two or three more in order to accommodate EAS service, extended area service, between McIver's and Lark Harbour. They do have it on the North side of the bay and in some areas on the South side of the bay, but in order to get the whole area as part of extended area service they would have to make some other modifications and I will take it up with Newfoundland Telephone Company.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans,

I had indicated.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications as well.

I will just say that when the four year agreement for the reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway was announced, the road between Bishop's Falls and Grand Falls - and I might point out that this specifically was the only area on the Trans-Canada Highway in Central Newfoundland, in the immediate central area, that would see reconstruction - the Grand Falls/Bishop's Falls road was announced as being a priority to start in the first year. Now obviously it has not started in the first year, and the question that I want to ask the minister; Is it still considered a priority and will that reconstruction and twinning start in 1979 which would then be the second year of the four year agreement?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Trans-Canada Highway agreement signed by my predecessor, we had some \$60 million associated with Trans-Canada Highway upgrading, and, of course, we will continue that programme and try to get more funds for further development. What is covered under the agreement, and, of course, we will certainly go for the 90/10 -

MR. DOODY: But we will not sell the railway in the process.

MR. DINN: - But we will not sell the railway in the process, absolutely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: The \$60 million covered is St. John's city limits to Donovans, \$4 million; Chance Cove intersection to Goobies, \$9,470,000.

- MR. STRACHAN: Whose bid (inaudible).
- MR. FLIGHT: How about the Grand Falls bid?
- MR. DINN: Does the hon. member want the answer or is there any control he can have over the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan)? I understand his constituents would like to control him.
- MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This period should be restricted to asking questions and giving answers, or refusing to give answers as the case might be, but not to debate.
- MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was just a tit-for-tat rule that I was using.
- The West boundary of Terra Nova National Park to Gambo and George's Lake to Crabbes River, the last two were \$13,000,500 and \$33,030,000 for a total of \$60 million.
- MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.
- MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.
- MR. FLIGHT: Then I can take it, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has just indicated to the House that the road between Grand Falls/Bishop's Falls is not being considered under the present agreement signed for the upgrading and reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway?



MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. minister.

MR. DINN:

I just mentioned the highways that were to be done under the programme and the hon. member should be able to interpret from that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir followed by Conception Bay South and Bellevue.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Your colleague (inaudible).

MR. F. WHITE:

(Inaudible) is pretty concerned back there now. You had better turn around and tell him.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. The question relates to the government's much announced plans about the Polytechnic. The last commitment I heard in this House was a year and a half ago when construction was to have begun during the 1977 construction season. We are now almost past the 1978 construction season. I wonder would the minister indicate what the government's plans are now on the Polytechnic? Has it been shelved altogether or what is the situation on it as of now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I think it was last year during the sitting of the House we did pass the Polytechnical Institute Bill setting up the Polytechnical Institute to proclaim at a later date. And I said at that time that we had been having negotiations through Intergovernmental Affairs with Ottawa, DREE, on a cost sharing arrangement for this particular unit. We had our planning done, we put the act through to try and facilitate it and, of course, we sent our specifications to them. They wanted to look at it again and then they came back to us to review the plans and they agreed to cost share a committee to review the plans -

MR. SIMMONS:

The Feds.

MR. W. HOUSE:

- the Feds, yes - a cost shared agreement with us, ninety/ten I think it was. And that has been done

MR. W. HOUSE: and we are still waiting word from them. Negotiations, I understand, are still going on. It is being done through Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Education saying that this is another clear case, such as the Labrador linerboard and the fisheries deals, is this another case where the programme was announced without the agreement of the Federal Government as to cost sharing? The government certainly has the full prerogative to announce what it wants as long as its going under-  
rate the cost, but is the minister saying now that at this point in time the funding for this project has not yet been nailed down?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to go back a little further because it was, I believe, five or six years ago we made representation to the Federal Government at that time for shared funds for a Polytechnical Institute and shared funds for pre-vocational wings on existing high schools to implement some of the pre-vocational programmes. We got a definite 'no' on the one on the pre-vocational but we got encouragement to go ahead and do the planning for the Polytechnical Institute and that has been done. When I introduced that bill, and I think I was very careful to say this at the time of the introduction of the bill and in any questions that were asked, I always say it is predicated on the Federal Government input and we have had good negotiations so far and I am hopeful that it will be a reality.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, one more time. Is the minister saying that he does not have the funds for this project despite the fact that he in speaking to the bill indicated in answer to a question from me that the construction would start in that construction year? That was his answer, no if's, and's or

MR. SIMMONS: but's, it would start in that particular construction year. Is he now telling us, Mr. Speaker, that the reason he could not keep his commitment to the House was that he did not have the funding nailed down at that time, or he had it nailed down and it since became unstuck, if you like? What is the problem that it has not gone ahead? Has the government changed its policy on the matter, changed its decision or is it just a simple matter that it does not have the money and indeed did not have it at the time he indicated to the House the job would go ahead in that construction year, the 1977 construction year?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, at any time that I said the construction would go ahead my words were predicated and I think it was clearly pointed out that it was pending an agreement with Ottawa which we were working on and are still working on and subsequent to that they came back and said that the programme that we had envisaged was a little bit ambitious and to take another look at it and they set up this committee with us and that is where it stands now. Again I say that

MR. HOUSE: We are hopeful that there can be an agreement on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, followed by Bellevue and St. George's.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and I realize that in order to get this information it may be necessary for the minister to communicate with Ottawa and the federal department there. It is in connection with the prices of food in this Province which I know he monitors from time to time, but there are a number of things that I would like to have some information on and I feel the people would, in view of the current high food costs. For example, and I will give the minister the name of the supermarket in question in private if it is okay with him, rather than here in the House. The question, Sir, is as follows. If, for example, I am Kraft Foods and I buy \$20 million worth of goods a year, is there a requirement that I then have a rebate of between three and seven per cent - I would call it a kickback - to the supermarket, based on the total amount purchased each year? That is question one. I can meet with the minister later to go over any detail on this that he would like to go into.

Secondly, if the minister is selling goods to the supermarket in question or their chain and he has his goods, say, on the eye level shelf, does he have to pay for that? How much does he have to pay? Because my information is that if you have your goods, whether it is soap suds or whatever it is, at eye level you have to pay to have it there in that spot.

And the third part of the question is this, that if the minister were selling goods to a supermarket and because, say, of unions within the shop he is not allowed to send his own man in to

MR. NOLAN: stock the shelves, would he then be required, if the supermarket paid, say, \$5,000 or \$10,000 to have it done, would he then have to pay the supermarket that amount? In other words, just to have the shelves stocked.

And the final part of my question is if the minister were selling a product or products and he were advertising, say, in The Evening Telegram, or The Daily News for the supermarket in question, would he himself have to pay for that ad and not the supermarket, as I understand is the case? I realize it is a bit of a complicated question. I would be happy to meet with the minister on it but I would like to hear his views on it if he has a moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, all the questions asked, as far I can gather, have nothing whatever to do with Consumer Affairs. If I wished to make a deal with any store to pay them \$100 for a front shelf that is up to the dealer and the person. If I wanted to put an ad in a paper and I want the front page I will pay \$200, if it is a third or fourth page I will pay less. But I believe that the gentleman asked the questions in all sincerity and I would like to have the questions on paper so as I could give it to my consumer officers and I would certainly detail all the answers that are necessary. But to my knowledge, in free trade, and this is the answer I get from Ottawa at all times, that there is nothing whatever that we can do here as far as the special place in the store is concerned, whether I want a back shelf or a front shelf, I could be friends with someone and they would say, "You take this shelf. Someone else take that one." So any of the questions, as far as I can understand, have no relevancy whatever to any control that I, as Consumer Affairs Minister, or the Federal Minister of Consumer Affairs, would have over the sale of these goods.

MR. MURPHY: But I would be only too happy to have the hon. member drop in and we can chat over the whole matter as far as these questions are concerned.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman, now that he has decided to return to the House after announcing publicly that he would not be returning to the House, would the hon. gentleman tell us if there has ever been any complaints about suppliers being forced to kick back to the big food chains in this Province, to give the food chains kickbacks in return for getting the business of these supermarkets? Have there ever been any complaints? And if not, would the minister investigate the matter to see if, in fact, this is the practice of the big supermarkets like Dominion Stores in this Province, to force suppliers to give them kickbacks in return for buying their product? And if they do not provide a kickback of five to seven per cent then they are kicked out of the store, they do not do any business with these supermarket chains. Has the minister heard of this? Is he aware of it? Will he investigate it? This is a very, very serious matter and a very dangerous practice indeed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I have never had any complaints about anybody being threatened, because if there are no kickbacks they will not sell their goods. And I am sure that the hon. gentleman, with lots of time, can compile a list of 4,000 or 5,000 firms and I will be only too happy to have all of these firms looked into to see what practices they use.

MR. NEARY: Dominion Stores is the one I mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's

MRS. MCISAAC: My question is for the Minister of Transportation.

It has to do with the district of, I guess it is the West Coast, but the district office is in Deer Lake. And in view of the fact that the district is, I would say, twice as large in mileage as other districts in the transportation field, I wonder if the minister would look at the possibility of maybe having Stephenville or somewhere in that area set up as a separate district? The Deer Lake district now, I understand, is taking in the Southern part of the Coast of Labrador, they have the Baie Verte Peninsula, the Northern Peninsula, and all the way down to Burgeo. Along with that, we are going to have a new road to Burgeo which would also fall under that one district. Is there a possibility of splitting that district? Would the minister take a look at it and see if it is possible to probably set up a district in Stephenville?

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is always a possibility of developing more districts in the Province. I do not know if it will improve the service out there, and I guess that is what we are ultimately trying to do, improve the service. I did visit district number four and it does go from St. Anthony all the way down to Port aux Basques. We do have a Burgeo road that is going in there. There may be a need for a new sub-depot, for example, just for the Burgeo road alone. And we will be looking at those possibilities as time goes on and if the need arises we will certainly think about setting



Mr. Dinn: up a district in Stephenville. But as of right now we do not see the need for it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this is Private Members Day and the first resolution on the Order Paper for Private Members Day is Resolution (1), but with the unanimous consent of hon. members it has been indicated that if Your Honour will call the resolution just presented by the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) that it will pass without debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand there is unanimous consent that before proceeding to Resolution No. 1 a vote will be taken on the resolution of which notice was given by the hon. member for Ferryland, without debate.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a standing vote on this?

MR. W. N. ROWE: A good idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: A recorded vote.

MR. HICKMAN: We have got to wait until it is read first.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Pardon?

MR. HICKMAN: We have got to wait until it is read first.

MR. NEARY: Well, we are going to grant the consent. We only wish that the hon. gentleman would have had the courtesy to have somebody on this side second it, because we have already discussed the matter and the tradition is that usually it is back and forth. That is why we would like to have the vote recorded, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Fine. I will put the question, then we will vote on it and then if there is a request for a standing vote that will be taken. The question before the House is; WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador was the only Province to give a railway to Canada:



Mr. Speaker:

AND WHEREAS there is grave danger that the railway service in Newfoundland is to be abandoned;

AND WHEREAS there are over 2,000 employees directly working with CN;

AND WHEREAS the user pay concept is posing great hardship to all Newfoundland consumers;

AND WHEREAS the railway is being deliberately downgraded;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House deplores the action of CN Railways to curtail services and employment and urges the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to have CNR services brought up to the same standards as in our sister provinces;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the actions in recent years of downgrading the railway are viewed by this House as a violation of the spirit and intent of the Terms of Union with Canada and specifically of Term 33 of the Terms of Union;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if necessary all members of this House of Assembly will present themselves in Ottawa to deliver this message to the Government of Canada.

Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "Aye" .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Aye".

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the other members will stand with me -

MR. W. N. ROWE: Before the standing vote, solely for the purposes of showing the unanimity involved in this resolution, I understand from talking back and forth with the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan), that he will consent, Mr. Speaker, to drop as seconder and I would suggest that my hon. colleague, the member for LaPoile district (Mr. Neary), which has one of the greatest railway districts in the Province, be added as the seconder. Is that agreed?

December 6, 1978

Tape 91

PK - 4

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will agree to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay. Fine.

Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: If members agree we can call it five minutes. Is it agreed that we consider it as if five minutes have elapsed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Well, apparently it is not agreed. We had better wait for five minutes.

Those in favour of the motion please stand. The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, the hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Rural Development, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Education, Mr. Carter, Dr. Collins, Mr. Young, Dr. Farrell, Mr. Wells, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Power, Mr. Cross, Mr. Lundrigan, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Woodrow, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs McIsaac, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Neary, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Lush, Dr. Kitchen, Mr. Callan, Mr. Flight, Mr. Canning, Capt. Windsor, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rideout, Mr. McNeil, Mr. Jack Winsor, Mr. Moores.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried unanimously. It being Private Members Day we proceed to Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This being one of the most important items ever, I believe, likely to come before this House this session I am delighted that it has come on so early so that we can get an early debate on it and hear the views of every member in the House on this matter of such overwhelming importance to the people of the Province, namely, the problem of unemployment which has been a plague to the Province for the last number of years particularly.

MR. W. ROWE: You will notice, Sir, from the statistics that the unemployment rate in this Province went up astronomically in 1972, or the start of the astronomical rise was 1972 which happens to coincide with the takeover of the administration of the government of this Province by the party opposite. The figures, the statistics show that in October of 1978 there was a labour force of some 204,000 and there was an actual unemployment rate of just about 15 per cent, a seasonally adjusted rate of just about 17 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that compares with the jobless rate in 1971, in the same month, of about 9 per cent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in the years since 1971 the jobless rate in this Province has just about doubled. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the number of the unemployed has more than doubled over that period of time. The actual unemployed figure for October of 1978 was 30,000 unemployed and the actual number unemployed in 1971, October 1971 was 13,000. The number of unemployed people has more than doubled in the time that this government has been in power.

MR. W. N. ROWE: When I asked the questions on Question Period to the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower, he tried to give the impression that the unemployment rate has, in fact, gone down in this Province, whereas as reported in today's Daily News it can be seen that 31,000 people were unemployed out of a work force of 198,000 as of November, and by comparison there were 30,000 unemployed in October of the same year, two months ago, out of a work force that was 6,000 higher. In other words, in October, the unemployment figure was lower and the work force higher, and in November, one month later, we see that the work force has decreased but the number of unemployed people has actually gone up. The seasonally adjusted figures vary from month to month for reasons known only to statisticians, but, Sir, the figures speak for themselves, the unemployment rate has, in fact, gone up in actual figures every year and practically every month since this administration came to power.

Something which is particularly discouraging concerning this government's administration and looking after of the economy, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the young people of our Province, those between the ages of fifteen or sixteen and say twenty-five, the youth in our labour force, show that they are by far the greatest proportion of any group unemployed in our Province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, of the 30,000 or so which are unemployed in our Province, about one-half of them are in that age group, fifteen or sixteen to twenty-four or twenty-five - 15,000 unemployed as of October, 1978 in that age group. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment rate among our young people is close to 50 per cent. The figures say about one in three or one in four are unemployed. In fact, I would say, Sir, that when you take into account

MR. W. N. ROWE:                   the discouraged young people, that our unemployment rate can truly be said to be that one out of every two, every second young person that you meet today, Mr. Speaker, is unemployed, which is a very bad indication of what is going to happen in this Province in the future.

  In addition to those horrendous figures, Mr. Speaker, we have the situation where tens of thousands of our young people particularly, but also family

MR. W. ROWE: men and women over the last seven or eight years have been forced in tens of thousands to leave Newfoundland and Labrador and to go to Alberta, to go to Ontario, and to go as far away as Iran, Saudi Arabia.

The hon. Minister of Tourism talks about resettlement programmes. Well, the new Newfoundland resettlement programme is to send our workers off to find jobs in Saudi Arabia and Iran. That is the new resettlement programme, Saudi Arabia and Iran. I would like when the Minister of Labour gets up to speak, I would like him to give the House if he can, I hope he has a grip on some of these figures, I would like him to give the House of Assembly some figures as to how many people in the labour force have left Newfoundland and Labrador since 1972 when the government with which he is associated took over in this Province. How many people? Tens of thousands, Sir. I would say, 5,000, 6,000, 7,000, 8,000, maybe 10,000 a year are being forced to move out of the Province and go to Alberta, Ontario and these other distant foreign countries in order to find employment.

What I am saying, Sir, is that the unemployment figures themselves are somewhat misleading. Even with people moving out of the Province unfortunately in their droves, the tender mercies of this Government still cannot create the employment which can take care of those who are left behind. And some 30,000 to 35,000 are perennially unemployed in our Province of which 15,000 are young people. And what kind of a depressing, psychologically depressing and depressed state must they be in, Mr. Speaker, to be searching for jobs and not to find them? The fact that their names occur, and their names or the figures occur in the statistics, 15,000, that is the number who are actively looking for work in our labour force, there must be

MR. W. ROWE: others, tens of thousands, who have given up in despair, in disgust, completely discouraged at the thought and the fact that this government has not been able to look after, in any kind of a viable, economic way, the growing labour force and the young people who are coming into the labour force. And then, of course, there are the 15,000 or 20,000 who are family men and women, families to look after, who cannot find any kind of employment whatsoever to look after their families and have to live on unemployment insurance or on welfare, which is a very, very terrible situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is all bad enough that the government has not been able to provide any kind of adequate employment opportunities for our growing labour force and the people are forced to leave, but what is just as bad is that the government, and we have the Minister of Education with us as well in the same - having two portfolios, Education and Labour, so he can speak to this as well - but what is just as bad is that there is no direction whatsoever, as far as I can make out, given by the government to schools, to technical training colleges, trade schools, to high schools, no direction at all, no information of any substantial kind given to indicate to young people who are coming into the labour force what are the best job opportunities in the Province and what are likely to be in the future the best opportunities for employment in the Province.

A couple of years ago we had a situation where young people were being enticed by the government and by the university into the teaching profession, only to find themselves in the third year or the fourth year having the Minister of Education coming out and saying that there is going to be a cutback in the number of teachers necessary in the Province and that many of those currently, then at that time training to



MR. W. N. ROWE: become teachers, educating themselves to become teachers, would not be able to find jobs in this Province when they got out of university. Now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of direction is that? And that is in an area which can be wholly controlled or foreseen by the government. What about areas where private enterprise enters more into the picture? In those areas, Sir, the government, I would submit, has given no sense of direction -has no sense of direction and has given no direction or information to young people as to what they should go in for, what is most available to them in this Province, or if they have to go to the Mainland of Canada while our economy is building, what is available across Canada in the meantime while they are waiting to come back to this Province. No kind of direction like that, Sir, given by this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Your leader?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, no, we were having a private conversation.

MR. CANNING: We were waiting for you to stop talking over there.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I did not want to interrupt the conclave over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: You cannot hear what the member is saying with the conversation going on on the other side.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) leadership.

MR. NEARY: He can only speak for (inaudible)

MR. W. N. ROWE: Well, there are four of them there. The four of them together might make a leader. There is no single one.

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

MR. NEARY: Speak from your own seat, Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: I nominate 'Carter'.

MR. W. N. ROWE: 'John Carter'.

MR. SIMMONS: Appears to be the best of that lot over there.

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: Anyway, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: He does not agree with my nomination.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He does not agree with your nomination - I do not blame him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. members to my left to keep their voices down, please.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is a government which is always talking about lowering the tone of the House, Sir, and I must say they do not show too much respect for the dignity or decorum of the House.

Mr. Speaker, why have I put down this resolution on the Order Paper? Because it is clear that this administration headed by the Premier, who is unfortunately absent - I hope he will be back by Thursday or Friday so he can answer a few questions. Mr. Speaker, why have I put down this resolution? Because, Sir, clearly the government of the Province, the ministers of the Province, headed today by the Deputy Premier over there, have lost control of the economic situation despite the fancy words and blueprints for development and so on, have no firm grip on where the Province is going, have no policy for full employment in our Province, a policy of full employment which is accepted now by just about every democratic nation in the world. The United States, even as conservative as they have been in many economic policies, is coming around to the concept of full employment.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible)

MR. W. N. ROWE: Senator Humphrey died two years ago.

MR. W. N. ROWE: This government, Sir, have lost control, have no grip at all on the economy and job provision in the Province.

So what I have suggested in my resolution is that a Select Committee of this House, half a dozen or so from both sides, be appointed to hold hearings in a wide variety of areas of Newfoundland and Labrador for a definite purpose, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of obtaining the ideas of a large cross section of the general public, a source of talent and information and ideas that this government have never tapped, solicit ideas for full employment, permanent employment, job opportunities - the general public including, of course, representatives of labour unions throughout the Province, business associations - what can be done to help them provide more jobs, and the academic community for what they can contribute to the overall area.

MR. HICKMAN: Did you hear of that last group from the member for St. John's West?

MR. W. N. ROWE: That last what?

MR. HICKMAN: That last group, the academic community.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Yes, what about it?

MR. HICKMAN: Did you hear that from the hon. member for St. John's West?

MR. W. N. ROWE: He is no longer a member of the academic community. He is now a member of

MR. W. ROWE: the political community and doing a good job.

MR. SIMMONS: Any more than the minister is no longer a member of the legal community.

MR. W. ROWE: He is not supposed to be.

MR. NEARY: He still has his name on the door down there.

MR. W. ROWE: I would say he will be making use of the name after the next election, whether he runs or not.

MR. NEARY: Maybe he will disassociate himself. I do not know.

MR. W. ROWE: Whether he runs or not.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister has had his name on a lot of places he has had no impact on.

MR. W. ROWE: This Select Committee, Mr. Speaker, to hold the hearings in a wide variety of places, to tap the talent and ideas and information available everywhere, interested individuals, to get information and ideas regarding the development of job opportunities in the Province and having done that, having made sure that all ideas are canvassed throughout the Province and across Canada for that matter, get some ideas elsewhere as well, it is further resolved in the resolution that without undue delay the Select Committee draw up recommendations for early consideration by this House and the provincial government with a view to producing a clear plan and a firm plan, Mr. Speaker, for the joint and co-operative action of the provincial and federal governments designed to provide stable, full and permanent employment for all workers and all people wanting to work in this Province.

I am not one of those, Sir, who think that the provincial government can do the job by itself, I do not think that can happen, I think that we need the joint co-operation of the provincial government and the federal government to create the job

MR. W. ROWE: opportunities in this Province using the private enterprise system that we have. But, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government in this Province must take the lead, They must take the lead. The federal government is looking after the whole economy of Canada. What we want is a provincial government that takes the lead in formulating a plan of joint action with the federal government, such a plan of joint action based on recommendations made to it by a Select Committee of this House, the government having lost control as far as ideas are concerned. Perhaps if they are provided with a few ideas, perhaps then the government can enter into a joint plan for action and development.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: Speaking in silence as the hon. member so often requires us to. Mr. Speaker, the area of the fisheries, for example, is an area which has been sadly neglected by the government. We get a flurry of energy, a flurry of activity whenever the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier gets involved with a large multinational corporation. We see that happening.

