

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) is - I will ask the President of the Council:

Is the minister going to be here? If so, I will defer it until he comes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: He is on his way to Gander for - he has to go to the Mainland. He had hoped to catch a later flight but because of the fog -

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, then. Well, in his absence I will have to make do with second best and ask the President of the Council. Could he please tell us whether the government have had any conversations with the St. John's Municipal Council, or with representatives or members thereof with respect to this vexing and newly re-emergent question of the institution of a ward system? I ask because, of course, my understanding is that that would require amendments to the City of St. John's Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I am tempted to say, Mr. Speaker, that why do with second best. I could take notice of it and say the minister will be back and he will answer it, but I can answer the question.

We have had no direct - the matter has recently come up as a result of an editorial in The Evening Telegram, and then I understand at Wednesday's council meeting it was also brought up. I think the Deputy Mayor indicated that he was going to bring a motion forth before council next Wednesday. Now the position of the government is that it has not been approached this year with respect to this request and, before the government could consider the implementation of a ward system, it would have first of all to receive a request for same from the city council. And even at that, of course, that would not be conclusive, but would then have to have consideration by the government themselves as a matter of policy as to whether it in fact is

MR. MARSHALL: the best system for municipal elections
in the city of St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for the
Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister. I give
him about an A minus, I guess, for his answer, as opposed to a B. He is going
in the right direction but not going far enough. I understand from
what he said, and I want to be sure I understand, that the government's
position is that as the council as yet have not approached the government
in respect of this matter, you know,

MR. ROBERTS: the government have not taken it under advisement or whatever the correct phrase is. Can I ask the minister if he can indicate whether the government would be prepared to institute such a system assuming - and I realize it is hypothetical - assuming the council do request it, bearing in mind the fact that the voters of the City of St. John's and the franchise municipally, as I recall it, is almost precisely, in fact is precisely the same as the franchise for this House, a general election in the Province, something which I believe the Liberals did in the much maligned previous administration, the previous administration Mark I as opposed to Mark II. Can the minister tell us whether the government bearing in mind that a majority, a substantial majority of the voters of St. John's in response to a referendum, a plebiscite, did indicate they wanted a ward system, whether the government would be prepared to bring such legislation before the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is always dangerous for one minister to indicate what the government would do before the government has considered it as a matter of policy. I would point out that it does not just involve the government. Before there could be any implementation of a ward system there would have to be an amendment to the City of St. John's Act, so it would obviously have to come before the legislature.

There are many aspects to be considered in connection with this, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand, you have the situation as to whether in fact it is the most effective representation, where the councillors represent best when they represent all of a municipal area or whether in fact they can do their jobs better if they represent one segment or, on the other side of the coin, would become much more, shall we say, parochial than they ought to be to consider the overall needs. Now with respect to the referendum, a referendum, of course, is not mandatory, as the hon. member knows, but certainly a matter that the government would have to take obviously into consideration because it was a direct -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

April 24, 1980

Tape No. 997

AH-2

MR. MARSHALL:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may ask for quiet?

I cannot hear myself.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please! I have difficulty hearing the

hon. president speak.

MR. MARSHALL:

As I say, on the question of the referendum, you know, the government would obviously have to take that into consideration with the whole situation. I would point out to the hon. member though, Mr. Speaker, that when the referendum was taken it was taken coincidental with the last municipal election and, if memory serves me correct, I believe there were something like 9500 voters in favour of a ward system, something like 5000,

MR. W. MARSHALL: I believe, in a partial ward system, but then there were a substantial number, approximately 9,000, who were against a ward system. So it was not like it was a referendum that was very conclusive and represented a large majority of the wishes. But certainly, as with any referendum, the government would certainly have to take that into consideration as part of the entire parcel in determining whether or not as a matter of policy it would lead legislation in this House to bring effect to it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A final, if I might, Mr. Speaker. This is not the place to debate it or I would point out that, of course, we are elected to this House under a ward system as is, as far as I know, every parliamentary Legislature in the so-called English system - whatever it is called - the Anglo-Saxon system.

I wonder if the minister could indicate - and I realize that he is under no obligation to indicate, the question in fact may be on the verge of being out of order, but if he wishes, I am sure he can - whether the government are going to ask the House in this session to consider amendments to the City of St. John's Act? And I ask because the city has made it known publicly that they are - I do not know how; there is a mysterious osmosis process by which stuff comes from City Hall to Confederation Building and it then comes up here to the House. But the city has indicated, I believe, that they are contemplating asking the House through the government to rewrite the City of St. John's Act, and I wonder if we might expect that in this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I can say the matter is under very active consideration. I do not know whether any legislation will be here before, say, the middle or end of May, but certainly, as far as the government is concerned, as the hon. member will recall, government itself has initiated amendments, has indicated that we are now looking

MR. W. MARSHALL: at the City of St. John's Act with respect to the provisions of zoning as to whether or not, in fact, there is too much discretion. And this arose directly as a result of the Heritage Foundation's apparent conflict with the discretionary powers of the city of St. John's itself in connection with the Duffett Building.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) a very real conflict.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, it is a very real conflict, so as far as the government is concerned, for a number of years amendments have been made to the City of St. John's Act that have been suggested by council, but government is reviewing the entire City of St. John's Act, not only with respect to that, but with respect to the discretionary powers that are in the act itself for the council because I think that -

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, there are all sorts of areas, but I think the thing that we are mainly concerned with is the large amount of discretionary powers conferred upon the city council and I might say not just the city council but local governments themselves. I think it is a matter of concern that we have, but specifically with respect to the City of

MR. W. MARSHALL: St. John's and the controversies that have recently arisen with respect to zoning, that we are going to look into this. It is necessary, as I say, as a result of the conflict with the Historic Trust and the Duffett Building but is equally, I think, necessary and almost mandatory when you consider the developments that are occurring here and will occur in and around the Avalon Peninsula and particularly the St. John's area as a result of offshore development.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) and it is a rather serious matter. It involves probably the loss of a couple of hundred jobs in the Lewisporte-Botwood-Carmanville area as a result of the government's decision to turn over large tracts of Crown Land to Price and now the men who are involved in the export wood business can no longer get permits and a large number of loggers are going to be forced to lose their jobs. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not any pressure can be put on Price (Nfld) to let some of this wood, that they do not need at the moment, go to those private operators so they can continue this major industry, probably one of the best new industries to start in Central Newfoundland in a long time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members are aware, management units eight and nine in the Forest Management Division, and large tracts of it, were licence to Price-Abitibi in relationship to the re-opening and opening of the mill in Stephenville when it was changed from a linerboard mill to now a paper mill.

There is a serious problem in that area as it relates to export wood. We are now into the final stages of negotiations with Price-Abitibi and a suitable arrangement is being worked out so that it does allow for export wood so that there is not a monopoly situation arising in those areas that allows

MR. C. POWER: just Price-Abitibi to purchase wood
but also for the export market.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member
for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter
is that even today companies in that area, in the Lewisporte area,
are being refused permits to cut further wood, In addition, they have been
threatened with fines even if they buy wood that has already been
cut and is lying in the woods ready for export. You know, this
wood has to be peeled and so on and creates in the last two years
nearly \$10 million into the economy of the area. I wonder if the
minister could be more specific and tell us whether or not the
present export conditions in that area will continue?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands
and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my earlier answer, we have made arrangements in the negotiations with Price-Abitibi that there will continue to be export wood and export in that area so that not only loggers but also sawmillers will be protected. The conditions that have arisen today, I am not fully aware of as to who is denying access to the wood or who is refusing to issue permits or who is refusing to buy wood. That part of the question I will be glad to take under advisement.

I can only reiterate my original answer, that we have made conditions in the negotiations with Price-Abitibi that export wood will be allowed to cut in that area so as to protect both loggers and sawmillers.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell the House - he keeps referring to arrangements being made with Price - what the arrangements are that were made with Price (Nfld.) and whether or not the present level of export wood can continue?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I again tell the member as in my earlier answers to his two previous questions, negotiations are in process. We are in the final stages. There will be conditions allowed in that area so that we have export wood so we do protect both sawmillers and loggers and that is all that we can announce at the time until the negotiations are finalized.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are 687 barrels of matacil stored in bunker 630, I believe it is, on Eagle Road in Stephenville and that the Council in the area are quite concerned about it. I was just wondering if the Minister could tell me whether

MR. J. HODDER: there is any danger of spillage ?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forests,
Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, that matacil that is stored in Stephenville is being inspected on a daily basis. We have been assured by the company that sold us that it is safe to leave it in the barrels that it is now in for at least another year. We are now in a process of asking the State of Maine, both the Province of Quebec, the Province of New Brunswick and also the company which sold that matacil to the Government of Newfoundland if they are interested in purchasing that matacil from us. If the matacil is not sold by the Fall, then we will have to get involved in a re-barreling process because the matacil is quite corrosive and after a period of several years the barrels do have to be changed. We are hoping to have a reply from the companies and the State of Maine and the provinces very shortly and I certainly will be announcing to all the members of the House and to the Province the decision of government when those negotiations are completed.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplemenatary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplemenatary, the hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: It was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the label on those barrels said that they should be re-canned this year. As a matter of fact, it was someone who saw the label told me that. As well, the former Minister of Forestry had said that they would be re-canned this year and the minister has just said that the stuff is very corrosive. Now, that was put there in 1977, Mr. Speaker, and it was canned

MR. J. HODDER: the year before that. And, my understanding is that it is supposed to be re-canned this year. Could the minister tell me whether they have - I know it has been inspected but, you know, you cannot see inside the can. Could the minister assure me that there will be no spillage?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. minister.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again I want to assure the hon. member and all members of this hon. House that a portion, and a fairly significant portion of that matacil was re-barrelled last Fall at a very significant expense to government, that we had to check with the company, that they assure us that the barrels are safe until a period up until next year, and that we as a government hope to have that matacil disposed of before the end of this year. If it is not disposed of, then we will simply re-barrel to make sure that no spillage takes place.

MR. J. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this stuff is very highly toxic and, I guess, the fact that they use one ounce per square mile when they are spraying would tell that this is a very concentrated chemical. Could the minister tell me how you go about cleaning up a spill such as that if one of those cans were to break or a number of them were to break? Or even if they sold it now, would they have to re-can before they moved the barrels? But my main question is how we go about cleaning up if there is a spill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Again, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that that matacil is being stored according to the directions and specifications of the manufacturer, that we are certainly hoping to have that matacil sold before this Fall, that if spillage should take place then certainly provision are in place both with the Emergency Measures Organization and other persons to make sure that any spillage that would take place would be cleaned up quickly and promptly and without any ill effects to the general public. That is one of the reasons it is stored in an area that is far removed from the public and it is inspected on a daily basis. And, again, all I can say at this stage in the game that that matacil storage is perfectly safe.

MR. J. HODDER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I indicated a final supplementary, unless the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) wishes to yield.

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Since the former minister said it would be re-canned this year, is the minister -

MR. POWER: It was re-canned last year.

MR. J. HODDER: It was not re-canned, it was stored there after the spray programme.

MR. C. POWER: It was re-barrelled last year.

MR. J. HODDER: It was not re-barrelled last year. But since the former minister said it would be re-barrelled, are you not now sort of fudging on the issue because there is \$500,000 worth of matacil there. And if it is supposed to be re-canned and if the minister made an announcement that it was going to be re-canned - the former minister - are you not now fudging on that particular issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

April 24, 1980

Tape No. 1001

DW - 3

MR. C. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, again either the member is not listening very well or he is not hearing what I am saying. Last year we re-barrelled a large portion of the matacil, what we thought may have been unsafe or the barrels were approaching

MR. POWER: stage where it was considered to be unsafe. We do a daily inspection. It is perfectly safe now. If we can sell the matabil before this Fall, there is no need to re-barrel it. It would be an unnecessary expense. The companies, particularly the company which has made some inclination to us that they are willing to purchase the matabil back, have said that we do not have to re-barrel if they are going to purchase it.

MR. HODDER: How much did you re-barrel if you re-barrelled some of it?

MR. POWER: We re-barrelled all that was last year considered to be, or even approaching the level that we might consider as being unsafe.

MR. HODDER: Well, would the minister tell us how much was approaching that?

MR. POWER: We spent \$10,000 last year in re-barrelling a fairly significant portion of it.

MR. HODDER: How many barrels did you use?

MR. POWER: I am not exactly sure. I would be glad to find out for the member. All I am saying is that what is there now is safe.

MR. HODDER: How many barrels are unsafe?

MR. POWER: There are no barrels there now that are unsafe.

MR. MORGAN: Go home, boy.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett).

MR. ROBERTS: He is just lapping it up over there.

MR. STIRLING: He is aware of the problem that exists. There is a bridge from Greenspond to Ship Island that has, according to the council, has tilted at a twenty degree angle and there has been worsening over the last few days and a total collapse is very likely. The minister is aware

MR. STIRLING: of the problem. I mentioned it yesterday and he was going to check into it. Could he report to us today?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I had the staff check that out. It is my understanding that part of that structure acts as a breakwater.

MR. ROBERTS: So it is federal, is it?

MR. BRETT: That part of it is, just that part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: The remainder - well, let us put it this way. My department does not have a presence on Greenspond Island. You know we have no responsibility for any of the roads or bridges that are there, for the simple reason that they have a council; of course, therefore, all the roads are maintained by council.

