

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to bring to the attention of all hon. members in the House that we do have some new seating arrangements. We have not yet had an opportunity to print the new seating plan, but for your information the new seating arrangements are that the new Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth and Environment (Mr. Andrews) will be sitting here on my left where the former Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth and Environment (Mr. Dawe) sat. The new Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is sitting down where the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) was sitting, and the member for Trinity North will sit where the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) was sitting - just so that everybody is aware of it. We will have a seating plan as soon as we get an opportunity.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I would like to point out to the hon. House that I rise on this point of privilege without any rancour or ill feeling or anything of that nature on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the Premier of this Province in response to certain questions asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on March 25th, deliberately misled this House. And, Mr. Speaker, he deliberately misled the House on several occasions in connection with the answers to questions. It is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that we feel on this side of the House cannot

MR. THOMS: go unchallenged taking into consideration parliamentary democracy over the ages and that, Mr. Speaker, in situations such as this, you know, there is an old legal adage or principle that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my point is that the Premier deliberately misled this House, namely - and I would like to quote for Your Honour and to indicate that there is a prima facie case here that there was a deliberate misleading of the House. I would like to quote from Hansard of March 25, 1981. The Premier in response to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), makes this statement: "Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the incident that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to raise again, let me say that I have spoken to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) on the matter, as I have indicated before, and the Minister of Transportation has paid for the services rendered to him at the time and that is where the matter rests."

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we know differently from the letter of resignation tabled in this House yesterday.

The Premier further goes on to say, "No, he has paid in full."

MR. L. THOMS: "And I am persuaded to that point of view, and not only persuaded, I know it to be a fact. And when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) returns to the House no doubt he will then have the additional documentation which was not available to him because it was in the mail to his bank. So that is the situation, Mr. Speaker."

Further on in the same Question Period, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says, "Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before this matter became an issue in this hon. House". Now, Mr. Speaker, again we know that the Premier could not have known because, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation had not paid, had not produced a receipt where he had paid for what he said he had paid for. The Premier goes on, Mr. Speaker, in the same Question Period on March 25, 1981. "Mr. Speaker, if the hon." - and I am quoting here from Hansard - "Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), you know, has some information, then let him present it outside of this House or wherever, not use in this House, Let him present it. When the Minister of Transportation returns to this House, he will produce the additional documentation that the member for LaPoile is looking for. He will produce the cheque and all the rest of it. There is nothing dishonest, there is nothing underhanded about this transaction at all. It is totally aboveboard."

MR. NEARY: Shocking, shocking.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon we found out that indeed there was something underhanded, that in fact there was something dishonest. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one further reference. As you know, one of the key ingredients in the whole line of questioning

MR. THOMS: on this particular matter was whether or whether not there had been a receipt issued for the cheque that was alleged to have been paid. And there has been no receipt to this point in time tabled in this House. Premier Peckford, in answer to a question, says, 'Mr. Speaker, if you want to get specific about the receipt, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) has the receipt'.

MR. NEARY: What? Tut, tut!

MR. THOMS: 'Mr. Neary: He does not have a receipt.' 'Premier Peckford: He does so have the receipt.' 'Mr. Neary: He tabled all the documents and there is no receipt there.' 'Premier Peckford: He has the receipt and he will have the cheque when it returns from the bank and then it will be tabled in this hon. House.'

MR. NEARY: Shame, shame!

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, all those answers to questions in this House, put together with the letter tabled in this House on yesterday afternoon to the hon. A. Brian Peckford, Premier, from the Minister of Transportation, I believe constitute a prima facie case

MR. THOMS:

that there has been a breach of privilege of this House, that the Premier of this Province has in fact come in here and deliberately misled members of this House and this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, if you find to this effect, if you find that there has indeed been a prima facie case, I am prepared and ready to move the necessary motion.

Thank you very much.

MR. MARSHALL:

Speaker.

To the point of privilege, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

hon. the President of the Council.