MR. SIMMONS: Did you see that programme last night on T.V. on the fisheries?

MR. W. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I was down at a meeting last night. I did not see the hon. member there, the hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS: He was trying to save the railway at the -

MR. W. ROWE: Down with twenty or thirty other politicians, Sir, who were concerned enough to attend the meeting. The Premier could not go because he is ill, The Deputy Premier should have stepped in at that point, I would submit, and give the people who were assembled there - most of them were unionists, members of trade unions, associated with the railway. But the hon. Deputy Premier was not there. I do not know why. He was home watching television - All in the Family and so on.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) with the Minister of Transportation,

December 6, 1978

Tape No. 96

AH-3

MR. HICKMAN: the Minister of Municipal Affairs and that very popular man Mr. John C. Crosbie Q.C., M.P., that it was going to be redundant for me to be there.

MR. W. ROWE: So, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. W. N. Rowe: that is where we were. I did not see the programme on the fisheries, but I do know that this government is a government which is married to the idea of co-operating with gigantic multinational companies. We never saw a flurry of activity by this government as great as when the Nordsee proposal was before the government. Then they were doing everything, putting pressure on Ottawa to get that deal through, highly inflating the figures involved as to employment and the investment which would be made.

But, Mr. Speaker, whenever it comes to helping the smaller independent operators, for example, around the Province, we do not see the government getting too active about that or too highly involved in it. What we see is a government which is wedded to trying to help the large corporations. But I do not think the future of the fisheries is in large corporations, Mr. Speaker, when it deals with what is going on around the coast of this Province. We have a policy which I wish this government would follow. We will implement it when we get the opportunity, but I wish this government would follow the policy.

The policy is making the inshore and the nearshore fishery the top, the highest priority in the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery. That is the policy, Sir, to make sure that the traditional way of life in the fishery is preserved, that as many men and women who can be involved in the fishery are involved. The inshore and nearshore fishery is labour intensive rather than capital intensive, as the gigantic deals cooked up by the government are. They do not employ nearly enough labour. What they do is employ capital at the expense of labour and, Sir, also, at the expense of efficiency, because it has been shown that the nearshore and the inshore fishery and the use of the relatively small boats employed by our fishermen on the Northeast Coast, for example, is the most efficient way to catch fish. We have a government, Sir, which

Mr. W. N. Rowe: has done very little about trying to get the marketing of fish under control and the further processing of fish under control in this Province.

We are exporting all of the time frozen blocks of fish and all the processing takes place elsewhere. Now, I will admit that it comes largely under the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, but, Sir, this government should be putting pressure all the time on the Government of Canada to lower the tariff barriers, negotiate the lowering of tariff barriers in the United States and in Europe to allow further processed produce, fully processed produce from this Province to go into these markets, Europe and the United States and Asia. The government will not do it, they will not put that kind of pressure on, and they should, Mr. Speaker. They should do that.

We could have, Mr. Speaker, several times the number of people presently employed in the fishery catching fish and processing fish around this Province than we do now, if the right things are done. And we should do it, Sir. Because that alone could sop up a lot of the unemployment problem, and that alone, Sir, could help this Province do away with the 30,000 or 40,000 joblessness that is going on here now, the number of people without jobs. That alone could do away with half or more of the jobless rate in this Province.



MR. W. FOWE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other areas as well. If we were to obtain, as we have been pressing on this side of the House, say \$400 million or \$500 million per year from the Upper Churchill, which we should be entitled to, which would equal the revenue which comes from every other source in Newfoundland to the provincial government, if we did that then we would find, Mr. Speaker, that the government of this Province would have enough money from provincial sources alone, added to federal sources, enough money, Mr. Speaker, to provide the services, provide the much needed services, hospitals, roads, public services of all kinds, on a continuing basis, and it would not be as we have had over the last number of years, a situation where it is boom or bust - rev up the economy at election time and rev it down when we are between elections - we could have it on a sustained level, on a decent level at all times.

\$400 million, for example, Mr. Speaker, which is double the amount of money spent every year now by the provincial government on all public services, capital investment in the run of a year, a tremendous amount of money, Sir, which could provide many jobs on a continuing basis. I am not one of those who think that government jobs are not real jobs for some reason or other. The construction industry should be up at a certain level and it should remain at that level on a sustained basis, constantly maintaining and constantly building over the future. And that could bring in a tremendous amount, or could rev up the economy and have the effect of bringing about a tremendous amount of employment, Mr. Speaker, as well.

I would say, Sir, that if these things, these kinds of things are done, that we would find that we could not only serve the growing labour force and the young people who stay in this Province, but we would also be in the position where we could welcome back into our Province the young people and the families who

MR. W. ROWE: reluctantly had to leave our Province to find employment elsewhere and that is only as it should be. We should have the buoyancy, the economic buoyancy to make sure that the people who are living elsewhere now do have the opportunity to come back here and work in their native Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I want to touch on. It deals with unemployment and it deals with the activities or the actions of certain ministers of this House. I do not know where the Minister of Tourism is, is he within ear-shot? I would like for him to hear what I am going to say.

MR. NEARY: He is up doing an interview upstairs.

MR. W. ROWE: Well I will start my few remarks. I hope he hears -

MR. NEARY: He is squirting his poison upstairs.

MR. W. ROWE: I hope he hears what I have to say, Mr. Speaker, because it is important that he hear it and it is important that members of this House and members of the press and through the press the public, hear what I have to say on another important matter, dealing with the general economy of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, one of the less pleasant aspects of politics in this Province is that sometimes in order to protect your good name, in order to protect your honour you have to get into what somebody described one time - President Truman, as a matter of fact, described as 'a stink fight with a skunk.' It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot have politics on a high and honourable and decent level but sometimes you do find yourself getting involved in a stink fight with a skunk. It is hard to win, hard to win in a stink fight with a skunk. All you can really do, Mr. Speaker, is try to protect

MR. W. N. ROWE:                    yourself from the stink,  
deflect as much as you can and clean the stink off you  
as best you can, but it is hard to win against that kind  
of politics.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Tourism yesterday in, I would say, one of the lowest ebbs that this House has reached in a number of years, the lowest ebb, I would say, that this House has ever reached - I could see from the way the member for Kilbride district (Mr. Wells), the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and the Minister of Justice were squirming in their seats that they thought it was one of the lowest ebbs that this House has ever sunk to - the hon. the Minister of Tourism made certain innuendoes, made certain statements, made certain charges and asked certain questions. Certain questions are valid questions. One does not mind answering questions. For example, the minister has asked; wondered publicly why in 1974 I resigned from the House of Assembly. Well, Mr. Speaker, in 1974, I resigned from the House of Assembly and I made a statement at that time. And as I mentioned, the reason why I resigned from the House of Assembly at that time was a very personal reason based on the fact that I as a young man had been actively involved continuously in politics for eight straight years. I had been first elected to this hon. House at the age of twenty-four, Mr. Speaker, two months after I graduated from university. Two months out of university, I got elected and then spent eight years in politics, in the hurly-burly of politics. After those eight years, when the Liberal Party was on the upswing, as it was in 1974, I decided in consultation with the leader at the time and my colleagues that what I would do was resign from the House of Assembly temporarily. The Liberal Party, as Your Honour will remember, was in good shape in July of 1974. We had won

MR. W. N. ROWE: the Fall before a by-election in Hermitage district. There was a federal election in July of 1974 which I participated in and all my colleagues participated in, where we brought the Liberal Party federally in Newfoundland up to four seats, a majority for the first time since 1968.

What I decided to do after those eight years in politics and the party being in good shape, was resign temporarily, for a personal reason. I do not mind saying what the personal reason was. I had at that time become more or less satisfied with my contribution in provincial politics. There was a Leader of the Liberal Party in control, a man who was going to, I thought and expected, win the next election when it was called in 1975, and should have won it, of course; but, Sir, through no fault of his own, through other things that happened, the election was not won. What I decided to do; Mr. Speaker, was continue in politics but enter into the federal field. That is what I was going to do - enter into federal politics. And in order to prepare myself for the entry into federal politics when the opportunity presented itself, I took a decision to learn the French language, as Your Honour has done. Perhaps Your Honour will get into federal politics sometime as well.

Anyone who gets into federal politics and anyone who aspires to any position in federal politics, I would submit, Sir, must be bi-lingual, and I certainly did not want to be a backbencher in Ottawa all my life, so I was going to become bi-lingual and learn the French language. And, Sir, if plans had gone according to plan, I would be preparing myself now for running in this present upcoming federal election.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

But things did not go quite according to plan politically in the Province. We lost the 1975 election and upon my return to the Province I decided that I would get involved in provincial politics and go for the leadership of the Liberal Party. It is an opportunity which presented itself, an opportunity which I accepted. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that a little later.

Let us look at the manner in which I resigned from the House of Assembly in 1974. Let us just have a look at the manner in which I resigned.

The hon. minister with his innuendoes and his slanderous remarks would indicate I resigned in a hurry and took off out of the Province. That is what the hon. minister would indicate.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

He did indicate.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

He did indicate and would indicate and wants to get across. In fact, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour may recall, certainly your predecessor in office will well recall, I announced my resignation from the House of Assembly in July of 1974 and I made my resignation effective as of September 1st., 1974 or it could have been October 31st. but it was one of those two days. Your Honour would have the latter on file in there. About a month and a half transpired from the time I announced my resignation and my resignation becoming effective.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was more or less, two and a half months.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It was October 31st.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

A couple of months, August, and part of July and part of September, a month and a half, two months. I was in this Province working on behalf of the district which I represented and I stated at the time that the reason I gave such notice, the month and a half was so that this government could call a by-election, so that the district of White Bay South would not be left in the lurch, a by-election could be called to replace me in that district. If government refused to do that that is not my

MR. W.N. ROWE: fault, I had no control over what the government did there. I had a passport, Mr. Speaker, and a Visa to go to France. The passport, Mr. Speaker, was issued in May of 1974 -

MR. RIDEOUT: Go on.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Hurried up, rush job -

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, that was rush job.

MR. W.N. ROWE: May of 1974 a passport is issued to me with a visa on it allowing me to go to France.

MR. RIDEOUT: That was a rush job, getting that through.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I announced my resignation in the middle of July 1974 and it becomes effective in September and I leave the Province amidst much fanfare, I might say, from my friends and so on the third day of September 1974. Who went with me? I scurried off somewhere I suppose. Who went with me? My wife and my two children accompanied me to France. Where did we go? How much time did I spend in Paris? Three days is what I spent in Paris because, as I announced in my resignation announcement, I was going to the South of France in order to study French. So where did I go? I went to a house in the South of France, in a village ten miles up from the coast called St. Francois, St. Francis, a house which I had rented in a hurry, Sir, in a great hurry in May of 1974 to become effective, my rental, I was to take occupancy in September of 1974. I enlisted the aid, as far as renting a house was concerned, of a gentleman by the name of Monsieur Houde who is the Consul General for the South of France. He assisted me greatly in this and travel agents - not travel agents, real estate agents in the South of France found this house for me and we rented it. When I got over to the South of France,

MR. W. N. ROWE: arriving there on about the 4th. or 5th. of September, we went into our house there, I enrolled my two children in a school in St. Francis in accordance with plans already made in May of the same year with that same school - it was a big rush job - in May of that year, and I enrolled my two children in that school in September, a French speaking school. As a matter of fact, it was a one room school with twelve or so children in it and they learned French in about two weeks, as a result. My wife and I, being very deficient in speaking the French language, enrolled in an internationally known college or school of languages known as Berlitz in the South of France in order to learn the French language under scientific conditions in a milieu where French was spoken. My wife, subsequently, I might add, enrolled in another institution. I continued with my French studies under Berlitz and so on, my wife enrolled in another institution in the same area called College International; she went there for several months.