Some time ago our staff went in and inspected the bridge at the request of the council. There is no question about it that something needs to be done. I think that the appropriate channel through which the council should go is the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and if perchance they are lucky enough to get some money from that department, then we would be only too happy to provide whatever help we could in the way of engineering or consulting services or any other way that we could help. But the actual project cannot be funded through this department because it comes under the ambit of the local council.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I am surprised because yesterday the minister indicated something would have to be done. The reason that he does not have a responsibility in Greenspond for the highway is that there are no roads in Greenspond. It is completely and utterly without roads.

MR. ROBERTS: What about George Cross's causeway?

MR. STIRLING : And this is an emergency type situation, Mr. Speaker. The town council of Greenspond has said in a telegram they will not assume any responsibility for any damages to fishing boats, injury or possible loss of life to persons travelling or under the bridge. It is entirely either a federal or provincial responsibility. There is a breakwater and a bridge and no roads. So they have no funds. There is nothing the town council can do. Would the minister agree to take it up with Municipal Affairs or whichever department he needs to because there is no question that it would be his responsibility if there were a highway there. It is an emergency type situation. Will the minister agree to take it up with the minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor)? This is a small council that has no money and it is a major problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to sound like I am callous or anything, but I do not see why I should take it up with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor). There are an awful lot of bridges and roads in local communities around this Province that need repairs and if there is a council there then of course it is up to that council, if they cannot maintain them themselves, to go after the department. Now I have already indicated that my staff will help in any way that we can, but I am not going to take on the responsibility of trotting off to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) if somebody has a health problem or trotting off to the minister of something else if there is another problem. As far as I am concerned, the council should get in touch with the minister or the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and outline the problem and I hope that they can come up with some solution; or with the MHA for that matter, you yourself, but my department will do

MR. BRETT: anything in this world that we can to help but I am not going to accept responsibilities for which my department is not responsible.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), Sir. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he indicated in any way, shape or form that he was going to go to Harbour Breton or Terrenceville yesterday morning to meet with the group of people, hundreds of people, who had turned out to meet the hon. gentleman in connection with the road conditions in that area? Did the hon. gentleman say he was going to be there, because

MR. S. NEARY: the people obviously thought the hon. gentleman was going to be there and he did not turn up, neither did the member, and the people want to know why. Did the hon. gentleman say he was going? Did he indicate in any way, shape or form to these people, who waited for hours for the hon. gentleman to arrive in Terrenceville, and he did not show up.

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate to the people on the picket line, but I did indicate to the member that enroute to another part of the Province yesterday I might find it convenient or possible to be on site. But as the hon. member knows, you know, nothing could get out of St. John's yesterday, it was almost impossible to drive out much less than to fly out, so for that reason I was not able to be there.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Did the hon. gentleman, after being very discourteous with these people, did the hon. gentleman have the courtesy to call the people to tell them that he would come to the community at the earliest opportunity to discuss the bad, deplorable road conditions in the Terrenceville area?

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

MR. C. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not call them because I was not talking to them in the first place. I do not know if the MHA for the area called them or not, but I did not.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall). On August 10th of last year in Goose Bay the Premier ended up making a press release, and in his press release he proposed that the Labrador Resources Advisory Council become the primary contact for

MR. E. HISCOCK: consultation concerning resource development issues in Labrador. The question to the minister; has that taken place and is the Labrador Resources Advisory Council the only or the primary body for consultation on resource matters in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I think, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. J. Goudie) could quite adequately answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was some other conversation going on here, I did not hear all of the statement, but I think the hon. member was asking the question whether or not the Premier in his statement last year identified the Labrador Resources Advisory Council as the group to consult with in terms of resource development in Labrador. If that was the question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: With regard to the

MR. E. HISCOCK: last couple of days the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Town Council as well as the Chamber of Commerce in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is sending a letter to all M.H.A.s, all development associations, all councils and all chambers of commerce in Labrador, basically saying that they have not been consulted in resource development, and also they express the concern that the Labrador Advisory Council itself needs to be monitored a little more closely. They feel that they are independent and also that their attitude towards development in Labrador is particularly negative. Could the minister advise this House what position the government are going to take on this suggestion from the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Chamber of Commerce and Town Council with regard to monitoring the Labrador Resource Advisory Council?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any response to that question until I get some kind of representation from the various groups that the member identified. I do not have any correspondence or anything else to that effect yet.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: In that regard, that is why I asked the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) - letters and telegrams were sent to the Premier and the Premier sent telegrams back to them.

There is a concern basically with the Labrador Resource Advisory Council that they are concerned with resource matters, and, if they stick to that area, I am sure a lot of people would not particularly mind, but they are wandering into other areas. For example, there is a conference down in Labrador now with regard to regional government. Could the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development state the position of the government with regard to regional government in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot give government's position on regional control or government or administration, whatever you want to call it, in Labrador. It has been obvious over the last number of years since I have been associated with government, Mr. Speaker, that we have been decentralizing. My department, I think, is a prime example.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. J. GOUDIE: We are talking about decentralizing the administration, Mr. Speaker, and that is what has been happening. Northern development is an example. I do not know if the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) agrees or disagrees with that particular concept, but nevertheless, it is there. But in terms of giving any kind of a commitment or a definition to regional government, which I think is what the member for

MR. GOUDIE: Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) asked, no, I do not know if there has even been a discussion on it. I am not aware of one.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), who seems to be getting a free ride this session. I will see if I can get his name in the news. I always succeed with the Premier.

Down here at Torbay Airport on the RCAF side where all these buildings were put up during the Second World War by the Royal Canadian Air Force, I notice now that a lot of the buildings are being torn down. What is happening down there? Does the provincial government own that land? And if they own it, will all these buildings be torn down? What does the government have in mind for this particular area, which seems to be prime land?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, these buildings are in a delapidated condition and we tendered and they are being torn down and the land will remain with the Department of Public Works.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate if the land will be used for an extension of the airport? Will it be awarded to private enterprise and, if so, if it is going to be sold or leased, will public tenders be called or will just the choice few, the favoured few have the first crack at that prime land? It seems to be the only industrial land left in the St. John's area.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, there are no chosen few in the Department of Public Works, they go to tender and I am sure there will be tenders called, legal tenders, if we decide to use the land. But at the present moment there is no specific use for the land.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have heard that the government has in mind an industrial park down there, Does the hon. gentleman know anything about that? Could he enlighten the House on whether or not the government intends to make an industrial park out of that particular site adjacent to the airport?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: When it is finalized, Mr. Speaker, if the government decides to use it for an industrial park, there will be an announcement made at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: One quick final question, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Newhook), I understand now for some time that the minister received the Powell Report on uranium development in Labrador, Could the minister advise the House what progress has been taking place? Has it been presented to Cabinet? Has any decision been made yet or what time will the House be notified of the decision?

MR. ROBERTS: A quick question.

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

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: We have received the BRINEX public hearing board report; I think it has been in my office now for probably a little over a week. Our officials are reviewing the report, I am reading it myself, and we getting extra copies made. Under the guidance of our Environmental Assessment Act there will be thirty days to have it distributed to all interested people and when we get the extra copies made, of course, it will be distributed to members of the Cabinet. And I am hoping that we will have our recommendations ready within that thirty day period to present to Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Establishment Of A Newfoundland And Labrador Arts Council." (Bill No. 16)

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when we rose on Tuesday I had made an erudite, brilliant, comprehensive and compelling analysis of the bill and I do not need to add to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. E. ROBERTS: I do not know if the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) has roller skates on or whether he is going over to find about public tenders or not. I would say politics makes strange bed fellows, Sir, and perhaps strange seat mates.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can say in response to the unspoken question from the minister or from the learned House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on the other side, that we on this side will not go on on this bill. What we have

MR. E. ROBERTS: to say has been said. That applies to my friend for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) as well.

Mr. Speaker, we think this is a reasonably good start on a very worthwhile project. We have a number of detailed concerns but I say to the minister that we will raise these at the committee stage, Committee of the Whole. I think in particular my friend for Lewisporte (Mr. White), who could not be here earlier to speak on the bill, has some very penetrating and very incisive comments and questions with respect to the detailed provisions of this bill. We will raise them in committee and we will see how the minister responds to them there.

I do not need to say anything more, Sir. There have been some excellent speeches made and, like most members of the House, I could give my own views on what the future holds for us on cultural affairs in this Province and the importance of things of the spirit and things of the mind in addition to things of the body and things of the pocketbook, the latter being the type of matter we normally discuss in the House.

But really, I think the council ought to be set up, we will see how its work goes ahead, and a year or two down the road will be the time to measure the merits of its performance and measure the worth of its achievements. I do want to say that the membership on the council is, I think, well chosen. I am particularly delighted with Dr. Storey and Mr. Maloney as the Chairman, I believe and the Vice-Chairman respectively. Dr. Storey is well known to anybody interested in the intellectual or artistic fields in this Province and has devoted a number of years of his life to a massive contribution which will shortly, I understand, be published and that is a dictionary of Newfoundland. I

April 24, 1980

Tape No. 1007

DW - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS:

think that is a very worth-

while project and I understand that in the scholarly sense it will be a landmark and that is what we would expect from Dr. Storey and then no doubt that is what we would get. Mr. Maloney is well known to many of us, Some of us in the House had the opportunity of serving with Aiden Maloney. He sat for one term or most of one term as the member for Ferryland district and I believe, Sir, with considerable distinction. Before that term ended, that was the 1966 House, Aiden was elected and he entered the Cabinet as Minister of Fisheries and one of his major achievements is one of the great achievements of the fisheries

MR. ROBERTS: policy these last thirty years in this Province and that was the creation of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and Aiden Maloney was offered by - I guess Jack Davis was Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa; in any event whoever was minister in Ottawa it did not matter - Aiden Maloney was offered the position of first president of the corporation and I know, he and I were and are good friends, that he felt it was a commitment that he had to carry through. The Cabinet and the Premier were reluctant to see Aiden leave that phase of elected public life, but it was decided that was the best way he could serve the people of this Province and in particular the fishermen, so he resigned and, I think it is only appropriate to say, discharged the duties of president of the corporation with exemplary zeal and set the corporation on a course that it has followed ever since.

Aiden also is extraordinarily well-grounded in the artistic field and I think it is a compliment to the minister that he and whoever advised him in choosing the people who make up this committee, this council, have sought out a man with such experience in public life and such knowledge of this Province as well as with such a depth and a background and a feeling for the artistic pursuits. So I could go on and it is a subject that any one of us could speak on at great lengths, Sir. I have a deep concern and a deep passion for the cultural and artistic life of this Province. I have no pretensions to being either cultured or artistic, but I do very much value these things and do very much try to appreciate them and I would hope and believe that that is something that every Newfoundlander would more and more come to do and the establishment of the council hopefully will lead to that end and for that reason we support it, Sir. We shall debate the matter further at committee, not on principle, in principle we do support it wholeheartedly. But, as I said, my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) has some very real questions, some very important questions and I would hope the minister will deal with those, respond to them in a positive sense and deal with them. I think there are some positive suggestions that can

MR. ROBERTS: be made that would improve what, as I have said, in our view is a reasonably good bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been very interested in the comments that have been made by hon. members on both sides with regard to this particular bill, particularly as it relates to local artists, local individuals in their particular area who have become either famous or infamous as the case may be through their artistic talents and endeavours. I think after having some experience in travelling around Newfoundland and having lived in a number of places and being familiar with from time to time local artists, local individuals who provided various forms of entertainment to people within the community and to their friends, I remember days in what used to be the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) former district, on Bell Island going over to a time somewhere around the New Year's Eve area, and it was tradition to have a bean supper at those times and the music that occurred after the bean supper was sometimes provided by each and every individual in the place. There was some reference

MR. R. DAWE: There was some reference in just about everyone's speech made to sport. I think the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) indicated that probably my bias in the recreation field came forward when I initially introduced this bill, but as each speaker on both sides of the House got to his feet, I think somewhere along in his speech, each of them referred to some area of recreation or some area of sport, and I think it is only fitting that these types of activities be mentioned, because they are indeed part of our provincial heritage, our provincial culture, and in some cases are indeed in themselves a real art.

I notice this coming Summer, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Indian Government are holding a conference, a three week period of meetings, of discussions, and they are going to be involved in native games, in native sports activities. This, of course, will take place in the historic district of St. George's on Sandy Point. I would encourage all members who are available in the month of July to probably take the occasion to travel to Sandy Point and see these particular activities.

I had the good fortune in attending high school in St. John's of being subjected to Mr. Ted Russell as a teacher for a number of years. Anyone who has found Shakespeare or some classical items of literature to be boring would have had a real treat for themselves if they ever could have heard Mr. Russell in his presentations. They were anything but boring. Shakespeare, as far as we were concerned in high school, was a man from Pidgin Inlet.

The Premier has put considerable thought and effort and dedication into this particular bill and it is through his ultimate direction that this bill is now before this House. I think I spent some time in the same school board as the Premier, and when I visited his school, which was Grant Collegiate at the time, in Springdale where he taught, it was very noticeable when you went in through the school to the staff room door, that just about every teacher on staff had a guitar, an accordion or a violin lying on his desk. And after school, after the children

MR. R. DAWE: had gone, it was an entertaining place to be. And this is probably where the Premier perfected his talent of playing the spoons, for those of you who have had occasion to hear him do that.

Also I might mention the talents of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan). Those of you who have not had the extreme pleasure of hearing him play the guitar are in for a real treat.

The Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) indicated that he could, in fact, not only recite the songs of Newfoundland, but as well, sing them - again, a real treat for those of you who will experience that some time in the future if you have not already done so.