To the point of privilege, the

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I find it indeed a matter of extreme regret that the hon. member for Grand Bank (L.Thoms) has seen fit to get up on his feet in the House on this particular point of privilege. I thought myself that the response of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he said that the Opposition took no great joy in what occurs to be a very unfortunate incident affecting a member of this House and affecting the position of a member of this House, I thought it was a fine statesmanlike expression by the Opposition and I am really really sorry that the hon. member has seen fit to get up on a point of privilege like this because really what he is doing, Mr. Speaker, is really he is trying to make a case out of a situation that was dealt with, and it was dealt with yesterday, I think with a great deal of sadness by all members on both sides of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the letter that the hon. gentleman read before this House, the letter to the Premier from the former Minister of Transportation and Communications (C.Brett) quite clearly says that the former minister of Transportation misled this House and misled the Premier. The Premier, when he made the statements to which the

MR. MARSHALL: hon. gentleman referred, was obviously repeating information which had been conveyed to him by the Minister of Transportation, the former Minister of Transportation and Communications (C. Brett) at the time, and that is quite clear, that he gave this information and subsequently it has been brought before this House that the Minister of Transportation and Communications himself acknowledged that he misled not just the House, but the Premier. And I see the hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms) apparently in conference with the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) on this particular matter, Mr. Speaker, because it is the member for LaPoile—and I find it really regrettable that the hon. gentleman would get up and try in effect to draw to the attention of the public a very, very sad and unfortunate incident that has occurred in this House which the Premier has dealt with, which the government has dealt with, which the former Minister of Transportation has dealt with, with a great deal of heaviness and sorrow from all sides, and I find it very despicable really that the hon. gentleman would get up and go to the stage of alleging that the Premier has now misled the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the very best, this bestial type of point of privilege by the hon. gentleman is a difference of opinion, if you like, between two hon. gentlemen. But I cannot say too much about the interpretation that the hon. gentleman himself wishes to put upon it to come up with a difference of opinion. And while, Mr. Speaker, a matter of

MR. W. MARSHALL:

privilege must be raised at the earliest possible opportunity. The government does not want to rely on that because, Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly and absolutely clear that when the Premier rose in this House to answer the question that was put to him, he was repeating and he was conveying to the House information that had been given to him at that time by the former Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett).

Having done this, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to see how the Premier can be accused of deliberately misleading the House. I think it is a sad and unfortunate day in this House that this matter would be brought up at this particular time. And, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice that I will be rising on a point of privilege, after Your Honour has had an opportunity to consider the matter, to ask the hon. gentleman to retract and apologize for statements made like this. I mean there are certain depths, Mr. Speaker, to which and below which one does not stoop even in this House of Assembly and even from the gentlemen in the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

To that point of privilege, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the same point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. First of all, I would like to correct a statement that the hon. gentleman made about the earliest opportunity. This is indeed, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows, the earliest opportunity that we could raise this matter because Hansard was not available to us until today and we did not have an opportunity to go through Hansard, yesterday's proceedings, and the letter tabled by the Premier yesterday.

MR. S. NEARY: Another statement that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) made, Mr. Speaker, that is totally wrong and incorrect has to do with the Premier quoting the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett). At no time during that cross-examination in the House during the Oral Question Period did the Premier indicate that he was quoting the Minister of Transportation. And let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, directly from Hansard what the Premier did say. He did not indicate he was quoting anybody. When I asked him about the - Mr. Speaker, here is the question, 'We have seen the sincerity and the honesty of the government' and so forth. 'The information the Premier just gave the House is contrary to the facts. And I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a straight question and I expect to get a straight answer. When the hon. gentleman discussed this matter with the Minister of Transportation, did he ask for a bill and did he see the receipt?' Now, listen to the answer, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not saying, 'I am quoting the former Minister of Transportation'. He gives his own words, 'Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before this matter became an issue in this House'.

Now since that statement was made, we have discovered that it was incorrect.

MR. NEARY: We have evidence to prove in the letter that it was contrary to the facts, Mr. Speaker. And then getting to the receipt itself, did the hon. the Premier quote the Minister of Transportation as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) just indicated? No, Sir.

Premier Peckford on March 25th.,
"Mr. Speaker, if you want to get specific about the receipt, the Minister of Transportation has the receipt," leaving the distinct impression, the inference, that the Premier had indeed seen the receipt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tut, tut!

MR. S. NEARY:

They can tut, tut, tut all they

like, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Seriously.