Now how long did I stay in France, Mr. Speaker? A couple of weeks? A week? A month, maybe? From the time I left Newfoundland in September of 1974 until the time I came back I was in France for ten continuous months, ten months, most of which was spent in this community in which I lived. Did I come back?

MR. MORGAN: Not going to school though.

MR. ROWE: Did I come back during that period of time, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WHITE: You, shut up!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, could you keep -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: You listen to the truth.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Could you keep this quiet?

MR. FLIGHT: Shut up and listen to the truth.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, did I come back to Canada during that ten month period? No! Did I go anywhere else during that ten month period aside from, I believe, a side drive to Venice, in Italy



Mr. W. N. Rowe: during Easter holidays, during that ten month period? No! Ten months spent going to Berlitz doing French studies private tuition, children enrolled in school, wife enrolled in College International, ten months in the community of St. Francis on the South of France.

MR. MORGAN: Not ten months in school.

MR. WHITE: Resign.

MR. FLIGHT: Resign, boy!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me finish my statement, if Your Honour will permit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign again.

MR. RIDEOUT: Put it on the Table or shut up!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now did I come back during the period? No, I said.

Is there any testimony or evidence of the fact that I spent ten months in France? Well, Mr. Speaker, a little, just a little. For example, during the ten month period I had numerous visits in person from family and friends in the South of France. For example, in the month of April Richard Gwyn an internationally known journalist, a good friend of mine, and his wife spent several days with us at our home in the South of France.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Now, now!

MR. FLIGHT: Did you know that 'Jim'?

MR. RIDEOUT: Do you know him?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone else know about where I was? Well, somebody might ask Bren Walsh of the CBC, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who? Who?

MR. W. N. ROWE: - who in November or December of the same year called me and located me in my home in the South of France, called



Mr. W. N. Rowe: me from St. John's Newfoundland and we had a telephone conversation, Mr. Speaker, called me and located me in my home. Anyone else? Well, we might ask the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) who was operating an open line programme out of Grand Falls, I believe, it was in the same period of time, who called me on at least one occasion and had me on open line programmes, called me at my home in the South of France. He located me in the South of France during my period of residency there.

MR. MORGAN: Ten months in school?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Keep quiet! And shut up!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, is there anything else?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shut up! Shut up!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: You should be thrown out the window.

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

Hon. members on both sides should both refrain from interfering and let the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak without interruption.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is there anything else, Mr. Speaker?

Well anyone who wants to call a gentleman I have already mentioned, Mr. Houde, who was a Consul General in France

MR. W. ROWE: with whom I carried on personal and telephone conversations and became great friends with over the ten month period knows full well where I was. There is no need to have any innuendoes about where I might have been.

Mr. Speaker, during the period of time that I spent in France, in the South of France the hon. Don Jamieson in Ottawa called me and spoke to me on the phone, located me without any trouble whatsoever. He did not have to go scurrying around. He called me in my home in France and I spoke to him on a matter of public policy and so on sometime in April or May of the same year, 1975. During the same period of time, Mr. Speaker, I had numerous telephone conversations back and forth with my law partners, Thoms, Fowler, Rowe and Barry, the partnership that I belonged to at that time, back and forth. As a matter of fact one of the persons with whom I had continuous conversations, perhaps on a monthly basis, was Leo Barry, a law partner of mine, a former minister of this government, a man who I would say, Mr. Speaker, without going too far, would not sit in the same government with a certain hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: No trouble, Mr. Speaker, All you had to do was pick up the phone and dial the number of my residence in France and the chances were, if I was home, I would pick up the phone myself and respond to the conversation. And this is what anyone who wanted to contact me did on scores and hundreds of occasions, I would venture to say. Now anything else? Anything else, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) going to school for (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Shut up, 'Morgan'.

MR. W. ROWE: No, just about several hundred letters of correspondence back and forth between myself and my bank manager downstairs here, most of which I do not mind saying were to borrow more money to keep me alive over there, correspondence back and forth and phone calls. The Royal Trust Company corresponded back and forth on a monthly basis, the Royal Trust Company which had taken over the



MR. W. N. ROWE:

my school in Berlitz, enrollment of the children, Mr. Speaker, bank receipts. He could have asked me, Mr. Speaker. Does he ask me? Does he, Mr. Speaker? Does he ask me? Does he ask me, Mr. Speaker? No. Now, Mr. Speaker, listen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Table the registration (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may have some silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must insist that hon. members not interrupt.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the CBC, a responsible news gathering, investigative journalism institution, were interested in certain things being pushed around by the hon. minister and had the decency to come and ask me; they said "Listen, we are interested. When you left Newfoundland and went to France, what did you do, where were you and so on?" I said, "Come with me, my friend. Come to my home down here in St. John's and have a look."

MR. MORGAN: Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege I must hear.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just made a comment that an investigative reporter of CBC came to him on a matter that he said was 'being pushed' by me. Would the hon. gentleman have the courage to say 'what' is being pushed by me?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point, of course, on which the Chair has any problems. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I said "Come down, my friend, come down to my home and I dug out a box". I sat him down in my den and I said, "Here, look, have a look". Receipts galore, school enrollment, passport, I believe I showed to him, I believe I did, if I did not anyone can see it. Pictures, Mr. Speaker, pictures taken with a camera of me and my family, many of them dated with the dates on the back in various parts of the south of France. Pictures, documentary evidence - I said "There, my friend, have a look". We had a chat for a couple of hours and on he went, presumably satisfied. I heard nothing back. If he wants to know, if any member of this House ever wants to look at any documentation belonging to me, let them feel free to do so.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was in France for ten months from 1974 to 1975, from September to the first part of July. I was and nobody can doubt that, there is no reason to doubt it. But, Mr. Speaker, let us get along a little further and ask a few more things. If I was not in France, I was, but say I was not in France during that period, say I was in Australia studying the Aborigines, so what? What has it got to do with me as leader of this party or as a member of this House? Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I was in the south of France for ten months, but say I was not, say I was in the South Pole checking on the mating habits of the penguins, so what? What has it got to do, what has it got to do with my leadership of this party or my membership in this House? I studied French in France. Say, I did not, so what? What has it got to do with the leadership of this party or my membership in this House? Say I was not in France, I had been in Montreal for ten months, not to learn French because in those days French was scarcely spoken there, but say I was in Montreal for ten months during that period of time, my question, Sir, is so what? What has it got to do with anything? What has it got to do with, Mr. Speaker? What kind of innuendo and what kind of allegation or accusation is inherent in, is tied up in the questions and the sort of semi-accusations made by the hon. minister in this House yesterday? What, Mr. Speaker, what has it got to do with? Can Your Honour inform me as to that? Can any member of the House inform me as to that? What is behind the questions, the innuendo, the squirt of poison, what is behind them? That is the question I ask, Mr. Speaker. What is behind the questions? The hon. minister said yesterday in this House that he has been investigating something for eleven months. Now, it so happens the eleven-month period happens to coincide with my assuming of the leadership of

MR. W. N. ROWE: this party. His so-called investigation did not take place before that, it has taken place since that. Now, for what purpose has this so-called investigation been going on? Will I be charitable and say that an hon. minister or an hon. member of this House is prepared to resort to anything to cling to power? Will I say that? - prepared to resort to anything to cling to power, in an effort not to be thrown out of power? Is that what we are faced with? Would he cling to power at any cost? Some of his colleagues do not agree, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Justice, I am sure, would not agree with that philosophy, from the look on his face yesterday. The member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), other members, would not agree with that philosophy. They would not agree to cling to power at any cost no matter how low a person may stoop to try to cling to that power.

MR. MORGAN: You did not take French for ten months in France.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. FLIGHT: No wonder! Shameful thing!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, what has this great investigation consisted of for eleven months? We have had eleven months of investigation by this member of the House, he says. What has it consisted of? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, what it has consisted of, it has consisted of eleven months of whisper, eleven months of whisper, whisper, whisper, whisper behind his hand - that is what the investigation has consisted of - eleven months of whispering falsehoods and half truths in this city and perhaps beyond, as the Minister of Justice will be very painfully aware, since he is aware of the whisper campaign as I am, and it has affected somebody very close to him.

MR. W. N. ROWE: And that hon. minister should know that many of his colleagues - I have not talked to all - many of his colleagues are disgusted at the whisper, whisper, whisper campaign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me call the hon. minister's bluff. Let me throw out a challenge to the hon. minister. My challenge is this: Go outside the House, call together the press and state publicly to them what he has been whispering privately for eleven months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Let him go out, Mr. Speaker, let him go out, Sir, and publicly state -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go outside the House 'Jimmy'. No guts!

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

I require hon. members on both sides to cease interrupting.

I specifically call upon the Minister of Tourism not to interrupt any further, but I point out to hon. gentlemen on my right that it can be very difficult to impose that if, obviously, there are interjections toward him from that side. So I ask all hon. members to not interject at all.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, so that my challenge is not mistaken by the hon. minister, what I am asking him to do is, if he has the courage and the guts, which I doubt, let him go out there and call together the press and state



MR. W.N. ROWE: to them publicly, state publicly, Mr. Speaker, what he has been whispering privately, slanderously behind his hand for the last eleven months. Let him do it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am waiting, Mr. Speaker. I would like the hon. minister to go outside the House and state publicly, let him say publicly, Mr. Speaker, what he has been privately whispering for eleven months, let him do it now. Let him show if he has the guts and the courage. Let him do it, Mr. Speaker, outside of this House. Let us see if he has the guts and the courage to do so. I doubt very much if he has.

MR. MORGAN: He did not attend university in France, he did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. MORGAN: He spent two months in school in Berlitz.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

MR. NEARY: Name him, Sir.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, now, Mr. Speaker, I see he will not go outside the House. He will not go outside the House do -

MR. MORGAN: In due time I will

MR. W.N. ROWE: In due time, Mr. Speaker. Do it now, or have the decency to remove yourself from the chamber, Mr. Speaker. Let him go out there, Mr. Speaker. I am waiting for the hon. member to go outside the House and publicly state what he has been whispering behind his hand for eleven months, smear and slander. Now, Mr. Speaker, let him do it. We are waiting, Mr. Speaker, everyone is waiting with bated breath to hear the minister say publicly, to show the courage and the guts. Let him do it, Mr. Speaker. We are waiting for him.

MR. SIMMONS: I think your sin is you did not go to school long enough to please him.

MR. RIDEOUT: If he never went to school at all, what is the point?



MR. W. ROWE: So what?

MR. NEARY: Yes he did, he went over to university. We all know about that episode over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, yes, there are some other people's names in police files.