On March 22nd of this year, Georgiana Cooper, the author of this particular book of poetry and sketches called The Deserted Island, celebrated her ninety-fifth birthday here in St. John's. Unfortunately, only a few short days later, Georgiana Cooper passed away. Those of you who have not had the opportunity to read this book of poetry, I commend it to you. Georgiana Cooper was not only a fine artist, but also an excellent poet and I think that every hon. member and the people in the community at large should endeavour to read that particular book.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. R. DAWE: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition made reference to the fact that if he could change the bill he would put in a clause that would allow for private contributions or corporate donations, and I am pleased that my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins)

MR. R. DAWE: mentioned this point in his speech and corrected the situation. In fact, the Bill does go into great detail in providing an opportunity for the Arts Council to be able to solicit funds from private and from corporate interests and so add to the amount of resources that they would have at their disposal to help support the arts community and the arts individuals in our province. I might make reference to the member from Terra Nova (T. Lush), who indicated in his speech that figure skating, which was a very popular activity in his area, was not funded by this particular government or indeed by my department, and if the hon. member was listening, I would tell him how much money we are giving to figure skating.

The Provincial Figure Skating Association in this province, last year received \$11,650 towards supporting their particular activity. At the same time, they received anywhere from \$7,000 to \$8,000 in any given year to help support them in their training activities towards the Newfoundland and Canada Games. So, this is a significant contribution, and I think it is that plus many other areas that are being funded in this manner help support the young people in this province and some of the less young, I suppose, engage in a particular activity. I just wanted to make that point.

The hon. the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) indicated that he hoped that the Arts Council, part of their mandate would be to support the choirs and various orchestra groups within the Province and I can assure him that that indeed was part of the intention and I understand they have already received several applications for assistance from similar organizations and groups.

My apologies to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). I forgot to indicate the fact that he is an accomplished jews'-harp player and I truly apologize to him for not mentioning that earlier.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE:

There were a number of people who indicated that probably the Arts Council should direct some of their attention and impetus into the educational procedures that are going on within the Province, and unfortunately I did not hear the speech made by the Minister of Education(L.VERGE) when she spoke. I do not know whether in fact she made reference to the proposed new curriculum changes for high school within the Province as they relate to the Arts and so on.

I understand that there is a proposal, not only to carry on the normal types of programs as they relate to music consultants and curriculum guides in the arts and so on, and what is called, I believe in the school system now as Newfoundlandia. But also there are proposed courses that will include Newfoundland culture, creative writing, theatre and the performing arts, media and art history, the study of Canadian art and the environmental arts as they relate to our landscape and our different topography around the Province.

I understand there are a number of school boards which are making their own efforts towards promoting the arts within the Province, and I would like to probably point out one at this time, although there are many others. The Labrador East Integrated School Board, through their fine arts supervisor, host an annual fine arts festival and by so doing, bring arts within the school system up to a much higher profile and I think they are to be complimented very deeply for that effort.

When I introduced the bill initially, I mentioned the fact that we should be very proud of our Arts and Culture Centres as facilities around the Province and I had the good fortune of

MR. R. DAWE: being able to attend the last play of the Newfoundland Drama Festival in Grand Falls. And the adjudicator, in his final adjudication later that evening, complimented this province, and I think we all should be proud of his comments, when he said that our Arts and Culture Centres represent the finest group of Arts and Culture Centres anywhere in North America.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE: And I think we can be very proud of that. I think, in combination with the Arts Council in combination with the arts and cultural section of my particular department, in cooperation with the arts centres themselves and in cooperation with each and every individual within the Province. I think we are making firm and definite strides towards developing a sound and effective manner in which we can promote our provincial heritage, our Newfoundland

MR. DAWE: culture and, indeed, provide an opportunity for Newfoundland artists to develop their talents to their fullest.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to move second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On Motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment Of A Newfoundland And Labrador Arts Council", (Bill No. 16) read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Preparing to call Committee of Supply, I notice it is not one of the motions on the Order Paper, or at least I do not see it here. But, anyway, it is supposed to be there. Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply on Head III, Executive Council, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!
Head III, Executive Council.

Shall 302-01 carry?

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we are doing the Premier's salary so it is only fitting, I believe, and appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that somebody on the government side should tell us if the Premier is going to be in his seat today while we are discussing his estimates.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. member will yield I would explain.

MR. NEARY: I will gladly yield. I want to find out because we have a few things we want to say to the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier had intended to be here this afternoon but at the present time he is due to speak at a conference in Halifax on Canadian unity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: He was due to leave tomorrow. Because he was the keynote speaker at the conference he did not want to miss it, so he went to Gander today. Now in the meantime, any questions that the hon. gentleman has we will be quite prepared to answer. And if there are any that we cannot answer we will certainly take notice of them and I am sure the Premier will be glad to on his return.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The irony of it all! The Premier is gone to Halifax to speak about Canadian unity but in this Legislature, where he was elected to sit, he has done more to destroy Canadian unity by his attack on the Province of Quebec -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - at the worst possible time it could happen. That is one of the things I wanted to raise with the hon. gentleman today. The hon. gentleman will not get any praise or any accolade across Canada for asking the federal government to force the Province of Quebec to allow a transmission line to go across their Province right on the eve of the referendum. Very poor timing indeed, as I have said before. And I am not going to belabour the point but then, within a matter of a few days, we had another minister in the Tory administration get up and attack the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather

MR. NEARY: hypocritical. To say the least, it is hypocritical.

AN HON. MEMBER: Write Dear Abby.

MR. THOMS: I have heard it all now. Talking about Canadian unity.

MR. NEARY: Can you imagine! The Premier of this Province who has done more in the past week - you would not know but he deliberately set out to wreck Confederation, gone over to Halifax to talk about Canadian unity, the very man who himself, inside and outside this House in the last year or so, has tried to imitate Rene Levesque and Lougheed out in Western Canada by, through their greed, trying to get their arms around the world, by saying that they want everything. Not prepared to share anything, they want it all, they are going to grab

MR. NEARY:

everything, grab it all. Talking like separatists. The advisors out on television and radio talking like separatists. And the Premier, instead of being here while his estimates are being put through the House, takes off for Halifax to talk about Canadian unity. Well, we have heard it all now, Mr. Chairman. We have heard it all.

I wanted to also, if the Premier had been in his seat, I wanted to raise this matter of his trip to New York recently and his meeting with Mobil Oil and with the Governor of the State of New York in connection with the export of power, electricity from the Lower Churchill. You know, Mr. Chairman, I will say this straight away, that if I did not have to look at a calendar, if I was not reminded by the calendar that this was 1980, I would swear that we were back in this House to 1965.

MR. WHITE:

In the Smallwood days.

MR. NEARY:

In the Smallwood days when the matter of the Anglo-Saxon route first came up and it looks now, as The Daily News said today, that Mr. Smallwood's dream is about to come true.

MR. MORGAN:

Good old Joe.

MR. NEARY:

The present Premier, who tells us to step into the eighties with Peckford, that was the campaign slogan in the election, "Step into the eighties with Peckford." Forget the past and start life anew. Forget it. Blot out the seven years of Tory corruption, jump over that. Go back to the Joey era when it is to your advantage but do not talk about the Moores Administration or talk about the seven years of corruption in this Province. Blot all that out as if it never happened. That does not exist. All is sweetness and light in this House. That is the way it has to be. You are not supposed to zero in on the government, on the Premier, afraid you might offend the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), or you might offend somebody on this side of the House. Everything has to be sweetness and light.

MR. NEARY: But we are, Mr. Chairman, we are as if the clock has been turned back to 1965 when the Premier of that day was involved in a savage controversy with the then Premier of Quebec, Premier Lesage, when all the bombings were taking place over in the Province of Quebec. The Anglo-Saxon route was raised at that time. And now we are back again, after being told for seven years, seven years in this House we were told day in and day out that not one kilowatt of power from the Lower Churchill would be exported. There would be no surplus we were told. Study after study was done by the Tory Administration, we are told. Study after study indicated that the consumers alone in this Province, because Mr. Crosbie told us there was going to be a shortage of electricity in Newfoundland by 1981, that there would not be any surplus power to export. And all the power would be used by consumers in this Province and the surplus would be used for industrial development in Labrador. And now the Premier takes his briefcase and his entourage and he heads for New York to try to make a deal with the State of New York to take the surplus power from the Lower Churchill, after setting off \$110 million explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle -

MR. STAGG: \$220 million?

MR. NEARY: \$110 million, and telling us that no power was going to be exported, now he is off trying to make a deal. And when I asked him a question yesterday during the Oral Question Period about this fifty/fifty joint cost-shared programme between the State of New York and between Newfoundland to do a study on the Lower Churchill, I am told by the Premier no strings were attached. He said, "No strings attached." He said, "I told the State of New York and I told the Governor of New York, You are not getting one kilowatt of power even though you are going to pay fifty per cent of the cost of a study." Now how naive and how stunned, Mr. Chairman, does the hon. gentleman think we are. Wait until he goes to the bond market. \$3 billion

MR. NEARY: that project is going to cost. And the people he is dealing with in the State of New York know that that is not peanuts, that you have to get that money somewhere. Nine chances out of ten the financing will come from the moneybags South of the border down in the United States. And I do not suppose he thinks we are naive enough, stupid enough to think that in return for paying fifty per cent of this study on the Lower Churchill, that the State of New York is not expecting to get anything in return? Since when did the Americans become that generous? Do they have a Marshall Plan now for Newfoundland? Are they getting kind and generous and charitable and have just developed

MR. S. NEARY: a new Marshall plan for Newfoundland? Is that what you are doing? Or are they investing in favours from this Province for the future, namely, the export of power, as Joey used to say, "To light the lights on Broadway and to operate the subways of New York."

So we are right back to where we were, right back to square one, back to 1965 when this matter first came up when the government of that day became embroiled in a controversy with the Province of Quebec. Ah, Mr. Chairman, here is the technique and here is the strategy that this crowd use all the time. I do not have time to explain it now because I only have a minute left, but I will be back on my feet again. And I want to explain the strategy of this crowd in the last year or so. You would not know but we were the government and they were the Opposition the way they are behaving. They are attacking us all of the time, trying to put us on the defensive; you would swear we were the government. They are the government; the whole trouble is they are not governing.

MR. WARREN: No confidence.

MR. S. NEARY: They are spending too much time playing cheap politics -

MR. WARREN: No confidence.

MR. S. NEARY: - with the offshore resources and with the development of the Lower Churchill and the fishery and all of the other things that matter in this Province.

I know my time is up, Sir, I am sure there are other members who wish to ask a question on this heading. My hon. friend wants to ask a question and then I will get back again and I will have another go and I will talk some more about the strategy of the Premier and this government in the last year or so.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we should answer. I am mindful when I hear the member speak more and more as days go on, and today is a patent example of it, of the the saying, "Those whom the Gods will destroy, they will first make mad"-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: - because the hon. gentleman in the way he is raving on in this area, I sometimes wonder about the man's balance.

Mr. Speaker, to talk in this House about the government doing anything against Canadian unity - this is the first point he made up, an insinuation that what the Premier done with his statements was contributing to the disunity of Canada and what have you. Let it be know that the psychology of the hon. gentleman, some of his followers must be - it has to be - it is the only justification of their stand on the ownership of the offshore in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: What stand?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes, what stand:
The stand of the hon. gentleman opposite on the offshore which is to agree with the federal government, which is contrary to the interests of the people of Newfoundland, which denies the obvious fact that the people of Newfoundland have a right to ownership of these resources and the right to the benefit of these resources, but would rather give them to Uncle Ottawa and continue for the rest of the time to receive welfare benefits for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: That is the stand of the hon. gentleman there opposite, it is a stand that has been articulated from time to time by them all.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman makes a great deal, Mr. Chairman, about the visit of the Premier to the State of New York to discuss the Anglo-Saxon route and insists that we are going back to 1965. And this was the refrain taken up by the Daily News this morning, I noticed as well.

Now, Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to assure this House, as the Premier has already assured this House, that we will not be going back to the age of 1965, we will not be going back, Mr. Chairman, to contracts of sixty years with fixed price, we will not be giving away the power of this Province for a period of sixty years without the right of recall to this Province. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman wishes to inject it from time to time because we have to get up and show in stark contrast what the policy of this government is.

In respect to the present possible proposals, the talks down in New York, the government of this Province is exhausting every possible alternative, is going to determine and do its utmost to see that the power generated within this Province is used for the maximum benefit of the people of this Province. It has been consistent in its policies. There is an attempt by the hon. gentleman opposite, the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), to say there has been a change that now we are talking about exporting our power. The situation as far as this government is concerned, Mr. Chairman, remains the same, that as far as power generated within these borders of this Province, that the first call on the power of this Province is going to be for the people of this Province to use in this Province both for consumption on the one hand and industrial

MR. W. MARSHALL: development on the other hand, that priority is going to be given wherever possible to the places where the power is generated. Now, you do not have to be any intellectual giant to understand that with power developments such as are possible within Labrador, with the possibility of recapturing the power on the Upper Churchill, that right now at this point in time while we could use a lot of it, we may not use all of it. So what does the hon. gentleman want to do with the residue? Does he want it not to be used at all or does he want it to be turned to account? Well, Mr. Chairman, we are going to turn it to account, and we are going to turn it to account on this basis: we are going to turn only that power, which is not needed at the present time by the people of Newfoundland; we are going to sell it, export it, outside. But we are going to export it at the best price procurable by the people of this Province to Newfoundlanders. We are not going to export it at the best price possible to the people of the Province of Quebec or for anywhere else, because this resource belongs to the people of this Province. Neither when we sell it, Mr. Chairman, are we going to tie it up for generations, for thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy and eighty years at a time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: - so that future generations will not be able to get any benefit. If and when - and it is a big if - if and when we sell the power, we will sell the power, Mr. Chairman, on an arrangement whereby it is only on the short-term. And when, and so soon, and immediately as the people of Newfoundland need this power that has been sold for its development, then we will get it. Now, that is a consistent stand and it is a consistent policy.