MR. NEARY:

And the President of the Council, Mr. Speaker, can try to drum up sympathy all he wants. We regret very much that this incident happened. We are not boasting about it. It is our job to see that the parliamentary system is protected and that the Public Treasury is protected, and sometimes that is an awesome task, Mr. Speaker, but we have to see that it is protected. That is the duty of this House, not whether or not we should sympathize with this one or that one as the President of the Council attempted to get us to do there a few moments ago.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the facts speak for themselves. It is what the official record of the House says. It is what Hansard says, it is what precisely happened in the House at that particular time that we have to go on, not whether somebody has lost his job - and we sympathize with him.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we regret that very much and I do not know if that particular matter is closed yet or not. But there certainly has been a breach of the privileges of this House as indicated in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and that is

MR. NEARY: all Your Honour has to address himself to, is exactly what happened when questions were asked of the Premier and the answers that he gave. And I believe that is the crux of the matter, Mr. Speaker, and I would submit that my hon. colleague has made a prima facie case in this particular matter. It is a very serious situation, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure it is one that Your Honour will not rule on very lightly, because there is precedent for it and I hope that Your Honour will rule that the privileges of this House have been breached.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Justice to the point of privilege.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to it.

The central point of the contention of the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is that the Premier deliberately misled the House. That was preceded with quotations from Hansard, but that is the essential nub of the allegation that he has made against the Premier.

I would imagine many hon. members on the other side feel shame at his action and his leader is not here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: However,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: be that as it may, if Your Honour will consult May, page 141, I think the central issue of privilege is defined there and examples are given and the essence of it is deliberate deception, exactly what the hon. member has alleged against the Premier. May points out, " It is a breach of privilege to present or cause to be presented to either House or to committees of either House forged, falsified or fabricated documents with intent to deceive such House or committee," the whole nub of it is intent to deceive; whether it is written or oral it is intent to deceive." Examples of this contempt are, forging signatures to petitions or subscribing fictitious signatures, tampering with a petition, forging counsels names, making an alteration in a paper ordered to be laid before the House," etc. And further down under the specific heading, "Conspiracy to deceive. It has already been seen that the giving of false evidence , prevarication or suppression of the truth by witnesses while under examination before either House or committees is contempt," in other words, breach of privilege. So we know exactly what it is that the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is accusing the Premier and that is of deliberately misleading this House.

MR. NEARY: Correct.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And that allegation is proudly assented to by other hon. members of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, what it comes down to is this, whether there is any evidence in order to establish a prima facie case, any evidence whatsoever that the Premier in giving his statement yesterday, and that the Premier in answering those questions on the date in mind, March 25th, was in any way attempting to deceive the House, was in any way covering up information he had,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: but whether he was giving the House what he thought to be the correct situation based on the information given to him; that is the question. If I am asked how many fire engines are there in St. John's and I say ten and in fact there are twenty, unless I say ten knowing there are twenty there is no breach of privilege. So the hon. gentleman opposite, although he has tried to a very great extent, has not shown one instance, one shred of evidence to suggest that the Premier on March 25th was not giving the House the information as he believed it to be. And I would suggest that in order to establish any prima facie case, which means on the face of it there has to be something, that there is no prima facie case. The hon. gentleman has indicated nothing which would suggest that on March 25th the Premier was doing anything but giving the House the information that he had and he believed to be the case. The fact that somebody may or may not have given him wrong information, that is a different matter. As far as the Premier was concerned, the onus was on the hon. gentleman in raising this to establish some prima facie case that the Premier

MR. OTTENHEIMER: was withholding or was not giving the information as he believed it to be, and the hon. member has failed miserably to do it, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, absolutely no prima facie case has been established.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. the member for Twillingate have some new argument to the point of privilege? I would be prepared to hear new argument, but we have spent twenty-five minutes on it. The hon. member has some new argument?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes.

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

MR. W.N. ROWE: If I may be permitted to say a word on the matter; I am not going to get into the merits of the question as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has attempted to do. If, in fact, Your Honour rules that there is a prima facie case of breach of privilege, that is the time for debate on the issue and the House itself decides whether there has been a breach of the privileges of this hon. House.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to point out to Your Honour is that, as Your Honour well knows, the Speaker does not decide on whether there is a breach of the privileges of this House in this kind of a situation. All that the Speaker does in this situation, Sir, is, by looking at the plain words contained in Hansard, and the allegation made by my hon. friend the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), to decide whether the formal requirements for a debate to take place on a breach of privilege are, in fact, present.