MR. W. ROWE: Do the hon. members of the House - are we waiting for this hon. minister to go out and say publicly what he has been stating privately behind his hand, secretly and slanderously? Are we?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come on now, do it, now! Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Your colleagues are ashamed of you, ashamed of you! Shame - resign.

MR. FLIGHT: Your colleagues are ashamed of you.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Guts.

MR. MORGAN: Stop making a fool of yourself, little man.

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

MR. W. ROWE: No guts and no courage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No courage.

MR. W. ROWE: Whisper, whisper, rumour-monger. Call his bluff, Mr. Speaker, call his bluff.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! I have already admonished the hon. gentleman to my left and also hon. gentlemen to my right not to interfere and to interject. When there is a dialogue going on between right and left it makes it very difficult for the Chair to impose the necessary order, so I again specifically repeat to the minister not to interject, but in so doing I have to say to hon. members to my right that they have to desist from remarks to that hon. gentleman which are almost an invitation or a provocation for him to interject. So I wish and require that the hon. gentleman to my left not interject and in so doing that hon. members to my right not interject either.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, to continue my few remarks, I hope that members of the public will, as a result of this unfortunate episode which makes politics so distasteful in this Province, recognize once and for all what the cause of any of the lowering of decorum or dignity in this House has been now and in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go on with my few remarks regarding the unemployment problem in the Province. I dealt, Sir, with the fishery and I dealt with, and I dealt with the need to get the Upper Churchill power back in our own hands so that we can provide a decent livelihood for our growing labour force. Mr. Speaker, there are other areas of employment opportunities in the Province as well

MR. W. ROWE: that had not been fully realized and that have not reached their full potential. The forestry industry, for example, would be one example of that where, I believe, there is a need for greater rationalization of the forest holdings and so on to provide more job opportunities to the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to hear yesterday from the Minister of Industrial Development that there would not be any cutting of wood in Labrador, for example, when the Linerboard mill is converted, which is a sad state of affairs for the people of the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area, very sad, and I do hope that the Government is preparing some plan of action to help in that area. Mr. Speaker, what has happened in the Goose Bay/Happy Valley area is a very sad situation and unfortunately no hope has been presented by the Government as far as relieving the situation is concerned. I do hope that the massive forestry resources in that area and in other areas of Labrador can be used and that the Government has some plans for that because, Sir, Labrador, as far as I am concerned, if the full potential is reached with our hydro resources, our forestry resources and the further processing of our natural resources, I would say that the economic centre of gravity of this whole Province, in the long-term certainly, twenty-five to fifty years, will be moving towards Labrador and we will see tens of thousands more people living there.

So, I do hope, Sir, that Government does have some plans of development for Labrador. They do not appear to, Mr. Speaker. We do have policies on this side of the House for the development of Labrador. We presented them at a conference last year. We got the agreement of the Federal Government and the Prime Minister, and one of the fruits of that effort was the agreement which the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland have now entered into. And I hope that that realizes its potential as well, later on.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have an opportunity, of course, to speak again when the debate is closed up on this. Suffice it to say, Sir, that I commend this resolution to all members of the House and do hope that it gets unanimous support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution on unemployment. Members will recall last evening - those who attended the meeting over at St. Mary's Hall - and the Minister of - not Transportation - what is the minister's title now, the minister who is speaking for the Government? Transportation?

AN HON. MEMBER: Industrial Development.

MR. S. NEARY: Industrial Development. The Minister of Industrial Development speaking on behalf of the Government, Sir, could only come to one conclusion that if something is not done about the Newfoundland Railway to upgrade and modernize the railway and bring it up to parity with railways in other parts of Canada three thousand more people will be thrown on the unemployment rolls. Three thousand more of our fellow Newfoundlanders today feel that their jobs are very insecure and that they will soon join the ranks of the unemployed unless, Mr. Speaker, certain action is taken.

Now the Minister who was speaking for the Newfoundland Government last evening, and who got a little bit carried away at the tail end of his few remarks, did some fancy figure-skating on thin ice, as far as I am concerned. The Minister speaking for the Premier and for the Government of this Province did not make it clear to these three thousand Newfoundlanders

MR. NEARY: just where the Provincial Government stands regarding the Newfoundland Railway. The Minister just repeated, reiterated what had been said previously, that the government are for motherhood, the government are for keeping the railway. But Mr. Speaker, the Minister very carefully avoided telling the audience and telling the people of Newfoundland just where the Newfoundland railway stands in order of priority. Is it equal to the Trans-Canada Highway? Is it less? Has it greater priority? Or is the Minister and the government avoiding that question, which is the key question, which was the answer that the people at that meeting were looking for last evening and went away disappointed. Where does this Provincial Government stand regarding the Newfoundland railway? Where does it stand in order of priority? Now, Mr. Speaker, our Federal counterparts came in for some severe criticism last evening, maybe rightly so - I do not know; only time will tell. But, Sir, just to prove my point and if this government does not state its priority these 3000 Newfoundlanders or more - I would say if you use the multiplier effect, Mr. Speaker,

I would say you are talking about anywhere from 12,000 to 15,000 Newfoundlanders who will be affected directly and indirectly if that railway closes down, and will be thrown on the unemployment rolls, anywhere from 12,000 to 15,000 Newfoundlanders. So, Mr. Speaker it is up to this government here to take the initiative and let the people know where they stand as far as the order of priority of the railway is concerned. Why do I ask that question, Sir? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have in front of me here, and I am prepared to table this, Sir, a letter dated October 17, 1978, written to a Mr. D.V. McDuff, Canadian Legislative Representative of the United Transport Union, Suite 709, Metropolitan House, 99 Bank Street, Ottawa, Ontario. Dear Mr. McDuff: - and I might say the letter is written to Mr. McDuff by the Hon. Otto Lang, Minister of Transport, the gentleman who has come in for so much criticism of late, especially in connection

MR. NEARY: with the Newfoundland railway, the gentleman, Sir, who did not do any fancy footwork. The gentleman who wrote this letter, Mr. Speaker, I think put the case fairly and squarely, put the thing in its right perspective as far as the Newfoundland Railway is concerned:- "Dear Mr. McDuff: Thank you for your letter of September 21 on the subject of the railway in Newfoundland. In your letter you raised the question of the federal position regarding the future of the railway. As you pointed out, the Hon. Don Jamison has stated that it is not the policy of the Federal Government to phase out the railway,"-it is not the policy of the Federal Government to phase out the railway." This is correct," so states Mr. Lang. But listen to this Mr. Speaker, just pay attention to this and I hope the hon. gentleman, although he pretending he is reading there, will just listen to what Mr. Lang says: "The Government of Newfoundland has rejected the recommendation for abandonment on the basis of social and economic effects and has expressed the view that the railway can become a viable service in the Newfoundland transportation system." Well and good up to that point, so be it - great, wonderful, motherhood: "In correspondence to Premier Moores, the Prime Minister of Canada has stated that if the province establishes the upgrading and revitalization of the railway as high priority, the Federal Government will take that judgement into account." Should I repeat, Sir, for the benefit -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Blackmail!

MR. NEARY:

Oh, blackmail! The hon. gentleman is using his legal tactics again, twisting and turning.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman is trying to be smart-alecky again. There is no blackmail involved in that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give up the Trans-Canada.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there it is. Now we know what the priority is. The priority of this government is the Trans-Canada Highway and they could not care less about the Newfoundland railway.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. two gentlemen who are now speaking for the Newfoundland government, let me ask them this; has the Newfoundland government gone to Ottawa and asked for x number of dollars to be put into upgrading the Newfoundland railway the same as they have done with the Trans-Canada Highway?

MR. DOODY: We told them to upgrade it forthwith.

MR. NEARY: Upgrade it forthwith. A blank cheque.

MR. DOODY: That is right (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know now, I can see what the answer is going to be when the hon. gentleman gets up. The answer is going to be it is blackmail. The answer is going to be, "oh, we in Newfoundland are third class citizens because we have to decide between a Trans-Canada Highway and a railway." That is untrue, Sir. It is not true. We can have both.

MR. DOODY: Nova Scotia had to do it.

MR. NEARY: Nova Scotia did not and my hon. friend knows that is not true. They do not have to. Newfoundlanders do not have to.

MR. DOODY: They do.

MR. NEARY: They do not, Sir. That is in the minister's little corrupt - no, not corrupt, that is not a proper word - in his twisted mind. That is in the minister's twisted mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I got an excellent reception. I got a standing ovation. So, Mr. Speaker, this is a figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination. The Government of Canada according to this, Sir, this letter that was written to a union representative on the Mainland that the hon.



MR. NEARY:

gentleman never thought would ever see the light of day in this Province, Mr. Lang says it is up to the Newfoundland Government. It is up to the Newfoundland Government to get their priorities straightened out.

AN HON. MEMBER: What priority is it?

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, it is a priority. It is one thing for this government to say we are all for motherhood, we are all for keeping the Newfoundland railway and then sit back and let it die a natural death—because that is what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, and that is what this government is doing—when we can have both. We can have upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway and we can have upgrading of the railway system and we can have upgrading of our airports.

MR. DOODY: Can you get that for us in writing?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I have it here in front of me in writing.

Mr. Lang is saying to the government, get your priorities straightened out.

MR. DOODY: Yes!

MR. NEARY: Ah, yes. We will soon hear the dirt now and the muck being fired at Mr. Lang, not at members of this House because I hope hon. gentlemen have learned their lesson about getting down to personalities and smear tactics, the likes of which we never saw before in our lives yesterday and will never probably see again in this hon. House, never see it again. I hope they have learned their lesson on that and will not start to get personal unlike Mr. Crosbie, the member of Parliament. What was it he called Mr. Lang?

MR. DOODY: A bus snatcher.

MR. NEARY: No, no. But it was not very complimentary, I can tell the hon. gentleman. He had good training. When the hon. member was sitting over on that side of the House he got good training at name calling. And, Mr. Speaker, I tell you I was highly amused, I am highly amused, Sir, at this gentleman who is now out championing the cause of the railway workers in this Province in a hypocritical way when the hon. gentleman either has his shares now or in escrow of a



MR. NEARY:

shipping company and a trucking company in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentleman is that personal? Is that smear? That is a matter of fact and the hon. gentleman can go down in the Registry of Companies office and find out for himself if he is prepared to take the trouble to do it.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not talking about that.

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

I would ask the hon. members to refrain from interjecting.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we have it in our own hands and

MR. NEARY: I would have today, Sir, I would have for the sake of protecting the jobs of these twelve or fifteen thousand Newfoundlanders who are threatened with unemployment, I would have amended that resolution today only I wanted it to go through without any delay, without giving the government members, that is the more narrow-minded people who sit on the government benches, to give them any room to say that well, we were trying to delay it by moving amendment or we were trying to stall it. I wanted it to go through as quickly as possible. If I had moved an amendment, Sir, it would have been an amendment to include a provision in the resolution calling upon this government to declare its order of priorities as far as the development of a transportation policy in this Province is concerned. I ask the minister now, the minister who was speaking for the government last night, where does the Newfoundland railway stand in order of priorities in this Province?

MR. DOODY: Number one.

MR. NEARY: It stands number one. Well then, why is the minister always bellyaching and looking for handouts for the Trans-Canada Highway?

MR. DOODY: We deserve a road.