The hon. gentleman opposite tries to indicate that because the Power Authority of the State of New York is contributing to the feasibility study, 50 per cent, that there must be some deal made.

MR. J. CARTER: That is the way his mind works.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. gentleman says, that is the way his mind works, this is the way he thinks it was.

MR. W. MARSHALL: But the Premier of this Province got up in Question Period yesterday and directly pointed out that not only was no deal made, but it was indicated to these people that when any study is brought into effect and is being paid for, it is being paid for, as far as they are concerned, on spec, and, as far as we are concerned, with no obligation, absolutely no obligation of the government of this Province to supply them with any power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the only type, I would suggest to you, of sensible, sane development that we can have. We will not have a go back to 1965. We will not have power being sold out for sixty years. As a matter of fact, it will not be sold out at all. The return will come to the people of this Province, not to the people of Quebec or the people of Ontario or the people of B.C. or what have you, but to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: We will not be jumping into a contract for the sake of construction purposes, for the small, short-term construction jobs, beneficial as they will be, but we will be getting into power contracts, as I say, for the long-term benefits of this Province.

And I suggest to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), in these matters of resource development when we are at a critical stage, Mr. Chairman - and we are at a critical stage in the development of this Province at the present time - we have a situation where we have bountiful resources, but unfortunately, because of the stewardship of those who came before us, most of those have been given away to other people. But we are at our last chance in offshore. We are at our last chance, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the fisheries. And, Mr. Chairman, we are at our last chance with respect to hydro development. These are the three areas where Newfoundland has a chance for development not only today, but for the future. And this government remains committed, and assures the people of the Province that all developments will be made for the benefit of them and not for others.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I would suggest to the hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of attempting to make their small, little political tricks and to put a shade on the attitude of the people of this Province and the government of this Province and how Newfoundlanders stand, particularly with respect to offshore, for their own particular political immediate, short-term gains, I would suggest to them that they should

MR. MARSHALL: unite with this government, unite with the rest of the people of Newfoundland and come out foursquare on such issues as who is to have the ownership of the offshore of this Province. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, they are acting, and they get up and they protest from time to time, but it is as clear as the nose on your face they are acting diametrically opposite to the interest of the people of this Province and every single day, Mr. Speaker, they get up and they make the type of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Every day they get up and they make the type of speech that was made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to try to cloud the efforts that are being made in order to realize the resources of this Province. They are doing a grave and serious disservice to this Province, to the people of Newfoundland, to the people who are here now and the people who will come in generations yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I have come late to this debate but some of the things said by the hon. House Leader prompt a couple of questions. I want to ask the House Leader -

MR. WHITE: He has gone now.

MR. FLIGHT: He is leaving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I have difficulty hearing the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: So does the hon. House Leader now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Throw the poisonous runt out of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have difficulty hearing the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Since the House Leader is not here to hear the question and possibly stand up and answer, Mr. Chairman, I would still want to get it on record. The House Leader indicated that he tried to give, enunciate the position of this Opposition re the offshore and he indicated that the Opposition agrees with the federal position. Well, my

MR. FLIGHT: problem, Mr. Speaker, and the problem becoming more and more evident in this Province, is that we do not know at this point in time - and it is more important that the government would know, I would think than the Opposition - exactly what Ottawa's position is. It is a fact of life, and a fact that is not very much talked about in this Province, that this administration, this government have not to this point in time met with the Prime Minister of Canada or the hon. Marc LaLonde, the Minister of Energy or any other spokesman for the federal government, the newly elected federal government. And, Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that it is the same party but it is a different government, Mr. Speaker. The House Leader on the other side and the Premier have gone to great lengths to separate their performance from the performance of the former administration. I mean, I can stand up here, Mr. Speaker, and say that anything done, any stupid things done, any policies put into effect that were not in the better interest of Newfoundland by the previous administration, then this is a new administration so therefore they will not make the same mistakes. That is the preception that the members of this government want the people of Newfoundland to have. So it does not make the same sense to say that until the position of a newly elected government in Ottawa is determined, then by what right does the House Leader stand up and say that any group in Newfoundland, Opposition or otherwise, is supporting the position? Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to hear the hon. House Leader address himself to this, that this Province has not to this point in time, to this day, made an approach to Ottawa to determine exactly what Ottawa's position is in the offshore. And we are dealing with a new government. Now you can cut it anyway you like. That is a fact. There may well be reasons, Mr. Speaker, there may well be reasons. The hon. government might be afraid, might be worried that on going to Ottawa and sitting down, that the position that Ottawa is prepared at this point in time to offer this Province is indeed absolutely and totally acceptable maybe by the government and the people. But they are afraid of that because that is the last thing they would want to happen. They are having too much fun making a political issue, a

MR. FLIGHT: partisan political issue of the offshore in this Province. And they do not want, they do not want a policy enunciated from Ottawa that would wash with the people of this Province. And if that is not true, then why is it that the most important issue in this Province today, why is it that three months after the federal election, after a Cabinet have been put in place, that the Premier and his front bench have not seen it necessary to determine what is today's position with the federal government? So let us not hear any more of this nonsense about groups, be it Opposition or anybody else, agreeing or not agreeing with a federal position. To my knowledge there has been no federal position offered to this Province since the federal election, or none asked. So, Mr. Speaker, before we decide who we are defending and what position we are defending and what we are not defending, we need to know the position; and the fact of the matter is that this government does not know the position. I do not know if Ottawa has a position in place. I do not know and until the Premier accepts that responsibility and determines exactly what is the position of the government then he should not be going around this Province alluding to a position that he does not know whether exists or not. And maybe that is the reason why he is

MR. G. FLIGHT:

fluctuating so much himself. Mr. Speaker, in one speech the Premier very recently gave three acceptable possibilities to him for the control under which he would be prepared to accept the development of offshore. And the one that he preferred most of all was by agreement. Now when is the hon. minister going to stand up and tell us that he or his colleagues have gone to Ottawa looking for an agreement or trying to determine what the position is?

Mr. Speaker, the Anglo-Saxon route. again the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is right. The fact is that we talked about the Anglo-Saxon route in 1965 Preece-Ryder submitted a report on the feasibility of that route. And, Mr. Speaker, there were accusations at that time that it was a political ploy, and there is grounds for the same accusation today, that it is again a political ploy. I would like for the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to stand up and tell me and tell this House how it is that he says in one breath that this government will not export, that their policy is to keep the power in this Province and utilize it in this Province when at the same time he is looking at the possibility of not only building a tunnel and bringing the power across the Straits, but then carrying it by cable across for the Port aux Basques area to the mainland. Now the cost of that kind of a study is itself enormous, and the cost, I would imagine would be phenomenal, if indeed the technology is in place. Then how would he justify having put that transmission system in place? What is he proposing? That we would put the load, the 10,000 megawatts that can be developed in the Lower Churchill, Gull and Muskrat, that we have an agreement with Con-Ed in New York to sell that power for a year or two, then if suddenly the market was available in Newfoundland that we would pull off that transmission line, that underwater cable and possibly the billions of dollars that the transmission

MR. G. FLIGHT: cost would sit there? He sits and he wonders. And let me ask the minister something else: is Con-Edison, having spent that kind of money to put that kind of a electrical transportation system in place, is Con-Ed or any other customer in the States prepared to sign take and pay contracts on a monthly basis? Are they prepared to jeopardize the power supply of New York city, the lights on Broadway as he talked about, on a situation with this Province where we will have the right to instant recall? I am afraid not, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid that if that is the way we go that the people representing New York city or the Eastern Seaboard will not be any less prepared to take electricity or take power on a day to day basis than the people who did the negotiating for the Upper Churchill.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are loop-holes in what the minister is saying. It just does not jibe. If the power is going to be used in this Province, and he knows it is going to be used in this Province, then forget about talking about an underwater cable to New York. The minister loves to talk about what happened in the fifties and sixties re: the Upper Churchill development. I would like to hear his explanation of the \$300 million that his administration, starting in 1973 spent, have already spent on the Hydro development in Labrador! \$300 million for which this Province is not one penny better off today! Not one penny! Wasted, \$300 million! And that money was spent when his administration knew that there was no means available to take that power out of Labrador. We spent \$300 million on the development of the Hydro power in Labrador, not knowing where that power was going to go or how it would go out of Labrador. Well, talk about that \$300 million in the same context he talks about the Upper Churchill. And, Mr. Speaker, there is only one solution for the transportation of power out of Labrador and that is the one the minister referred to and that is to negotiate with Quebec Hydro, or with whoever it is, for the right to wheel the power

MR. G. FLIGHT: that is developed on the Muskrat or the Gull out over the facility that is now in place and owned by Quebec Hydro, wheel it out on a call-back basis so that there is no need of a thoroughfare down through Quebec, and negotiate an agreement where we would have the right, by rental or any agreement, to wheel the power from the Gull and Muskrat down to the markets South. And then as that power became needed in this Province, we could call it back because if we called every megawatt back, the hydro lines would still have to be in place to carry the Churchill Falls production for the next sixty-five years anyway. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get on with those few comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) replied in his usual - no, rattlesnake is not a right word - in his usual low level of debate. I am not surprised at that, Mr. Chairman, because the technique that this hon. crowd have been using in the last year is 'Go on the attack, stay on the attack, play politics with the offshore, play politics with the development of the Lower Churchill, play politics with this, play

MR. S. NEARY: politics with that.' Mr. Chairman, they have no more intention in the world of trying to settle this matter of the offshore, they have no more intention than the man in the moon. They do not want the cooperation of the Opposition, they do not want the cooperation of the people of this province. They think they have latched onto a great issue. Well, I can tell hon. members right now that their arguments and their low-level debate and their cheap political maneuvering is starting to wear thin in this province and the people are beginning to ask questions. They are beginning to say, well, who is governing this province, who is governing the Province? Why does the President of the Council (W. Marshall), why does the Premier go on television, come up in the House of Assembly and attack the Opposition? Why? Why? Because that is politically expedient to do: You can get a little short-term gain out of it.

But, it is beginning! The people are beginning to realize what is happening. The people are beginning to say, look, we elected the Tories to govern, why are they not governing? Why are they not developing the Lower Churchill? Why have they not, why have they not made a submission to Ottawa regarding the offshore development - offshore ownership or management? Why have they not made a proposal to Ottawa?

AN. HON. MEMBER: Honest Tories (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they talk about honesty in government. Well, there is more to being honest than being honest as far as the Public Treasury is concerned, as far as the Public Tendering Act is concerned, as far as this is concerned or that is concerned: You also have to be intellectually honest, and this hon. crowd are not being intellectually honest with the people of this province. It is not the Liberals, Mr. Chairman, look, I wish the crowd up over my shoulder here

MR. S. NEARY: the message would filter through.- It is not the Liberals who have to make the decision on the strategy for getting control of the offshore, it is the people who are elected to govern.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What about (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: What about it? What about it? Mr. Chairman, they have not even tested it yet. They have not even prepared a case to show you how sloppy and lazy and stupid they are- they have not even prepared their case yet.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) have not even asked yet.

MR. S. NEARY: I was told by the Premier of this province during the Easter recess, two weeks recess, he was going to spend all his time preparing a letter, he was going to lay it down in writing so he could present something in writing to the Prime Minister of this country and he has not done it yet.

They are not anxious, they are not interested in getting this settled. There has got to be another election they think they can win yet on the offshore. That is the name of the game, Sir. The name of the game is not get control, the name of the game is one-upmanship, political maneuvering, cheap political politics, keep her going, keep her going until we get near the next election and then we might win the next election on the strength of the offshore ownership.

Now, people are getting wise to that. People are getting wise to it and they know the game. They know the game. The hon. gentleman gets up and spends half his time - not half, ninety per cent of his time-ridiculing Mr. Smallwood. He and the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) are such a skinfull of hate -

AN. HON. MEMBER: His buddy.

MR. S. NEARY: His buddy, the fellow who wants to tear down the Union Jack- Next week he is going to haul down the Union

MR. S. NEARY: Jack and trample on it in this province.- such a skinfull of hate, that he has to squirt his venom, squirt his poison every opportunity he gets at Smallwood, and I wish, I only wish that I had that speech that little boy made over at Brother Rice last night about the development of the Upper Churchill. A little boy, I believe he was twelve or thirteen years of age, made a magnificent speech and won first prize for his speech in the High School Speak-off on the development of the Upper Churchill. Why even a ten year old student, a kindergarten student knows the difference, But the hon. gentleman does not. He is such a skinfull of hate, he has to squirt his poison at Joey, every chance he gets and then run out of the House.

But, Mr. Chairman, people are wise to that. People are saying, Hold on, now, just a minute, now. I mean, rather than get up and squirt your venom at Joey again, what have you done? Where is your record? What are you doing about the offshore? What about the hydro potential of the Lower Churchill? What about it? What have you done about it?

MR. WHITE: Wasted a fortune !

AN HON. MEMBER: Two holes in the ground!

MR. S. NEARY: And if you want to talk about the past, what about that seven years of corruption, of Tory corruption in this province? The minister the President of the Council (W.Marshall), managed to jump over seven years of Tory corruption and mismanagement and waste and extravagance to get back at Joey. Now, how can you blot out that seven years? So, we have no intention of baring our souls, Mr. Chairman. The people know, the people are getting wise to the game. The people know that this is a con job, this is a con game this government is playing. They are playing a very dangerous game. They have made no effort at all in this world to settle the offshore question, none at all. They want to keep her

MR. S. NEARY: going. Then keep her going until the end of this year and then into next year. The next thing you know, we will be getting near an election and then they will be out making this the big issue.