And along those lines, Sir, I would refer Your Honour to - unfortunately I do not have the Hansard in front of me here because this is, obviously,

MR. W.N. ROWE: something new to me - the Hansard of May of 1978 - The Clerk of the House or one of her assistants would be able to find it for you quickly, I am sure - where an allegation was made that the Premier of that day deliberately misled the House with respect to an entirely different matter. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was then the hon. Speaker of the House - and an excellent Speaker he was, Sir - he took the matter under advisement and went out and came back that evening, the allegation having raised by myself that afternoon, and said that obviously it is not his prerogative to decide on the matter of breach of privilege, but he did decide that on the evidence presented, the words in Hansard and the statement made by myself, that the purely formal requirements for a debate to take place in this House on a highly important matter, such as an allegation of breach of privileges, was, in fact, present. And the Speaker having ruled on that, I then made a motion to the effect that the House be resolved into a Committee of the Whole and that the matter be decided upon and the Committee report back to the House as to what action should be taken.

That particular motion was defeated by a majority of the House and then the present Premier (Mr. Peckford), then acting as the House Leader, made a motion of his own concerning the members who had, in fact, made the allegation, but that is irrelevant.

The point, Sir, without belabouring it, and without getting into what I find the distasteful merits of the question at all, is to decide, Your Honour to decide whether the purely formal requirements for a debate on this important matter are present. I would say, Sir, having listened carefully to my hon. friend on

MR. W. ROWE:

this side and to my hon. friends on the other side that the purely formal requirements, without getting into the merits, are indeed present and that Your Honour would be doing a wise thing, I would submit, Sir, without being presumptuous, to allow a debate to take place on such an important matter, a purely formal decision on Your Honour's part, which Your Honour may wish to take under advisement, as to whether there is "a prima facie case" which would allow a debate and the merits to be discussed in this hon. House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if I could speak for one or two minutes - thirty seconds - on this matter, the point of privilege I just want to say one thing, Mr. Speaker: Every statement I made on Friday past I gave honestly and sincerely. I did not withhold one shred of information. I made the statements based upon the information I had at the time. I stand by that totally, wholly, one hundred per cent. From March 25th, and the times I made those statements, until yesterday at about 12:45 P.M., I came in possession of additional information which therefore changed the whole situation, but at the time I made those statements I made them totally in all the knowledge I had at my disposal. I stand - they were valid statements at that time in the context of the information I had at my disposal. I believed what I was told after interrogation and questioning up to March 25th. I was found afterward to be misled in that information, which led laterally to the resignation of the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just one moment before -

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

MR. MARSHALL: Adverting to what the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) says, I just want to point out that Your Honour decides whether there is a prima facie case of privilege and this is just getting into the technicalities, there is no denying that, but I would not like Your Honour or the Chamber to feel that just because somebody gets up on this floor and alleges that somebody has deliberately misled the House that -

MR. NEARY: Hansard (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not choose to retort to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). You know, really, he can have his time when he wants it on the floor of this House. I have no truck with the hon. the member for LaPoile.

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour determines whether or not there is a prima facie case of privilege, but, as I was saying, it does not mean that because somebody in this House gets up and says that a person deliberately misled the House or

MR. W. MARSHALL:

makes some other allegations within the alleged areas of privilege, that immediately Your Honour suspends debate and says that there is a matter of privilege. What Your Honour has to do - otherwise a person could keep this House occupied with considering points of privilege all the time - what Your Honour has to do is consider, number one, the allegation obviously but, number two, the allegation within the context within which it was made. Your Honour has to also consider the evidence or the preliminary,

MR. NEARY:

There was no (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

I get quite amused when the hon.

gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I do not wish to interrupt the

hon. the President of the Council, but before we proceed I must point out that Standing Order 53 on Wednesdays indicate that the Chair has to tell the House that the Question Period must commence at 3:30. It is now 3:30. Unless the House is prepared to offer some leave and continue-or does a point of privilege supersede that Standing Order.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

With respect, Mr. Speaker, I

think you will find that points of privilege take precedence -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Over everything.

MR. MARSHALL:

- over everything at any given

time in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

No argument to that effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No argument.