MR. NEARY: We deserve a road, right, Sir, we deserve a road; we deserve a good railway too, and I hope, Sir, in future that as a result of my few remarks today that the minister will talk as much about the Newfoundland railway in the future as he does about the Trans-Canada Highway. Is the minister speaking for the Board of Trade or for the trucking industry in this Province when he advocates all the millions of dollars in the public treasury of Canada be spent on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland and none on the Newfoundland railway? That is what the minister is implying, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am assuring the hon. gentleman says. Well, Sir, it is becoming increasingly obvious to the people of this Province that the Newfoundland railway in the eyes of this administration has very low priority.

MR. DOODY: I guess you had a good time.

MR. NEARY: I certainly did have a good time. I enjoyed myself up to about 10:30 when a very serious personal situation developed in the family and I had to leave. Up to that point, I was enjoying myself tremendously. I really enjoyed it, Sir. I did not try to hoodwink or pull the wool over the eyes or do a con job on anybody. I did not. I do not get any votes over in that particular part of Newfoundland, so therefore I had no reason to play politics with these people. I got a chuckle out of the way the various and sundry politicians were parading and parading up to the mikes and saying "Ah, no politics in this". No politics in it!

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter indeed, and there is no point, Sir, there is no point in this government just providing lip service to the Newfoundland railway, because a movement has started in this Province that is going to snowball and skyrocket from St. John's to Port aux Basques that will get this government down off the fence in a hurry before the next election, and they will have to make some pretty serious decisions, and they will have to give up their gameplaying with the railway workers and with the people of this Province who believe that we should have a good railway. It must be made clear, and, Mr. Speaker, I will state here and now that any government that I become a part of in the future, any government -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
House, are you?

You are not going to cross the

MR. NEARY:

No, Sir.

We will put the Newfoundland railway on equal status with the Trans Canada Highway with the airports or with the ports, seaports in this Province. Newfoundland railway will get equal - as a matter of fact, Sir, did not my hon. friend who is Minister of Energy will probably realize more than anybody, if the hon. gentleman wants to, that the Newfoundland railway is going to come into its own whether this crowd likes it or not. It is going to come into its own because of the energy crisis in the world, and

MR. NEARY: nobody, but nobody, on the other side of the House seems to have sense enough to realize that at the present time. I have been saying it for years. I have been crusading it just the same as I crusaded for Grade XII, and that was a great battle. The Minister of Education and various and sundry ministers on the Government side of the House laughed at it, scoffed at it.

MR. W. ROWE: Threw it out.

MR. NEARY: Threw it out! When my hon. friend brought it in they threw it out when they came in -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - joked about it. Yes, my hon. friend, the member for St. John's West brought it in.

MR. HOUSE: Yes! Sure! Richard Hiscock (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. When my friend was no longer with us I crusaded for six years to get it back.

MR. PECKFORD: The John Dewey of Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: The first man to raise the question of using electric speed for the operation of the railways and energy saving was -

MR. NEARY: Eric Hiscock, I suppose.

MR. HICKMAN: - none other than that great Newfoundlander, that great Grand Banker, Senator Eugene Forsey, and your colleague, Mr. Langlois from (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I see. Well, I have to congratulate Mr. Forsey. Now I must be number two. I am prepared to take second place to Mr. Forsey.

MR. PECKFORD: Darn it. Again. He lost again.

MR. DOODY: He lost to another Grand Banker.

MR. NEARY: But he is the only one from Grand Bank that I will take second place to.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why the Newfoundland railway will bounce back as it has in other parts of North America and throughout the world is because of the energy crises. It is a myth, Mr. Speaker, for anybody on the Government side of the House to think or to say that you can move freight in Newfoundland across this island cheaper by tractor-trailer and by truck than you can by rail. That is not true. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to moving a lot of freight with very little fuel, railroads are far thriftier than anything on wheels. Ton for ton, mile for mile, a freight train is up to four times as fuel efficient as a large truck. That is a fact. A fact, Sir. That may come as a surprise to some hon. gentlemen who are providing lip service to the Newfoundland railway at the present time.

The reason it will bounce back, Sir, will be because of the economies that will be gained for the consumers of this Province. And I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, the only group in this Province at the present time who have gone along with the Sullivan recommendation to abandon the Newfoundland railway is the Board of Trade and their buddies. The Board of Trade is made up mainly of businessmen, executives and lawyers, and I do not know but some members sitting on the Government side of this House are members; if not, they are former members of the Board of Trade. And that is tragic indeed, Mr. Speaker. Tragic, indeed! The shortsightedness of the members of the Board of Trade in this matter, Sir, is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, do you know why I think the Board of Trade are lackadaisical about this, apathetic, and will go along with it? Because hon. gentlemen who were in business or who are now in business know that when you mark up your profit on an item that you put on your shelf in a store in this Province, when you put your profit on it the profit is added on to freight. So it does not make any difference to the businessmen how much that freight is.

ALL HON. MEMBER:

The more the better.

MR. NEARY:

The more the better, the more profit

he gets. Does my hon. friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) realize that? They add on the profit, their mark-up, on the item, the goods, including freight, and the more the freight costs all the better. And yet, Sir, we know it to be a fact, it is not a myth, that you can move freight across this island much more cheaply by train than you can by tractor-trailer. But they chose the tractor-trailers and the trucks. Why? Well, first of all, Sir, there is a gigantic, savage lobby going on by the trucking industry in this Province who apparently have the Administration brainwashed because they are putting all their marbles in one basket, in the Trans-Canada Highway.

Mr. Speaker, two diesel locomotives going back and forth across this Province can haul eighty or ninety cars. That is the equivalent of eighty or ninety tractor-trailers. Now, it must be as plain as the

MR. NEARY:

nose on your face that you can haul these eighty or ninety cars using much less fuel than you can using all these tractor-trailers, these monsters that are going down the Trans-Canada, our Trans-Canada Highway guzzling up the diesel fuel and gouging and plowing up our highway.

MR. HICKMAN:

I would say that every day about five of these monsters leave the Burin Peninsula loaded with fish. We have no railway down there.

MR. NEARY:

Oh my, oh my! Now is that not something? Is that not an intelligent question to come from the hon. -

MR. HICKMAN:

I think it is a big deal.

MR. NEARY:

-gentleman? So that is a reason we should get rid of the Newfoundland railway and go over to trucks.

MR. HICKMAN:

No, no, but we -

MR. NEARY:

I am not saying, I am not arguing that we should not have both, I am not arguing that. Is it not great? I am talking about the administration getting its priorities straightened out.

MR. PECKFORD:

You got about fifteen priorities all moving along all at the same time, that is not priorities.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we can have both and we are going to have both -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We deserve both.

MR. NEARY:

and we deserve both, and we are going to have, but we are not going to sacrifice the Newfoundland railway at the expense of the Trans-Canada Highway or vice versa, and that is what the hon. gentlemen are doing according to Mr. Lang's letter.

MR. PECKFORD:

The Liberal party is doing it, the Liberal party of Canada.



MR. NEARY: The Liberals! Mr. Speaker, what hogwash, what garbage! How narrow-minded and how partisan can you get! This problem of the Newfoundland railway, Mr. Speaker, will only be solved by all parties working together and not getting partisan about it, and it will only be resolved, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Newfoundland, if the people of this Province stick together and not allow themselves to be divided along partisan, political lines.

MR. PECKFORD: Against the Liberal party of Canada, not the Liberal party of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, oh, the Liberal party in Canada is all to blame. This hon. crowd here have nothing at all to do with it. My hon. friend from Grand Falls - Is Bishop Falls in it? No, Bishop Falls is in the hon. member for Exploits district (Dr. Hugh Twomey), but very, very, very close to Grand Falls, and I would like to see the Minister of Mines and Energy go down to Bishop Falls and say "It is all the fault of the government of Canada", or go to Port aux Basques "And it is all the fault of the government of Canada", when people know the difference. I just finished a couple of meetings across this Province and I will be holding others in the new year, public meetings. I have heard the expression of opinion. They say it has to be a combination of this government and the government of Canada, it has to be, and this government here has to get its priorities straightened out. And so, Mr. Speaker, let us have no more of this lip service, of this wishy-washy attitude, of this very weak position, let us have no more of that. Let those people who are trying to do a con job, trying to do a con job, the people can see through it. Let them try to persuade their own

MR. NEARY: government to take a stand as far as the Newfoundland railway is concerned - not to keep it, that has been decided - take a position as far as the order of priorities is concerned of this railway. If we are going to keep it, if we are going to keep it, Sir, then let us work hard, let us work diligently to try to persuade the powers that be to pour as much money into the Newfoundland railway as they do into the Trans-Canada Highway, to upgrade, to modernize, to buy new equipment, and to bring the railway up to parity with the Mainland of Canada, not to say anything, Sir, about the terms of Confederation. I was chuckling to myself last night and the other meetings that I had I was chuckling to myself. Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, I can claim the credit for getting both the provincial government and the federal government down off the fence in the first place when I scheduled these public meetings across Newfoundland. It did not take them long to get down off the fence. I think I can claim, Sir, part of the credit for that, but there is no point, Mr. Speaker, there is no point in just saying "That is fine; everybody now agrees: Sullivan was wrong", and you know I am amused at Sullivan, Mr. Speaker, I am amused at it, has offered his services now, written various and sundry organizations and unions across this Province offering his services as a consultant, 'I will come if you want to ask me questions'.

MR. HICKMAN:

What do you want me to say?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, he must be getting fed up

with the academic world again, Sir, fed up with the classroom now, wants to take to the open road. After recommending that we do away with the Newfoundland railway he has now written the various unions and organizations saying: "If you want me to I can come out and explain all of this to you, you know." I never thought I would live long enough, Sir, to hear a Newfoundlander make that kind of a recommendation - obviously brainwashed by the hierarchy of C.N. And then for the Board of Trade to go along with it! Very, very tragic indeed Sir, very tragic because, Mr. Speaker, we have to rely on the Board of Trade, the businessmen, to create jobs and employment in this province. I do not know where your honor gets these boxes, I do not know if they are imported or if they are made in Newfoundland. I would submit, Sir, that they should be made in this province. I doubt it very much, I would say most of them are imported from other provinces of Canada or maybe down in the United States. I do not know why they could not be brought in by rail as well as tractor trailer, nobody is in a hurry to buy a box from your honor. I do not know why we have to rush things and have them delivered at your door, home delivery service, why that particular commodity could not be brought in by rail and the railway goes right by the hon. gentleman's door.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right by the door.