You know, one thing about the Premier of this province. One thing about him; he has imitated and is imitating Joey to such a degree that I sit here some days in amazement, in awe that the hon. gentleman is over there imitating Joey. He is doing exactly what Joey used to do. And he thinks he can repeat term 29. He thinks that this offshore development will develop into a term 29 and he will go on then and sweep the Province. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this crowd do not want this matter settled. That would be the worst thing that could happen to them to get this matter settled. They would have nothing

MR. NEARY: fit to talk about, they would have nothing to distract from the problems facing the ordinary people in this Province, namely high unemployment, the cost of living, vandalism and crime, the high cost of electricity, the high price of gasoline, the high cost of housing, no building lots available, but as long as they can drag this red herring in, this offshore thing, as long as they can keep dragging that in everything else has to be pushed to the background. And that is the kind of a game they are playing. And they are playing a very dangerous game indeed.

And then we heard the argument put forth by members on the opposite side, some of them lawyers, that there is no good in letting this matter go to the Supreme Court because the Supreme Court were appointed by the Government of Canada and the dice would be loaded against the Province -

MR. THOMS: That is shame. That is low.

MR. NEARY: - that the cards would be stacked in favour of the Government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. gentleman this, even though these people were appointed by the Government of Canada, are they not some of the most outstanding and eminent lawyers in the Whole of Canada? Are they not

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, I am told, during my research on this matter, that these gentlemen, a lot of them, were appointed as a result of recommendations from the Canadian Law Society.

MR. THOMS: John Diefenbaker, I suppose, appointed some of them.

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on.

Is Mr. Bora Laskin going to tip the scales in favour of Ottawa? Mr. Chairman, that argument is so stupid that it should be exploded right from the beginning. The Canadian Law Society have recommended them, were asked and recommended most of these people. Unless

MR. NEARY: all lawyers in Canada are crooks, and a good many of them are, I would submit.

MR. STIRLING: As he looks across the House.

MR. NEARY: We have one gentleman in this House who thinks it is all right to accept benefits from the Bank of Montréal while you sit in the Cabinet. That is all right in Newfoundland, but over in Nova Scotia that kind of matter is being investigated by the RCMP, where you have a Tory minister being investigated for receiving benefits from a company doing business with the government while he is a minister in that government. That is a violation of the Criminal Code in Nova Scotia and in eight other provinces, but in Newfoundland it is perfectly all right to do it. You can get up and say, "Oh, I would not do anything wrong. I would not do anything wrong. Hon. members know that I am an honest, decent man and I would not do anything wrong. All you have to do is look at my halo. I would not do anything wrong." Nobody accused the hon. gentleman of being dishonest, but it is illegal what he is doing, illegal. It is illegal in Nova Scotia, it is illegal in Newfoundland. It is a violation of the Criminal Code, but the point here I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that they are using arguments when it suits the occasion, they drag up the former administration when it suits them, but they skip over seven years of Tory corruption. They are after doing it all. It is absolutely unbelievable! All in the name of sweetness and light in the House. The decorum of the House now is great, and when the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) starts praising up the Opposition, then I would say we are in serious trouble. I would say we are not doing our job. There is something radically wrong with the Opposition when you get two gentlemen on opposite sides of the House, one praising the other and one scratching the other's back. I would say there is something wrong. Everything may be sweetness and light in the House, Mr. Chairman, everything may be sweetness and light, but nothing is being done. This is the most unproductive session of the House so far that we have ever had in our whole history. The government

MR. NEARY: are not being criticized for the things they should be criticized for, and everything is sweetness and light, but it is the people who are getting shafted while everything is sweetness and light. We were not elected an Opposition to waltz around the floor of the House of Assembly with hon. gentlemen or kiss and hug them. We were sent in here to do a job. The hon. gentleman might like his sweetness and light, but I guarantee you this, Mr. Chairman, when the occasion arises, when I see a kind of a rattlesnake approach to things, a low level of debate and wrongdoing and intellectual dishonesty, then whether they report me or not I could not care less, I am going to do my job anyway, and I will keep repeating it over and over and over and over again until they get sick and tired of it, and the message will eventually have filtered through the table over my head out to the public. We want to find out from the Premier of this Province, for instance - he should be in his seat today, should be in his seat, because he is not going to make any contribution to Canadian unity. He will destroy Canada rather than unify .

MR. S. NEARY: it- but we want to find out what he is going to do about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) and the Auditor General's Report. My time is up now, but I am sure some of my colleagues would like to deal with that matter, because that is not a dead issue by any means, something that is going to come up if I get another chance to get on my feet in the next ten minutes, I am going to zero in on that particular matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, if the press were not here, I venture to suggest that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), not only would he not be on his feet several times today, he would not be on his feet at all.

This is the month of April, and I believe this is the month that Birks have their sale. I must go out and get thirty pieces of silver. And I was going to distribute them more or less evenly on the other side, but after hearing the hon. gentleman speak, I think I will dump them all in his lap, every one of them.

MR. S. NEARY: So you are all ready to haul down the Union Jack.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I have never heard such a pile of treachery in my whole life as has been -

MR. L. THOMS: When you have thirty pieces of silver, talk to the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout).

MR. J. CARTER: The member for Baie Verte - White Bay at least exercised his judgement, something the hon. gentlemen are obviously not doing. Not only do I suggest thirty pieces of silver, but I would like to suggest a few lengths of rope as well so they could use them properly on themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not blame anyone for being a Liberal; that is a matter between yourself and your conscience. A person can be a Liberal, I suppose. Even in Newfoundland a person can be

MR. J. CARTER: a Liberal, but I do blame very much anyone for voting Liberal under the present circumstances, because the leader of the federal party came down here and said clearly on television and clearly in public that Newfoundland did not have exclusive right either to management or control or ownership of the offshore oil.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not! He did not!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: He said the opposite.

MR. J. CARTER: And I am glad that there is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: On a point of order. The hon. gentleman is making a speech -

MR. S. NEARY: Is that what it was?

MR. W. MARSHALL: - a very good speech and I wish to hear him without interruption as a member of the House. He is entitled to be heard without interruption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. T. LUSH: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: We certainly appreciate what the hon. the House Leader had to say. We on this side of the House certainly did not know the member was giving a speech, but if that is what he is doing, we will certainly sit back and listen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, Beauchesne, No. 299: "Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt." I would suggest that the member stick to the subhead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that at least one of the members on the opposite side who is in the Chamber at the moment

MR. J. CARTER: is a lawyer, because it is to the lawyers that I think the Opposition should turn, to the lawyers on their own side. I am not suggesting that they necessarily believe everything that is said by the lawyers on this side, but at least they should turn to the lawyers on their side and ask them for some legal advice.

Now, I would like to suggest an analogy, and I think it is a valid analogy. I am quite serious about this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind interruptions, I welcome them. It gives one a chance to put one's thoughts in better order. But the point I wish to make is a valid analogy. Let us assume that there is an estate to be divided between two sons, two children, and one of them says, 'Look, I do not want any of this, I am prepared to sign away my rights. I will go to a notary public or to a lawyer or to some judge and I will sign away my rights to this property.' Now, automatically, that gives the other son or the other child the residual rights to whatever is to be inherited. Now, Prime Minister Clark was prepared to say publicly that he was prepared to give away or to renounce any rights that the federal government might have. Now, it is an open question as to what rights the federal government may have and the provincial government may have, but there is no question if one of those partners disavows, gives up, signs away all his possible rights, that all the rights that are remaining fall to the other person. You do not have to be a lawyer to see that, surely. And I think that this is an analogous situation. And I think it is - well, I do not mind the Opposition painting themselves into a corner; perhaps that is the way we would like to see them behave. I mean, perhaps that is our job, to see that they do paint themselves into a corner. If they want to commit suicide, even

MR. J. CARTER: without a rope or even if their names are not Judas, then that is fair enough, I suppose. But I can not understand. I would like whoever gets up next on the other side to try and justify what I call the most extraordinary political acrobatics that I have ever seen. And I am only surprised that only one has crossed this House. A great many of the gentlemen on the other side are fine men, thinking men, sensible men and I am sure that if the Opposition persists in its attitude we will see a great exodus from the other side, perhaps not to this side but certainly to an independent position. I can not see that the Opposition will remain united on this issue: I think it is absurd. I would be very anxious, quite seriously, to hear any one or all men get up and justify the official position that they are taking.

I do not mind the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), he just gets up and gives insult and abuse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: The official Trudeau position, I would like to see you justify it that we do not have complete ownership.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: - and that there may be some doubt to this and that the only way to resolve it is to go to court. I am suggesting there is another much easier way. All he has to do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: But he is in some doubt. We may have to go to court about this. But all he has to do is to disavow any rights that the federal government may have, all these residual rights -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: All right, one of you get up and explain it. Thank you.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, it is certainly an oddity as was pointed out by my friend and colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to hear that the Premier is in Halifax at this moment either speaking to or about to speak to unity. I would certainly like to hear what the Premier will be saying. I think I can speculate as to what he might be saying, but it is rather strange for the Premier to be there speaking about unity. As a matter of fact, I would much prefer that the Premier stop talking all together and start doing something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: He has been talking now going on a year. Talk, talk, talk. Talking about offshore oil.

AN HON. MEMBER: Talking and talking.

MR. T. LUSH: Talking about this and that, but doing absolutely nothing and the people of this Province are getting fed up with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the unemployment rate?

MR. T. LUSH: That is what I wanted to hear. That is what I would like for the Premier to be talking about. That is what he should be talking about, the unemployment rate, 220,000 jobs need to be in this Province in the next twenty years.

Would the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) like to hear about unemployment? 220,000 jobs needed in this Province in the next 20 years -

MR. HODDER: He has enough in his own district on unemployment and doing nothing about it.

MR. T. LUSH: - for the young people that are unemployed, 220,000 jobs. We need to create -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Six thousand in the Bay St. George area.

MR. T. LUSH: Ten thousand jobs a year, that is what we need in the next twenty years to reduce the unemployment rate in this Province to a respectable figure of about 4 or 5 per cent. That is what we need to do. How close are we getting to that? Two hundred twenty thousand to be created over the next 20 years, and in order to catch up from where we are now, we have to create 10,000 a year to get to a respectable level or to reach a respectable level of unemployment, or employment whichever way we want to look at it. That is what the Premier should be talking about. That is what the Premier should be talking about, talking about what he is doing in that respect. And let me tell you, putting a corridor through Quebec and exporting the power through New York is not going to create these 220,000 jobs, that is for sure. It is not going to create these 220,000 jobs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, again it sickens one, it sickens one to hear members on the other side make political hay out of this offshore oil. The unmitigated twaddle that comes out of people! It is absolutely astounding to hear these people. Let us talk about the position, the position outlined by the Premier in this House a couple of weeks ago in talking

MR. LUSH: about ownership. Now let us settle the question once and for all. Every Liberal on this side believes in Newfoundland's ownership to the offshore oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Every Liberal on this side of the House. Do we differ? Do we differ from anybody on the other side? Every Liberal in the Province of Newfoundland agrees that Newfoundland claims the ownership to its offshore oil resources, that we own it. We believe it! We believe it! We believe it as well, but we are not out trying to make political hay out of it because we know there are some problems associated with ownership as does the Premier.

MR. HODDER: And as does every member on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: And if you want to get his speech, I can tell you what he said. The hon. the Premier said, 'We can resolve this ownership through one of three steps'. What were they? Because I will tell hon. members, they probably did not read it. That is the speech that we got prior to the Premier's delivery, a mistake was made, and he gave three steps. One was an agreement in both parts, in this hon. House and in the federal - an agreement, legislation.

Secondly, it was by an agreement with the provincial government and the federal government as was entered into with the Maritime Provinces. All right?

Number three was this rather strange one with the extension of boundaries as was done somewhere.

MR. NEARY: In Bermuda.

MR. LUSH: In Bermuda somewhere. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition stood up that day and said we agreed with this but we questioned the legality of some of the points.

Step number one: We did not know whether you could resolve the ownership through an agreement in both parliaments, we just asked the question. Nobody answered it.

MR. HODDER: And they have never answered it.

MR. LUSH: If that can be done we will go along with it. If that is constitutionally proper and right we will do it. But what did the Premier say about it all? What did the Premier say about these three steps? Which one did he say was the better one?

MR. NEARY: He did not.

MR. LUSH: Oh, yes. Oh, yes, the agreement, number two.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, number two, the negotiated agreement.

MR. LUSH: Number two, the agreement. The agreement was the one.

MR. FLIGHT: Shared jurisdiction.

MR. LUSH: He said he was willing to sit down with the Prime Minister of Canada and negotiate an agreement. But what was he doing again the next day? Off talking about, to make it a political issue again, 'We believe in Newfoundland's right to the offshore oil', the ownership because that is a political issue, it is an emotional thing, but not talking about the problems associated with it, not talking about these problems at all. Not talking about that, just a cover-up again to try to make political hay out of it.

And there is nobody on this side who disputes Newfoundland's claim to its offshore

MR. LUSH: minerals, nobody. Nobody!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: You are the Government. Do you want us to negotiate for you?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

It is quite difficult to hear members from the Chair. I would ask all members to refrain from inter-ferring.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have laid bare the facts of this situation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. LUSH: - to expose the Premier and the government for what they are, trying to make political hay out of something on which we all agree. The Liberal Party has not been doing that, we have not been doing it.

I must say, if we had a spokesman on Mines and Energy the people of the Province would have known our position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right! Right!

MR. LUSH: I expect that will be taken care of shortly, and the people of this Province will know our position because we have to fight fire with fire. We cannot sit back here and allow hon. members to paint us in a corner as being unpatriotic Newfoundlanders, people who are willing to give away the resources of this Province. What nonsense! What trash, Mr. Chairman, what trash! Do, Mr. Chairman, we agree with the Premier, that we think too that the best resolution to this claim to the ownership of offshore oil and gas can be settled best, the resolution, through an agreement? We believe that is the best way, like the Premier.

I do not know if he was speaking for the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) then. Was he speaking for him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, I do not think so.

MR. LUSH:

One assumes that the Premier is talking for his government. That is what he said. But what effort has he made to set down with the Prime Minister and talk about the agreement? What does he think, that the Prime Minister has to come and see him? What does he think, that the Prime Minister of Canada should come and make an appointment to see him? He probably does.

MR. HODDER: Knowing him he does.

MR. LUSH: He probably believes that all of the Premiers of Canada should come here and meet with him on this issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is time for the Premier of this Province to get together with the Prime Minister of Canada and find out what deal we can negotiate.

MR. FLIGHT: That is the point. What is the position? Tell us the position.

MR. LUSH: If you want to know, and if the hon. members of the House want to know -

MR. FLIGHT: Tell us the position.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) I suppose.

MR. LUSH: If hon. members in this House of Assembly want to know where the Liberals stand -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) position. You do not know that position.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to make a point -

MR. FLIGHT: You must negotiate.

MR. LUSH: - to clue up my speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: You are not aware what Ottawa's position is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. LUSH: I am contemplating a great closing sentence, Mr. Speaker. Now that I have cleared up the position once and for all where

MR. LUSH:

Liberals stand, let me put this to hon. members - I wish the Premier were here. If the Premier wants to know where the Liberal Party of this Province stands on this issue, if he wants other people in the Province to know where we stand on this issue, let him start the negotiations with the Prime Minister of Canada, and if we find out that these negotiations result in an agreement that is not satisfactory to the people of this Province, if we find out that these negotiations do not give maximum benefits to the people of this Province, then I tell you all Newfoundland will know where this party is standing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So let him start the negotiations now. Let us know what is going on, and we are ready, Mr. Speaker, to tell the people of Canada and the people of Newfoundland where we stand. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: What does the House Leader have to say to that? What does the House Leader say to that? Stand up.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not much sense looking across the House, the ones on the other side really do not have that much to say in connection with this. Basically they do not know what their position is. I thought they had a position when I heard the Premier of this Province come out of a meeting saying that Mr. Clark, the late Mr. Clark, had given us control and ownership and jurisdiction and everything else of offshore oil and gas until, lo and behold, out behind the Premier of this Province struts Mr. Clark saying, "No, no, 'Brian! That is not what I meant at all. I did not say you could have control and ownership and jurisdiction and get your hands on it like that". And that was right in the middle of a federal election. And the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) have the audacity, the unmitigated gall, to stand in this House and to look across at the Opposition and say, "What is your position?". Get a position yourselves first.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. THOMS: Get a position yourselves first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - and then ask us what our position is.
I know what my position is as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, I know what it is. It was amply stated by my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), amply stated. And I will repeat what he said. I can repeat what he said. I agree with him 100 per cent. You will hear from this member if we do not get the maximum benefits of offshore oil and gas. You will hear from this member - okay? - and if you want the Liberal Party of this Province to get the maximum benefits for Newfoundland for offshore oil and gas then have the intentional fortitude to resign, call an election -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - then let us come back.

MR. NEARY: We will govern.

MR. THOMS: We will govern and we will get the maximum benefits, we will get them. But the most silliest thing I have heard, and I heard the schoolboy Mines and Energy Minister (Mr. Barry) in this Province -

MR. NEARY: The schoolboy debator.

MR. THOMS: - the schoolboy debator on, of all things, radio

MR. L. THOMS: telling us, saying to us, you know, 'Go to Ottawa, get an agreement with the federal government on offshore oil and gas.' But on June 18th, in case you have forgotten, you won.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: You won. You know, I agree it is very difficult sometimes to realize since the Premier of this Province and this administration have been elected on June 18th, there has been nothing done, not one single, solitary thing. And that is the problem with Newfoundland today. It is like I said in the House on Friday, that Newfoundland is burning while the Premier of this Province, the administration of this Province, is fiddling. That is the problem.

Mr. Chairman, to me it boggles the mind to have been told this afternoon that the Premier of this Province is in Nova Scotia speaking on Canadian unity. The next thing we will know, the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) will be going across Canada speaking on Canadian unity. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) will be going across speaking on Canadian unity.

MR. S. NEARY: He is going to haul down the Union Jack. We will have the Fleur-de-Lys up next week.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I would not ask those two St. John's men to come to Grand Bank to talk about Newfoundland unity, let alone Canadian unity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, the paper this morning says, 'All is sweetness and light in the House of Assembly.' And the President of the Council, the first time he gets to his feet this afternoon, shoots out the poison and a venom, squirts it out in this House. And again, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) does the same thing. And again, those two gentlemen are on their feet saying to me, that I am not a Newfoundlander, which is a lot of rubbish.

MR. S. NEARY: Are you a corner boy or what?

MR. L. THOMS: We did not have corners in Lamaline or Garnish.

MR. S. NEARY:

Or Gambo.

MR. L. THOMS:

Or Gambo, or Port au Bras or

Rock Harbour. We did not have any corners.

I will not apologize for any position that I might have on oil and gas. And as I said before, though, oil and gas scares the daylights out of me. It scares me to think what Newfoundland can become if there is oil and gas out there. It scares me that we could become another Calgary. We could have the highest divorce rate, the highest suicide rate and the highest alcohol rate in Canada. That scares me.

Crime is going to come to St. John's with its doubling or tripling of our population. That scares me. I do not want to stop oil and gas from coming ashore in Newfoundland. It can give our Newfoundland people an awful lot of things they have been without. It can give the people of Terrenceville and Bay L'Argent and Harbour Mille and Grand Le Pierre and English Harbour East, it can give them the road that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett) and the member for their district refused to meet them on this morning - or yesterday morning, whenever it was. It can give the Burin Peninsula its hospital. It can keep the students in Lawn, in Lawn, a problem that the Minister of Education (Ms L. Verge), even though she has been hiding her head in the sand before the Estimates Committees and copping out on every question that we have asked.

MR. S. NEARY:

She is not feeling well this evening.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We will get her tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS:

It is a funny thing

MR. THOMS: about Education, but the buck stops nowhere in Education. Nowhere does the buck stop. I suggested to the Minister of Education (Ms. Vergà) that we did not need a Department of Education at all. We should just merge it with the Department of Finance, because according to the present minister, all the authority she has, all the authority her department has, is to sign cheques. That is all, to sign cheques.

MR. NEARY: A crisis up in Labrador West completely ignored.

MR. THOMS: There are crises on the West Coast, there are crises on the South Coast, there are crises all over Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: She cannot take it now, she is going to leave. She is not feeling well today.

MR. THOMS: And the minister has no authority to do anything about it, none whatsoever. Maybe some of these crises will not occur if we can get \$15 billion from Hibernia, and I hope the people of Newfoundland get all the good things that the people of Newfoundland deserve.

MR. FLIGHT: What about hospitals?

MR. THOMS: Salt Pond would get its hospital. The land is there now, the land is there now, and there is a great big sign, there is a great big sign there now, too, from the Tory promise of 1975. There has been a change.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long do you have?

MR. THOMS: I still have about a minute, I think.

The only difference between the sign that was erected in 1975 when the Tory administration that you have disowned, the one that you disowned made the promise to build the hospital in Salt Pond, the only difference is in red paint there is a great big 'April Fool' marked across it. Well, I think that has been true of all Tory administrations, including this administration. It is one great big April Fool.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Faird) The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I come back into the debate again. It has been rather spirited this afternoon, people accused of squirting venom and hatred and all this type of thing, I would just like to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Baird) Order please! Maybe before the Leader .
of the House continues, I would like to mention that it being five
o'clock the Speaker will come in to announce the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! I can now inform the House
that I have received notice of two matters for debate at 5:30 when a
motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. Notice given
by the hon. member for Lapoile arising out of a question asked the hon.
President of the Council and the subject matter: Argentia-Massachusetts roll-on,
roll-off ferry service. The second matter for debate: Notice given by
the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) arising out of a
question asked the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications
(Mr. Brett) and the subject matter: the bridge to Ship's Island from
Greenspond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: As I was saying before the Speaker came
in, this debate this afternoon was motivated, really, in the first
instance by the hon. member for Lapoile and his statements -

MR. NEARY: Right on! We are showing a little
leadership over here.

MR. MARSHALL: - with respect - the hon. member for Lapoile
just cannot take that story in The Daily News. Of all places for it to
come to in The Daily News this morning, that story, I think, really got to
him about sweetness and light. He does not like sweetness and light in the
Legislature. You know, he short of depicts myself and the member from
the Strait of Belle Isle, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Roberts), as
singing and dancing around the -

MR. NEARY: Waltzing around.

MR. MARSHALL: Waltzing around the Chamber. I think that
the hon. member for the Straits would agree with me that is a very
unlikely event but, indeed, it is a very humorous one.

MR. NEARY: Kissing cousins.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, so, you know, the debate was
motivated, really, by the hon. member for Lapoile, and he gets up and he
talks about the development situations of this Province.

April 24, 1980

Tape No. 1024

GH-3

MR. MARSHALL: Obviously the hon. gentleman there opposite got quite exercised because of their vulnerability in this after I made a few comments, so I

MR. W. MARSHALL:

have no intention of reiterating them now except to say they are said. If the hon. gentleman - I will say just three things with respect to it, and the hon. gentlemen could perhaps hear this now without their little catcalls back and forth as they want to do when things touch them very deeply. Firstly, if they really want to show that the Liberal Party and they in this Province are interested in the ownership of the offshore being sealed in this Province, all they have to do as a group is to approach their Liberal counterparts in Ottawa and come out unequivocally and state that they will support us in asking the present Prime Minister of Canada to carry through the intent of the letter given by his predecessor a short while ago to the Premier of this Province, that is number one. So if they want to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Number two, if they want to show

that the interest of the Liberal Party and the interest indeed of the Opposition are similar to that of the people of Newfoundland, are not divergent from them, what they will do, Mr. Chairman, I think, quite clearly is that they will not attempt to confuse the issue and the very vital issue that is before the people of this Province. They say at the one hand that they are for us - not for us, for ownership, and then at the next stage of the game they say, 'Oh, the Supreme Court of Canada has to decide or somebody has to decide who has ownership'. So this is really, Mr. Chairman, speaking with -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Forked tongues.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

- forked tongues. It is really,

Mr. Chairman, doing a grave disservice to the people of this Province. It begs the question, Mr. Chairman, 'Why do you

MR. W. MARSHALL: have to have a court case?' as the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), when he got up and made his speech on a point of principle, indicated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Why is it necessary, Mr. Chairman, for there to be a court case on ownership at this present stage when some thirty or forty years ago the ownership of resources in other provinces was given by an act of the Federal Government? Now that has been debated before here as well. So that is the first and that is the second thing.

Now the third thing is this, if the hon. gentlemen would realize that this is the last clear chance for this Province to develop in the future, they would attempt, Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: If they really wanted to benefit the people of this Province, they would speak as one, not just with this government, requiring ownership and demanding full ownership, but also with the other people of the Province.

Now the debate has been very interesting, Mr. Chairman, we have gone into all sorts of areas - the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), references to her, references to the various other ministers and other policies not related whatsoever to the topic at hand. The topic at hand is the Premier's Office, Mr. Chairman, salaries. The item now being considered is \$529,500. We would be delighted, Mr. Chairman, to give the hon. gentleman - the hon. gentlemen I believe have already been given details by the Premier with respect to this, with respect to the detailed breakdown. We would be delighted to give them any further details they wanted. If they want to progress in this committee and use the committee for the purpose for which it is intended, which is the examination of the expenditures proposed by the government and expenditures raised through taxation from the people of Newfoundland.

April 24, 1980

Tape No. 1025

DW - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL: I think the people of Newfoundland have the right to expect the representatives on the other side to be asking questions and we would just be very happy to inform the committee, and through the committee the people of Newfoundland, how wisely the government is spending its money, but the hon. gentlemen there opposite seem to want to get off on the tangents.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and some of his comments are as upsetting to me, I would expect, as to the other people on my side of the House. He started off by saying that we should see our counterparts in Ottawa. But I tell the hon. the President of the Council that we would be quite willing to see our counterparts in Ottawa and negotiate on behalf of this government if this government will tell us that they want us to negotiate for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Because obviously, Mr. Chairman, they do not intend to negotiate. We have been going on for a full year now in this House of Assembly, while politics have been played back and forth, and not once have we seen any moves towards the federal government in any sincere way.

Now, let us look at what this government has been doing. I will tell you first of all what the government has been doing. This government during the federal election decided that oil was the way to win the election, they were going to go out and they were going to dangle the oil issue over the heads of Newfoundlanders. I heard members on that side of the House say as much when the election was called, that they would win seats in this Province because of the oil issue. One member said, 'Do you want the oil? Do you want the oil? Do you want the oil?' That is what we are going to say all the way along'. And I heard that said by members opposite and members in the Cabinet as well.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that did not work. They played their politics. Mr. Clark came down here, they stabbed him in the back. Their game of politics, they were so wrought up about this game, they

MR. HODDER: were going to win and they were going to win Newfoundland seats and they were going to get their point across.