MR. NEARY:

Right by the door, that is right.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are not going to pile up another 12,000 or 14,000 or 16,000 unemployed on top of the already record unemployment that we have in this province, we are going to have to pay more than lip service to this particular problem. And there is no point, Mr. Speaker, it would serve no useful purpose for Ministers on the government side to get up and take my words and twist them and try to make politics out of it. Level with the people for a change, Do not

MR. NEARY: try to make partisan politics out of it, level with the people. Do not get up and say: "Oh, the member from LaPoile said: 'Well, you know, we can have both,'" and then take that and try to twist it around and say that Ottawa is trying to blackmail us, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) said a few moments ago, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) above anybody else in this province talking about blackmail, Well the hon. gentleman may be very familiar with the term because it is not the first time I have heard that word from the members of the administration in another context, and the hon. gentleman may get a red face over that one too. There is no blackmail involved and I think that is very unkind of the hon. gentleman, not becoming of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) in this province. While the hon. gentleman may be leaving politics and getting out and saying: "Well, that is it, I am finished, retiring, I have had enough - enough is enough." Well, there are other people who may want to carry on, there are other people depending on the administration for their jobs. So, I hope the minister for the length of time that he has left, will not just take a lacadaemical attitude and just shrug things off by taking the attitude-"This is just a nuisance to me, I wish the time was up so I could retire and go back down town practicing law, with the money that is in law today." Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to persuade, somehow or other we have to persuade the business community in this province, who are the key, by the way, they are the key to the future success of the Newfoundland railway because they are the people who we have to depend on to use it. If they do not use it! Mr. Speaker, under the Terms of Confederation all you need to do is have one train going back and forth across this province and they have lived up to the Terms of Union and that is why I keep repeating and I can not help but emphasizing the fact that it is one thing to say that we are for the Newfoundland railway and then do

MR. STARY: nothing about it and let it die a natural death and hope that it will go away and be forgotten, and that seems to be the attitude of the administration. I would say it would be very difficult, indeed, at this present time to amend the terms of Confederation. I do not think this government would dare bring into this House a resolution asking that the British North America Act be amended to alter the terms of Confederation. I do not know if hon. gentlemen are aware of it or not but that is what has to happen, that is what has to happen, Sir, if

MR. NEARY:

the Terms of Union are related. First of all a resolution will have to be introduced in this hon. House by the government House leader asking that a recommendation go forward to the Parliament of Canada to amend the terms of Confederation. That would have to be debated and then the majority of members of this House would have to carry the resolution and then have it presented on the floor of the House of Parliament in Ottawa. Then the House of Parliament would have to bring in a resolution and the majority of members would have to go through the same procedure again and then if it was passed in the House of Parliament it would have to be sent to Westminster to have the British North America Act changed to alter the terms of Confederation.

I think, Sir, that I can say here in my place today without fear of contradiction that it is going to be a long, long way down the road, it will probably never happen, that you will get a majority of members of a Legislature in the Province of Newfoundland to vote in favour of a resolution to do away with the Newfoundland railway. I do not think it will happen, not only in my children's lifetime but in their children and their grandchildren's lifetime. We are going to have more railways and we are going to have better railways and we are going to have electrically operated railways although somebody thought when I first mentioned that that it was a pipe dream. If we can ever bring the power, if we can ever get the Lower Churchill development going and recall the power from -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not worry.

MR. NEARY: Do not worry! The hon. minister says, "Do not worry", and we are talking about employment in this Province. The hon. gentleman stalled -

MR. PECKFORD: No Liberal sellout here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman think that we all have short memories in this Province? The hon. gentleman told Mr. Gillespie between a year and a year and a half ago when Mr. Gillespie offered the federal-provincial Crown Corporation to study the feasibility of the Lower Churchill and set up a Crown Corporation,

MR. NEARY:

a federal-provincial Crown Corporation, my hon. friend and his administration told Mr. Gillespie to go leap, to go take a jump for himself.

MR. PECKFORD: No way!

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: That is untrue.

MR. NEARY: That is true, Mr. Speaker. That is true. I have correspondence down in my office. I do not have it here with me because I did not know I was going to get into debate this afternoon. About a year and a half my hon. friend told Mr. Gillespie to go jump, to take a leap, that they were not interested in a federal-provincial Crown Corporation. And I researched it and I enquired about it at the time because the argument was -

MR. PECKFORD: I sucked you in.

MR. NEARY: No. The hon. gentleman sucked me in! The hon. gentleman is always trying to suck somebody in with his poison pen.

MR. PECKFORD: I got you this time, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, the excuse at the time for not entering into a joint partnership with the Government of Canada, and my hon. friend will remember from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) because it is not the first time I raised it in this House, that the Government of Canada wanted a part of the profit. Not only did they want equity in the company but they wanted part of the profit. And I checked that out and I found it to be untrue. It was false and it was misleading. Mr. Gillespie and his colleagues said that they were not interested in profits from the development of the Lower Churchill, not interested.

So I came into this House and I laid that before the members of the House and still, Sir, I could not persuade the Minister of Mines and Energy. Then a year and a half later, Mr. Speaker, one and a half years later record unemployment, Newfoundland a disaster area, unemployment worst than the 1930's, 'Tory times are hard times' confirmed. A year and a half

MR. NEARY:

later in they come and say, "We are now going to accept your offer, Government of Canada and Mr. Gillespie. We are now going to accept your offer." A year and a half later! A year and a half delay! And what offer, Mr. Speaker, did they accept? What offer? They tried to leave the people of this Province, again a part of the con game, con job, tried to leave the people of the Province with the impression that the development of the Lower Churchill was going to start soon.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir. I would like for the minister when he gets up to tell us that that is not so.

MR. PECKFORD: Do not worry. Do not worry.

MR. NEARY: Because it is not so. It is not so, Sir. All the Federal Development Corporation does, Sir -

MR. PECKFORD: You are off the track now.



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously I am getting under the hon. gentleman's skin, getting under his skin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should not be reacting; methinks the hon. gentleman protests too much, protests too much. The hon. gentleman is reacting, Sir, and when he is reacting then I know I am getting to him, and what does it do, Sir, what does this federal-provincial crown corporation do? Well, here is what it does. All it does, Sir, is make a study of the development of the Lower Churchill to see if it is feasible. Is it feasible? After eight- no, after seven years in office they are now going to study the feasibility of developing the Lower Churchill. What an accomplishment! After setting off two blasts on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle at the expense of \$115 million to the taxpayers of this Province they are now going to do a study.

AN HON. MEMBER: To see if they did the right thing.

MR. NEARY: That is right, now they are going to see if they did the right thing. My hon. friend- I still have a few minutes left - my hon. friend voted, I believe, against or spoke against that expenditure. Much to the amazement of some members I voted for it, and I will tell you why I voted for it at the time, because it is part of the con game again, that I was misled; I was taken up a garden path; I was naive, naive, too much faith in human nature, did not think that a group of politicians would stoop so low. We saw the Minister of Tourism stoop pretty low yesterday, and, Mr. Speaker, you should have been on this side of the House to look at the looks, to take a look, to see the expressions on the faces of members on the government benches when the House yesterday went to its lowest ebb in its

MR. NEARY: whole history, howest point in history. My hon. friend was charitable and pitied him and my hon. friend is not the kind of a gentleman, as hon. members know, who will criticize very easy without the criticism being justified. So, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about unemployment, Sir, and the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, I think, put forth a very good case. The hon. gentleman expressed grave concern and shock over the fact that we have so many young Newfoundlanders, young men and women in this Province unemployed. I can only repeat, Sir, and concur with what the hon. gentleman said. Over 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, of the unemployed in this Province today are between the ages of 16 and 25. Between 55 and 60 per cent of our people unemployed right at an age when they should be out in the world getting a good background and a good training for themselves and earning a living.

MR. HOUSE: Wrong!

MR. NEARY: That is not wrong.

Mr. Speaker, how can this government, how can anybody in this government, Sir, have the face and the gall to continue conning the people of this Province? Dangling the carrot! Everything now, Mr. Speaker, everything is down the road. Minister of Fisheries programmes and policies and plans - 1980 or 1981; Minister of Education, Grade XII - 1982; Minister of Mines and Energy, feasibility study of the Lower Churchill - 1985. Dangling the carrot! Dangling the carrot, Sir, hoping that they can continue their con-job on the Newfoundland people.

MR. NOLAN: Pie in the sky.

MR. NEARY: Pie in the sky and the next election they will be out again saying "Well, here we are now; we have got all these grandiose plans, now you have to give us a chance, now you have to give us a chance

MR. NEARY: to implement them". Well, that worked twice before. It will not work again. It will not work again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Their day is gone.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, and enough is enough, And the people of this Province have had enough of this administration. Enough is enough, Sir, and there is no way, no way they are going to be conned again by the greatest con artist of them all, the hon. the Premier - unfortunately, he is not in his seat - the super-duper.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we should all hang our heads in shame.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we would have not had a debate on unemployment in this session of the House if the Leader of the Opposition had not put down a Private Member's resolution. We would have not had a debate on unemployment, the number one problem in this Province. It was not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and it would not have been debated and we have not heard any plans, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on I hope that the Liberal Opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, will put forward positive plans and suggestions and ideas for long-term job creation in this Province even if it means constructing the tunnel underneath the Straits of Belle Isle that will take ten or fifteen years, long-term planning, Sir, long-term job creation plans.

MR. FLIGHT: Funding action committees.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And I do not mean stowing your buddies away on Crown corporations, but long-term job creation plans.

AN HON. MEMBER: Failed businessman.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Unsuccessful businessmen, failures in the business world, stowed away, bring them in off the street. Would be politicians, stow them away until the election is called.

Mr. Speaker, what we need, Sir, is some realistic thinking and the Liberal Party and the Opposition will put forward over the next few weeks in this session of the House, we will try to show the people how we would do it if we were the government and we would not be wasting time. We would put forward realistic plans, positive suggestions and ideas for long-term job creation in this Province because that is what is needed, Sir. It is obvious now.

MR. NOLAN: Priority one.

MR. NEARY: That is right, number one priority. It is obvious that the business community is not going to provide all the jobs that are necessary to employ our young people. And we would also, Sir - I would take half the staff, half the hacks that they have appointed and put them to work right away now. Put them to work now trying to

MR. NEARY:

figure out ways and means to take advantage of the federal programmes such as JET, Job Employment Training, and get our young people working. There is enough down in the Premier's office, enough staff down there to do that job, the most expensive Premier's office in the whole of Canada. Take them out of it. Throw their desks away. Get them out and try to take advantage of the federal programmes, job creation programmes such as JET and try to work out some long-term job creation programmes in this Province. That is the only way, Sir, we are ever going to solve the high unemployment that we have in Newfoundland and get our young people working.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it looks like the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) after all his touting about wanting somebody to go to Buchans, after they go now he is sorry they went. I feel very sad for the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans. I am very sorry and I apologize for turning up in Buchans last Saturday, I really do, and I will really give it more thought the next time when I am invited before I go because obviously I did not give it enough thought and I made a serious mistake in going and trying to help the people of Buchans in their hour of need. Now that I have gone the poor, hon. member is very sad indeed that I went.

But, Mr. Speaker, more important things than the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans now attract the attention of this hon. House. That is primarily the debate we are now beginning on the resolution put forward by the Leader of the Opposition on unemployment. As I indicated just before I got up, this administration, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat more concerned with creating jobs than talking about unemployment, as is the federal government so Mr. Cullen keeps telling us.

Let me deal first of all, Mr. Speaker, with some of the comments by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who now sees fit after he speaks to leave the House. He talks about con artists,

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker. He talks about the administration here, the provincial government trying to con the people of Newfoundland into believing that we are in favour of the Newfoundland railway retention and even expansion, that this is an illusion, we really do not want to support the railway, we are just doing it, we are just trying to con the people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we demonstrated, the government demonstrated last night in the meeting that was held downtown

MR. PECKFORD: at which a number of members from the opposite side were also there. We demonstrated last night - Mr. Doody, the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, the Minister Responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs-demonstrated that this Government is 100 per cent behind the retention of the railway. Your Honour, of course, also attended that meeting. And fourteen or fifteen from this side of the House by their presence and by what they said demonstrated their support for the retention of the railway, and not only that, for its expansion as we go down the road.