Well, Mr. Chairman, when was the next time they started to play politics? In the Throne Speech. I listened to what members said on the other side of this House throughout the Throne Speech and none of you have a position, none of you. Everyone who got up contradicted each other, one after the other. Even some of the leading lights, like the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) disagreed. I mean, each one.

Then the last thing we heard from the Premier just before he went across Canada to spout his venom and try to raise his image - we think, by the way, the word is out that he is going for the federal leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: The second point is that half of them do not understand what the ownership is all about.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Chairman, they have a good position in one respect, they have a slogan, they only have the slogan, 'We want it all'. Okay, Mr. Chairman, all we are saying over on this side of the House, what our question is, how will we get it? Now, we have heard the Premier stand up in the House and give us three ways, which my hon. friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) mentioned in his speech today, we heard the Premier get up and say that there were three ways in which they were progressing. Well, when are you going to start progressing on offshore oil and gas?

Mr. Chairman, we want one thing. First of all, we want the government to spell out exactly what it is doing. Tell this Province, tell

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland and Labrador
what you intend to do, then find out if we agree with you
or not. If you feel that we have a better affinity with
our counterparts in Ottawa than you do, then give us
the mandate, give us the letters of intent and every-
thing else, give us the mandate to go up and negotiate
for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: For you. For them.

MR. HODDER: Because what seems to be
happening on that side of the House is that they do not
feel competent to go, or they are playing the political
game.

I saw the Minister of Mines
and Energy (Mr. Barry) on provincial TV, a man whom
you would think - on a provincial telecast sometime over
the Easter break - would be spelling out Newfoundland's
position to the rest of the Province, taking five minutes
or six minutes of provincial time, talking about the
Liberal position in the House. Well, if you are so
worried about our position, let us do it. We will do it
for you, give us the mandate.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not
think that is what motivates people opposite. I do not
think that is what motivated the Minister of Mines and
Energy when he was on television over the Easter break.
I do not think that is what motivated the Speech from the
Throne and the accusations of being traitors over here.
I do not think that is what motivated you during the
federal election, it was pure politics. And I think the
hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) hit it right on the

MR. HODDER:

head today when he said, Mr. Chairman, that this government had an issue which they wanted to hold on to, and hold on to, and hold on to. Well, that is what I am afraid of. You want to know my position? Well, I will tell you what my position is: I want to get the maximum benefits for Newfoundlanders, but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I want to know that we are proceeding in an orderly way. And I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentlemen on the other side have an issue which they think the Newfoundland people can identify with. They have a little, small slogan and that is all they will identify with and that is -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

You cannot hear the hon. member talking.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. members opposite will get a great surprise because the people of Newfoundland want to know what your position is and where you are going. But, Mr. Chairman, if you feel so inferior, if this government feels so inferior and feels that we have some pull with Ottawa, well, give us the mandate to go there. But, Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House want as much as anyone on that side of the House, on the government side of the House, to get maximum benefits. But our question still stands, Mr. Chairman - and I will end on this - how will we get it? Will you spell out, will you let us know how we are going to get it? Will you get down to some serious negotiations? Here we are in the Province now with the highest unemployment rate, the highest cost of living, we have got one of the worst educational systems in Canada, the highest rate of functional illiteracy, we have got problems with the farmers, problems with the fishery, \$35,000 for all the fisheries access roads in this Province: So what is this government doing? They are fiddling while the Province goes down into a hole, it goes down the drain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to congratulate my colleagues who have participated this afternoon in this debate. I think a lot of things have been said this afternoon that should

MR. NEARY:

have been said at the beginning of this session. My colleagues are getting fired up. They are getting sick and tired of having accusations of 'traitor,' of 'coward,' 'you are less than a Newfoundlander' flung across the House and now they are going to fight back. They are now going to fight back. Every one of my colleagues here will get up in his turn and I guarantee you he will fire both barrels, Mr. Chairman, because this afternoon we have stripped the government stark naked. We have exposed them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

We have exposed them for the fraud that they are perpetrating on the people of this Province, a fraud -

MR. THOMS:

The lies.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, you can call it a lie. You cannot call a member a liar, but it is a lie, it is deceit of the lowest kind. And the funny part about it is that the stunned crowd up over my head lap it up, suck it in, take his picture, put him on the television, interview him on the radio, suck it in as if it was gospel when in actual fact, as I said a few moments ago, they do not want the issue settled. They want to keep it going, keep it going. Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague from Port au Port hit the nail right on the head. If this crowd are incompetent, if they feel incompetent, if they are not sure of what they are doing, they cannot negotiate with Ottawa, well, get out, step aside. If they want us to do it for them, well, I would gladly accept the challenge. Just step aside and let us go at it. We will settle the matter. We will not just sit over there and talk about it for seven years. We will not get over there and yack and chaw about it like they have been talking about the Lower Churchill for the past seven years. Action, that is what this Province needs. And the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) stands up and says we should be discussing the estimates, item by item, that is what we are here for. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are on the Premier's salary, we are allocating money for the Premier's office and we want to know what he is doing, what he is going to do with that salary and with that money; we want to know. And that is why we are debating it. That

MR. NEARY:

is why we are forced into this situation. And the next thing you know some of the crowd up over my head will be saying, "Oh, all they are doing is making long-winded speeches!" Well, do we have any choice? Do we have any choice at this point in time in this House other than get up and speak for ten minutes and then sit down and get up again? And the Premier is not in his seat to answer the questions.

So, Mr. Chairman, the word will go out.

Sooner or later, the word will go out that all this is is a phony con game. All it is is cheap political trickery and maneuvering and fancy figure skating on thin ice, that is all it is. It is all a gigantic bluff.

MR. THOMS: It is all a giant lie.

MR. NEARY: And it is too bad we do not have more Wick Collins' in this Province to point it out. There is only one left, as I said the other day in this House, there is only one political commentator left worthwhile talking about and that is Mr. Wick Collins who beat the Thompson Group the other day. He did not get enough as far as I am concerned. He deserves more, even though I have been the victim of his pen on more than one occasion. But he is the only one left, the only one.

Mr. Chairman, it is twenty past five now.

I would say about four-thirty they packed up their papers upstairs, packed them up, took off for the day, everything is done, they have their day's work done. Well, if that is their idea of freedom of the press and being the eyes and ears of the people of this Province, I would say 'God help Newfoundland!' All my colleagues have made excellent speeches. Well, we will see tomorrow how much reporting will be done on it.

MR. S. NEARY: My colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) made one of the best speeches ever I heard him make in this House and it only took him ten minutes to do it. My hon. colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) almost got a standing ovation. My hon. friend from Grand Bank, (Mr. Thoms) a newcomer, a junior member in the House, absolutely fantastic - one of the best speeches I have ever heard! And the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) always makes a good speech, always.

MR. FLIGHT: Right on, right on.

MR. S. NEARY: I have no doubt why, Mr. Chairman, there are so many potential leaders, there are so many potential leaders and Premiers on this side of the House you could not count them on your two hands. If we accomplished nothing else this afternoon - we are forced to do this, rather than ask this question and that question about this vote in the Premier's estimates or that vote, we are forced to our feet to expose this fraud and we have stripped the government stark naked. They are standing over there now just the same as when they came into the world -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - ladies and gentlemen alike.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: You are still upside down, Steve!

MR. S. NEARY: I hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the interest of serving the people of this Province the way they should be served that we will never again, never again hear a member on the government side of the House get up and say, "What is your position on offshore?" We are not the government. When we become the government we will tell the hon. member for Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) and the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and St. John's South (Dr. Collins), we will tell you what our position is.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) a long time yet, though.

MR. S. NEARY: Is that so? It might be sooner than you think.

MR. FLIGHT: Better be careful.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I will you what it is like.

What they are saying - just listen to this - what they are saying: They are saying, "Yes, we own the offshore resources" Well, we are saying the same thing. That is what they are saying, " We own it". And then we say to them, " Well, how are you going to confirm that?" Because, Mr. Chairman, if I live in a house for one hundred years, does that mean that I own it? If I wanted to sell the house I am living in, say, for the past hundred years, I want to sell that house, can I sell it without proving that I own it? Can I, Mr. Chairman? It is just as simple as that. The government are saying they own it. We say, "Yes, we own the resources. Now, how are we going to confirm it?" I have heard five different ways put forward in this House of how we are going to confirm it. We heard the Clark formula. We started out with the Supreme Court case, preparation for the Supreme Court, a half million dollars of taxpayers' money spent preparing a case for the Supreme Court. We have heard the constitutional route, "Get agreement from the other Provinces of Canada." We have heard the negotiations, the same as P.E.I., Nova Scotia and New Brunswick did, negotiate a settlement, only Newfoundland would get more because we have a stronger case. And we heard the Marshall formula, whereby we will bring in concurrent legislation in this House and in the Parliament of Canada. Five ways! Now, I challenge the government here this afternoon to tell us which route they are taking, which position they put in writing to the Government of Canada. I challenge the administration! If it is being done, if they have made their position known in writing, I do not know, but I would almost turn my salary over to them for the next year. As of this date, no position has been put forward to the Government of Canada, none whatsoever, none, N.O.N.E, no position.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No position.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, all they have to do, because there is unanimous agreement in this House that Newfoundland

MR. S. NEARY: owns the offshore - now will the government please tell us what position they are going to put to the Government of Canada to confirm that ownership ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And once they tell us that, then we will answer them; then we will be able to tell them where we stand, if we agree with their position, disagree with it, water it down, beef it up. So tell us, never mind the phony arguments of you have to establish a principle first and then work out the details after. Tell us how you are going to confirm it, and once you indicate that to the House, tell the members on this side, and on your own side, because they are just as much in the dark as we are,

MR. NEARY: tell us what position you are going to put to Ottawa and then I will decide as a member of this House whether I agree with it or whether I disagree with it. I can do no more than that. At the moment I do not know what the government's position is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nor do they.

MR. NEARY: No, they do not, because the Premier has not taken the time, he is too busy having his picture taken to sit down and put it down in writing and carry it up to the Prime Minister of Canada. As soon as we get that position, Mr. Chairman, then we will be able to tell the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). We will be able to say yes or no or we agree with it or we do not agree with it or why do you not do this or why do you not do that. Which one of the five options, which one of the five options, which one of the five alternatives will the government use in trying to confirm the offshore ownership?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be nice to just say a few words on this because I could not do anything else here. I tried to do a little work, but it was so noisy here today I really could not get anything done. It was rather peculiar why it should be so noisy here today. I tried to figure out why it was so noisy and I came up with the answer: The Leader of the Opposition is not here, and the House Leader (Mr. Roberts) is not here, so all the little boys came out to play. Usually they do not say a word when the big noises are over there, but, when they are out of the House, immediately there is this great uproar and they kept rushing out and blowing off at the mouth, saying all sorts of wild things.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that came over was that the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) says, "Our position is clear, we believe we own the offshore", and that was to settle it all. There was no more to be said after that. That was the final answer to the position of the Opposition. Well, I would just say this, did we believe we owned Churchill Falls and did that give us the results from Churchill Falls? Just by believing

DR. COLLINS: we owned Churchill Falls we did not need
to do anything more than that. This is the fallacy and the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: - and the barren content of an article
like that. Now other members of the Opposition, they did add on a little
more to that. They said, "Not only must you believe, you must go to
Ottawa". Now, Mr. Chairman, what is different about that? Have we not
always had that old cap-in-the-hand approach? Have we not always said,
we own something but let us go to Ottawa on bended knee, let us go up
there with our cap in our hand and say, "Will you please give us what
we own"? That is another aspect of the Liberal argument across the way.
Now, the argument that the Opposition seems to be putting up is this, and
I would like to use an example or an analogy, and that is that you
have a car and it is parked outside your door. Now, someone comes up
the street and says, "That is not your car, that is my car". What our
friends opposite want us to do, they want us then to go out and say,
"Let us negotiate with this fellow as to the ownership of this car
and perhaps we will have a saw-off". Now it is my car, he claims it
is his car, so we will now negotiate with him and probably we will end
up owning it fifty-fifty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Well, that is not the way I look on things,
but that seems to be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - what is required.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Finance is (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, on our side of the House
we have been much more constructive than that.

DR. COLLINS: We went to the Prime Minister of Canada and we stated our case to him and we said, "There may be some dispute or some difference of opinion, in some people's minds, as to the owner of the offshore", and we said, "We do not feel there is any dispute whatsoever, we own the offshore". And the Prime Minister of Canada said, "I agree with you and I will give it to you in writing", and this is what he did. He gave us a letter in writing. Now, the members of the Opposition want us now to go and get a similar letter, to get another letter in writing. Well, in our view, when the Prime Minister of Canada says something and puts it in writing you do not need to go back and do it all over again, even though the man changes, the commitment does not change. Mr. Chairman, I can understand why the members of the Opposition want the second letter, because there is another Prime Minister in Ottawa now, and they are doubtful about whether that Prime Minister is trustworthy and that is why they want another letter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: I can understand why that should be so, because the present person who is the Prime Minister of Canada has stated things in the past and done exactly the opposite when the opportunity presented itself. We do not have to cast back our minds very far to price and wage controls, when the present person who is the Prime Minister of Canada said, "I would not touch it", and then certain events occurred and immediately he reversed himself. In this past little while, the person who is the Prime Minister of

DR. J. COLLINS: Canada said, 'The Tory budget is a hopeless document - I would not touch it with a barge pole. We had to throw these people out of office.' No sooner has that event occurred when they bring in the same budget. No wonder the members opposite have doubt about the trustworthiness of the present person who is the Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, the member who last spoke said, 'Tell us how we will resolve this issue. Tell us how. There are many ways of resolving this issue.' And I agree with the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) when he says this. There are many ways that the federal government can resolve this issue. We have stated our case - we say we own the offshore. Now the issue can be put totally to bed if the federal government will now come out and either again confirm, without our asking, in writing that they agree with us, or the federal government can bring an act into the federal House and confirm our ownership that way, or if they want to, at some point in time, they can even go to the Supreme Court and do it. We do not care how the feds do it. We know what we own. We know what we have stated and the ball is now in the feds court, so let them take any route they want but take one of the routes. That is all we are asking the feds to do - take one of the routes. And if the Opposition opposite have any influence at all, which I rather doubt, if they have any influence at all in Ottawa, please tell them to take one of the routes and we will get it over with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, it is 5:30 P.M., but we will come back. We have six hours left, I gather, on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Six hours and approximately five minutes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I think we will use them all. The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) has simply now opened the sixth alternative and we will have great delight in exposing the inconsistencies, the illogicalities and the other things in his mild-mannered mewlings, Sir.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But it is 5:30 P.M. and perhaps we can get along with the Late Show and then carry on. Maybe the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) could tell us: Are we going to carry on with this tomorrow?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Good. The Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) is first in the barrel in the morning then, Sir. I hope he is here.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A motion is deemed to be necessary for the Committee to rise.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) automatically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the Committee rise and report progress. All those in favour 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 5:30 P.M., a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is Argenticia - Massachusetts roll-on, roll-off ferry service.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was amazed the other day when I asked the President of the Council about this new roll-on, roll-off ferry service between Massachusetts and Argenticia and the hon. gentleman answering my question seemed to know very little about the new service

MR. S. NEARY: even though this company or somebody, whether it is the government or the new company, have gone ahead and built a dock in Argentinia for this new service. They have gone ahead and asked the Government of Canada to forgive a \$4 million customs duty on the ship, a Norwegian ship manned by a Norwegian crew - not a Newfoundlander on her. They have asked to have forgiveness and received. The \$4 million customs duty was waived by the Government of Canada.

And this service, Mr. Speaker, we are told, is to bring tractor trailers from Massachusetts, from the United States, to Argentinia. Now, I am not knocking Argentinia. I would say, God bless them, I hope they get everything down there they are entitled to. But what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the damage that this service is going to do to C.N.'s operation in this Province, including the C.N. ferry that goes in to Argentinia every year.

Mr. Speaker, I am told via a very reliable source that this ship, which is called the Sea Horse, is not intended to bring

MR. S. NEARY: tractor trailers from the United States exclusively, that tractor trailers from Ontario and Quebec will be able to go South of the border, get aboard of this ship and be brought into Argentia. These tractor trailers are now coming through Port aux Basques, through North Sydney and through Argentia in the Summertime. Now is this government, who are so dedicated to saving the Newfoundland railway and saving CN and saving CN employees' jobs in this Province, are they going to sit idly by and allow this to happen? There is no way, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that that company, Bridgeline or whatever it is, which is managed by Atlantic Ship Management in Halifax, there is no way they can survive economically by merely bringing in tractor trailers from the United States, no way. They must have something else in the back of their minds and in my opinion the something else they have in the back of their minds is to steal freight away from CN, tractor trailers and freight that is now being brought to Port aux Basques, Lewisporte and Argentia, to steal it away from CN. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, we will have lay-offs in North Sydney, in Port aux Basques, probably in Lewisporte and in Argentia. I think, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), if he speaks for the government, should tell us, should state a few facts about this new ferry service and not be just vague and general about it, tell us if this company is trying to do via the backdoor what so many other companies have tried to do by the front door, and that is cut in on CN's operations in this Province and give another body blow to those who are trying to save the Newfoundland railway and maintain the CN services at the present level or even improve CN services in this Province, in Port aux Basques and Argentia and in Lewisporte. I have very grave concerns about this new ferry service and I hope now that the minister when he speaks can straighten the matter out for me and reassure CN and its employees in this Province

MR. S. NEARY: that there will be no effect, no layoffs, no cutting into their operations if and when this new service starts and I understand that it is scheduled to start very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the question related to roll-on and roll-off ferries but it really could be entitled a rave on-rave off by the hon. member for LaPoile because I do not know whether the hon. member for LaPoile was really interested in the answer. The question was asked; at the time I took notice of it to get other information. Today, coincidentally, I have certain of that information but he did not want to wait for the information, Mr. Speaker, he wanted to get up and make a great tirade. In other words, he was unsatisfied with the answer, the answer that you were going to take notice of a question; That is really what he is debating. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile's concern for CN is very touching, but I say to him that it is really lately come to him. As far as this particular situation has gone, I will touch, for a few moments, on this, This is the concept of the roll-on roll-off ferry. It is by a company called Atlantic Ship Management Ltd. It is going to inject new life, not only into Placentia itself, but into, indeed, all of the Province. It is being deemed and it is being styled to be effective and efficient because the ferry will ply between Argentia and Fall River in Massachusetts. It will allow, particularly, the development of the fishery to be enhanced because it will give us closer access and more speedy access which is very very necessary to the fish markets. It will very much enhance the development possibilities in this Province. Now, we say this - I know the hon. member for LaPoile asked the question because he is the representative for LaPoile where Port aux Basques is.

MR. MARSHALL: and as far as we are concerned we have and we share the fervent hope and expectation that this will not really affect in any dramatic way the people of Port aux Basques but, rather, will be another development that this government has seen during its tenure to develop the productivity and the commerce of this Province and enable the fishery to develop better and, therefore, to enable all commercial activities. It will also enable us to get much needed fresh fruit much quicker from the Southern part of the United States and there are many other benefits for it.

Now, as I say, the hon. member's concern for CN is understandable now that he is the member for LaPoile but certainly, as I say, it is now lately come to him. Would that he had exhibited the same sense and degree of concern in 1967 when poor old Placentia at the time, when there was a deal struck by the government of which he was a member, to trade off the rail service into Placentia for the access road to Argentia. And it was only stopped, Mr. Speaker, at the time by the timely efforts of the now member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), who was living in Placentia at the time, who established a committee on his own.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And through his leadership this committee made representations that forced the government, of which the hon. member for LaPoile was then a member, to -

MR. NEARY: I was not a member.

MR. MARSHALL: Very much a supporter, sitting over here on this side of the House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) supported more than (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: He was a tiger then, Mr. Speaker, without any teeth at all. It was, yes, sir, no, sir,

MR. MARSHALL: three bags full, sir, what can I do today, sir, for you, sir.

So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is just trying to make political points out of this. The hon. member asked a question, notice was taken but he could not wait for notice. I have now given him the information. I also inform him that this government stands foursquare behind the development of Port aux Basques. Over the past four year approximately \$12 million has been poured in there.

MR. NEARY: From the Government of Canada, the federal government.

MR. MARSHALL: There is a new dock. There has been dredging. There have been all sorts of support for the people of Port aux Basques and the railway, much more support from this government than from the people opposite who sat back and saw the passenger service curtailed and were prepared to preside at the death of the railway itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned. We share the concern but we look at this as a project for the future development and fostering of activity of this Province and we are going to do everything that we possibly can and we do not foresee that it is going to affect Port aux Basques because this Province is growing, and day by day it is growing, and there is more and more for every segment of the Province and it is growing in a much more healthy economic manner both in the East and the West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

The second matter for debate, raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista North, is the

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): bridge to Ships Island from Greenspond. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have put this matter on the Late Show because of the urgency of it. I am not sure that the minister was aware of the degree of the problem because when he gave his answer he said, 'I do not wish to appear to be callous'. He then gave a very callous answer.

Here is the situation, Mr. Speaker: Ships Island is a small island joined to the Island of Greenspond. It had a breakwater built by a federal government and the Department of Highways about fifteen or twenty years ago built a bridge. Sometime after that the council in Greenspond was incorporated. Their total budget is about \$30,000 a year. The island of Ships Island, by the way, has had some famous Newfoundlanders born there, one of whom was Walter Carter. And I have no doubt that if he were in the House today we would have support for getting that bridge completed.

MR. HOLLETT: His own mother would not agree with that.

MR. STIRLING: The first and most important consideration is that there seems to be a stand-off. The

MR. L. STIRLING:

Federal Government has said that they are quite prepared to put up the money for the breakwater as soon as they know who will handle the bridge. They do not want to haul the bridge out of there because at this stage the council certainly cannot afford to take it on. Their total budget is about \$30,000 and the estimate for the bridge is about that same amount. The bridge is in imminent danger of collapse. I received a phone call from the mother of three of the children who go across that bridge every day to school. There are no high-roads on Ships Island or Greenspond. Anywhere else in the Province, the Department of Transportation and Communications would pay for the maintenance of the main road through the community. Well, the main road through the community of Ships Island does not exist and the main road through Greenspond does not receive one nickel from the Department of Transportation and Communications.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a situation in which everybody is taking a hands-off position. There are fishermen who use the waterway under the bridge and that can collapse on them at any time, and the children who go to school over the bridge—they walk, obviously, there is no transportation—walk over the bridge every day. The council has told me in a telegram, and I have given a copy of it to the minister, that the bridge is in danger of collapse. And I would ask the minister if he would at least send down an engineer to, if nothing else, close the bridge if it is a hazard and to sit down with the council and with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and with the Federal people because everywhere else in Newfoundland this is a responsibility of the Department of Transportation and Communications. If a child is drowned as a result of that bridge collapsing. I am sure that the minister does not

MR. L. STIRLING: want to be standing here saying, 'Well, it was simply not my responsibility so I take no responsibility'. The people there have nowhere else to turn. If that was the Manuels bridge there would be a dozen engineers out there this afternoon. It happens to be in a small community in a part of Newfoundland that we talked a good deal about preserving; the way of life in Newfoundland, the quality of life, the rights of our children in Newfoundland to have decent accomodations, decent education and at least, in this case, a safe means of transportation across a waterway to get to a bridge. They have no other alternative, they have no other choice, they cannot go on another road, they cannot keep the children home, they cannot send them to another school.

The very least, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the minister has had time to think about it because he took the approach, 'Well, it is not my responsibility and I am not even going to talk to somebody else about it'. The very least that I expect the minister to do is to agree now to send an engineer down to take whatever action is necessary for the safety purposes and then for him, because it is his responsibility everywhere else in Newfoundland to take the initiative in bringing the people together, to make it necessary for them to work out a subsequent solution to this problem. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I did not think that I sounded callous this afternoon. I simply indicated, in the reply to the question, that the hon. member should be addressing the question or the problem to a different minister.

MR. C. BRETT: I think all of us over here are concerned when something like this happens and, of course, I am concerned. But I indicated that every time there is a problem somewhere in some community, whatever the problem might be, that I see no reason why somebody should point the finger at me and say, 'Look, Minister of Transportation and Communications, will you go to your colleague and see that the problem is rectified?' That is all I said. I have to repeat that we do not have a presence on the island of Greenspond or the one adjacent to it and I do not know if the council in question, if they have contacted the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing or not but if they have not, I suggest that they should. I would also suggest that if the hon. member was doing his job he would not be asking me to go to that minister but that he would be doing it himself.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long the Department of Transportation and Communications has been the fall guy in government. And I have been trying to do something about it and I am going to continue because if somebody is digging out a basement to build a house, a private home and there happens to be a highroads tractor nearby, either the member representing the district or the minister gets a call, 'Can we have the tractor for a couple of minutes to dig out the basement?' You know, 'it is a government tractor, so what odds?'

MR. BRETT:

Give us the tractor for a couple of hours.' Somebody is building a playground and they want so many yards of fill moved, Get after the member on the other side of the House' - I am not being partisan - 'get after the member, see if we can get the equipment from the Department of Highways.' It has always been like that. If a church or whatever, you know, if there is something going on, right away everybody rushes off to get the equipment that belongs to the Department of Transportation and Communications because they figure it does not cost anything. But by the same token if I have a grader in Trinity North working on a private road and I have a tractor up in your district of Bonavista North and if I have ten or fifteen pieces of equipment belonging to the department doing things for which we have no responsibility, then, in essence, that means that there is some section of the highway for which we are responsible and where we should be working and we are not working because the equipment is elsewhere. I think that should be stopped. And maybe that is not exactly the case on Greenspond Island but certainly, you know, I have to reiterate what I said, that we do not have a responsibility for that. The department that has the responsibility should be contacted and I will repeat what I said in Question Period, if that department will allocate funds, or if they could make some deal with the council, I will be only too happy to send out an engineer or engineers or foremen or whatever the council needs and we will give them all the services that we can. But the project itself cannot be funded by the Department of Transportation and Communications.

You know, it might appear to the hon. member that everybody is saying, "Hands off!", and I do not think that is true. I do not know if Mr. Baker is involved in this. If not, then he should be because there is some federal responsibility there. But I think if we all got together we could probably work this thing out. I have no objections to sending down an engineer. I think we did that before. I do not know if that was requested in the telegram but whether it was or whether it was not, you know, I can certainly arrange for that to be taken care of.

MR. BRETT: I cannot sit down without saying that I am very proud that this government has seen fit to bring that settlement alive. It is now a very viable community and it is thriving again. It was not all that long ago that it was on the list to be resettled. We are very happy that that was done away with and Greenspond today is a flourishing, thriving community and I look forward to the day, in the not too distant future, when I will be able to get in my car and drive to Greenspond and I hope we will have a road through Greenspond then as well.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 A.M.