And this whole question of conning - Mr. Speaker, you know, it really, really can get on your nerves when you hear the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talking like that when his party, the hon. members' opposite party in Canada, the Liberal Party of Canada which now forms the Government of Canada, owns and operates, if you will - loosely, I agree; inefficiently, I agree - CN and CN Marine. CN Marine is not a body unto itself. CN Marine is a monster now of the Federal Government and that Federal Government is a Liberal Federal Government. And I would suggest that the hon. members opposite should have agitated a little more yesterday and the day before, and the day before that, to have more of their Federal Liberal MP's attend the gathering last night to show in person and to state in person their positions as it related to the retention of the Newfoundland Railway. That is where all the Liberal MP's should have been. Who turned up, Mr. Speaker, from the Liberal Party of Canada? Who turned up? Only one gentleman who has become over the last number of years one of the few Liberal MP's who will speak his mind in that Liberal caucus in Ottawa, the hon. member for Cander-Twilligate, who turned up, half Tory in any case. He turned up at the meeting to represent his constituents in Lewisporte and Bishop Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the other half?

MR. PECKFORD:

And half something else. Not a very popular term today across Canada, that whole capital 'L' Liberal. In any case, Mr. Speaker, to show the lack -

DR. KITCHEN:

He is very popular.

MR. PECKFORD:

A very good MP. The member for Gander-Twillingate is a very good MP, unlike the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. I am one of those very fortunate individuals, very lucky MHA's, local MP's, to have in my district of Green Bay, two Federal MP's. I have the member for Gander-Twillingate and I have the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. And what a contrast, Mr. Speaker. What a contrast. The hon. the member for Gander-Twillingate is head and shoulders over the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. There is no comparison at all. He is an excellent, excellent member in his -

DR. KITCHEN:

He has the lot cornered.

MR. PECKFORD:

He is excellent, excellent. But it is true. But it is true. And as the Leader of the Opposition tried to point out this afternoon - the facts, the truth, and as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tried to find out, the facts, the truth, I am making an observation as it relates to my two MP's as a constituent of this Province.

MR. FLIGHT:

What do the people think about it?

MR. PECKFORD:

Well, the district will say the same thing.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Canada saw fit last night in a very important meeting in this city to ignore the union's invitation to attend. Now, how is one supposed to interpret that? And in the light of not attending, the hon. the minister in the Cabinet, the member for the South Coast, the Minister of External Affairs sent a long, long telegram which, in effect, said nothing really, Mr. Speaker. Nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Multi-dimensional.



MR. PECKFORD: Yes. It was multi-dimensional. It was ad hockery. What was it? The imaginative or creative ad hockery that Mr. LeBlanc talks about in the fishery. It said absolutely nothing. So, if hon. members are interested in the facts, let us look at the facts.

DR. KITCHEN: What does that have to do with unemployment?

MR. PECKFORD: That has a lot to do with unemployment, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) realizes that the reason why we were at the meeting last night was to try to retain two or three thousand jobs which I think are important in this Province which are now being phased out, that the Newfoundland railway has an awful lot to do with employment and unemployment. So, let us look at the facts as it relates to the Newfoundland railway and how it creates jobs in this Province and the Liberal Party's attitude towards the Newfoundland railway. How many people from the Liberal Party of Canada turned up last night? One MP. One MP. Now, if they are really serious I guess that means something. That is an indicator of their concern. That is an indicator of their interest, or should be. It was given lots of notice .

MR. PECKFORD:

and they did not turn up. They did not turn up. That is on one side. That is one indicator. Secondly, what has been the policy of the Liberal Government in Ottawa over the last year as it relates to the Newfoundland railway? What has been the policy? Does anybody really know what the policy is? Almost every second or third day there is another downgrading effort by CN Marine, not by CN Marine alone. Obviously the minister responsible for CN Marine knows what is going on in the CNR. So we know, the hon. members of this House know, the Leader of the Opposition knows, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who were there last night, the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) are already familiar with the situation. So therefore the whole question is not one of CN Marine and the Newfoundland railway, it is one of the Liberal Party of Canada which forms the Government of Canada and the con job that they are trying to perform on the people of Newfoundland, the Liberals, Progressive Conservatives, NDP and everybody included. That is what is happening. The con game is one that is being played out on the federal stage by the Liberal Party.

If the Liberal Party of Newfoundland are really serious and are not trying to con as well, they would disassociate themselves from the Liberal Party of Canada on this issue and come out clearly and say, the Liberal Opposition of Newfoundland should come out and say clearly in a policy statement, 'On this issue we must disassociate ourselves from the Liberal Party of Canada because obviously the Liberal Party of Canada, which is the Government of Canada, has deliberately over the last number of years ignored and now seems to be deliberately phasing out the Newfoundland railway.'

So let us get the record straight as it relates to the Newfoundland Railway. If there is any con job being done it is being done by the Liberal Party of Canada and now in recent days I think the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is being suspect because on the one hand-you see the hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot have it both ways.

MR. PECKFORD:

They flogged last year in this hon. House the fact that the Liberal Party of Canada in its convention passed a meaningless resolution, a silly resolution dealing with Labrador development which they say because it was a resolution of a party in convention, not a resolution of the House of Commons or Parliament, that this was a great indication that very, very soon the federal Liberal Government was going to unfold a great developmental plan for Labrador, which is craziness. So if they can support the Liberal Party of Canada on this kind of resolution dealing with Labrador and associate themselves so closely with the Liberal Party of Canada on that, they cannot now try to disassociate themselves without saying they are going to from the whole question of the Liberal Government approach to the Newfoundland railway. They cannot have it both ways. If it is only going to be convenient for them to be there when things are positive, they must also be there when things are negative. On this issue the Liberal Government of Canada shows its lack of regard, its lack of interest in the Newfoundland railway and this administration has said last night and said before in representations to Ottawa that we want to see the Newfoundland railway retained. We want to see the Newfoundland railway continue to be a part of the transportation system of this Province and that without it we are in trouble as a Province.

So there are 2,000 or 3,000 jobs there we are after losing already, Mr. Speaker, a lot of jobs as it relates to the Newfoundland railway we are after losing already. So we want not only to keep it from the point of view of the employment that is there now but if the federal government would change its policy and begin to upgrade and maintain the Newfoundland Railway it will create additional jobs. So if you want a platform and employment strategy, Mr. Speaker, one does not have to go any further than the Newfoundland Railway. If you want an employment strategy and as the hon. member for LaPoile says, a long-term employment strategy, let us start with the Newfoundland railway and let us have the Liberal Government, let us have the Liberal Party of Canada start to say in part of its employment strategy with

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Cullen and all the rest of the gentlemen up there, let us have them say, "As part of the overall employment strategy in Eastern Canada we will begin over a long-term plan to maintain the Newfoundland railway and to start to upgrade it where it needs upgrading first way down the road

MR. PECKFORD: on a ten-year plan or a fifteen-year plan. Now that, Mr. Speaker, that would be a fantastic employment strategy for the federal government to get involved in, because on the one hand they are going to be creating jobs, retaining the jobs we have, creating the new jobs and secondly, and just as important, providing an efficient transportation link across the Province from Port aux Basques to St. John's. So, you know, we can talk about clearing the reservoir at Gull Island which they have turned down, which the Liberal government of Canada has turned down, and that smacks exactly opposite to their great resolution in their convention last year. They can turn that down. Now they want to phase out the railway. So we have two - there are two items that immediately come to mind when one talks about the federal Liberal government and employment strategy in this Province, where they would get the total and absolute co-operation of the government of Newfoundland. One is on transportation as it relates to the retention of the railway, secondly on the whole question of forestry improvement as it relates to the Gull Island or the Lower Churchill Basin and the clearing of the reservoir. So it is quite easy for both governments to co-operate on two very major issues, one dealing with power development in the long-term and the second one dealing with an efficient transportation system, both of which can be linked to high employment levels if the federal government were really serious, if the federal Liberal government really meant what it said in its resolution before its convention last year.

So when we start talking, Mr. Speaker, about employment and unemployment we can come up with a lot of statements as to where the federal

MR. PECKFORD: government should be involved and is not involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a kind of accusation made by the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) when he said that last year or a year and a half ago the Government of Newfoundland turned down a request from the Ministry of Energy, Mines and Resources as it related to establishing a federal-provincial corporation for the development of the Lower Churchill. Mr. Speaker, may I have silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman wishes to continue without interruption.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that statement is totally untrue. What is true, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources tried to persuade me to sign an agreement for a corporation which would be identical to the Maritime Energy Corporation agreement, and it was that I disagreed with, that no way were we going to sign that kind of an agreement because it did not give us any protection as a Province and it did not recognize our ownership of the resource and it did not recognize that we must get - we must have a majority control. It did not recognize that we must have first call on the resource and all of these basic principles were not part of the corporation that Mr. Gillespie wanted us to sign, and at that time we told him so and until Mr. Gillespie and his cohorts wanted to change the rules as it related to this kind of corporation we would have no part of it.

MR. PECKEFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting that after that at the First Ministers' Conference last year the federal government saw fit under the urgings of Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and a couple of other provinces that if you are going to increase employment, if you are going to decrease unemployment, that one of the quickest ways to do it would be through major energy projects which were not only high profile but were highly labour intensive, and so that is when the whole Lower Churchill thing came back on the front burner, and it was after that First Ministers' Conference where agreement in principle to look at establishing a federal-provincial corporation came into being. The day will come, Mr. Speaker, in the not too distant future when we will be at liberty to release a lot of the negotiations that went on.

Suffice it to say right now, Mr. Speaker, which I will substantiate later, that the federal government were so eager to sign that agreement before the First Ministers' Conference which just finished on the economy that they were making changes because we had turned it down right up to 48 and 50 and 60 hours before D-Day, and got major concessions which they hithertofore would not agree to. So for the hon. member for Lapoile to say that Mr. Gillespie in Ottawa wanted us to sign an agreement like we signed a few days ago or a few weeks ago is completely untrue. What Mr. Gillespie wanted us to sign was an agreement like the Maritime Provinces signed with Ottawa, and it is very interesting now, Mr. Speaker, that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are requesting changes to that agreement, number one as a result of these negotiations and now the corporation



MR. PECKFORD: we have and number two, that the agreement on the Maritime Energy Corporation was only an agreement in principle, and the details now are bogged down and can not be worked out because of the agreement we have in place with the Federal Government. So now, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick are saying that they do not like the agreement, the principles that were outlined, and that they want a better agreement, so therefore the hon. member from LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) information is completely erroneous and completely wrong and there is no semblance to the truth at all. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Lower Churchill Development Corporation does not only incorporate the ideas for refining and completing studies already underway on the Lower Churchill Basin, it also incorporates that corporation to be the main vehicle for the development of projects on the Lower Churchill Basin. So it is not simply a corporation to deal with studies, it is also the corporation and it is outlined in the agreement which will be tabled in this hon. House, the ways and means to get a project off the ground and that this corporation will be the vehicle to do it under the financing arrangements agreed to already. So all that has to happen now is for the corporation to get to work and to make recommendations of a project to get off the ground and it will be that corporation, under the terms and conditions in that agreement, that will apply for the financing and to get the project moving. It will not be some other corporation or somebody else who will be doing it. So this agreement has in it, not only the principles to establish the corporation, has not only the principles in it to refine and study and bring in realistic cost figures on the various projects but thirdly and most importantly, the vehicle to actually do the project, which is of course the most important thing of all and which is quite a bit different from the Maritime Energy Corporation. Now, Mr. Speaker, it being almost six o'clock, I adjourn the debate.



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate. The Crown Minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: This House adjourns until tomorrow Thursday, three p.m.