MR. SPEAKER:

Okay, carry on.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, one has

to consider it within the context of the allegation as

indeed when the hon. gentleman made his allegation in this

MR. MARSHALL: House, he pointed to the transcript of March 25th. So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to be sure, if I have Your Honour's ear, I would just like to be sure because I do not think the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) meant to convey this or whether he was conveying it, maybe I heard it incorrectly, but it does not mean just because a member gets up in this House and alleges a breach of privilege that Your Honour immediately, because it comes allegedly within the areas of privilege, that you immediately say there is a prima facie case. In order to determine there is a prima facie case, you have to inquire into the circumstances which indeed where the matter is brought up and referred to by the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of privilege, I would point out to the House at this particular time Beauchesne, paragraph 84, Fifth Edition, page 25 subsection (1) "Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to determine if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence (or as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed); and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity". And it goes on to say, in subsection (2), "It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function is ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question", which argument has been presented here today, "whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over the notices of motions and Orders of the Day standing on the Order Paper; and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether in fact a breach or privilege has been committed, a question which

House

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): can only be decided by the House.¹¹
The Chair will take the matter under advisement and reserve its ruling for another time.

000

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I give notice, Mr. Speaker, so that I will have risen it at the earliest possible opportunity, that pending Your Honour's ruling that I intend to rise on a point of privilege arising out of remarks of the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) to the effect that the hon. the Premier deliberately misled the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are going to have it now.

MR. SPEAKER: May the Chair have clarification?

Is that a notice or is that your point of privilege?

MR. W. MARSHALL: That was notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice,

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. S. NEARY: How low can you get, Mr. Speaker?
How low down can you get?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) a question about an agreement or any correspondence between a company called Atlantic Energy, which is owned by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., and the former Premier of Ontario, John Robarts, if there was any deal, any agreement, any correspondence in connection with this company to act as the broker for the delivery of power to the State of New York from the Lower Churchill, and the hon. gentleman told me there was no correspondence.

MR. S. NEARY: Now I would like to ask the hon. the Premier the same question, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. the Premier tell the House if that is true, if it is correct? And so there will be no - in Hansard if this matter comes up again - that there will be no inference that there was pressure or that there was no inference that the Premier did not know what he was doing - they were not his words, somebody told him - I am going to ask the hon. gentleman now to tell the House if there was any correspondence with Atlantic Energy? And, if so, would the hon. gentleman indicate what this correspondence was comprised of?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question under advisement and respond to it at a later time.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman if he has seen any correspondence. He is quoted in Maclean's Magazine in a story last year, 'Confederation-Brian Peckford's Crusade Against Ottawa,' He is quoted as having said that there was indeed correspondence between Atlantic Energy and the Newfoundland Government and the the company, Atlantic Energy, was entitled to 1 per cent commission for acting as the broker for power to the state of New York? Is there any foundation to this? Does the hon. gentleman remember making the statement? And, if so, is it a correct statement or was the hon. gentleman mis-quoted?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the second question is very similar to the first and I have already answered the first one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if there is indeed an agreement between Atlantic Energy and the -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 129, these are restricted questions, you are not allowed to "repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." There has been no answer refused in this case. The hon. Premier (Mr. Peckford) has indicated that he would look into the situation and he took notice of the question. The hon. member is just continuing to repeat the substance of the original question.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Speaker rules that.

MR. NEARY:

Well, that is all right but there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has to apologize again. I did not hear the substance of the first two questions. I understand that notice was taken of them and in fact I call on the hon. member, if he is repeating the same question, then to change his questioning. I will just have to listen a little more attentively.

MR. NEARY:

The question has been changed substantially, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the Premier if he

MR. NEARY: recalls making a statement to Maclean's Magazine to the effect that the courts may end up having to decide this matter, and does the hon. gentleman remember saying this? Is he misquoted? Is it a correct statement? And if so, on what does the hon. gentleman base this statement?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take notice of the question.

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

MR. NEARY: A new question for the hon. Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: A new question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman inform the House if there have been any deals, any correspondence, any oral discussions with downtown developers with a view to putting up office buildings whereby space will be rented in these buildings by the Newfoundland Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Over the years, Mr. Speaker, I can remember back five or six years ago when there was some discussions. I was not involved with them when developers were trying to build a building down next to City Hall, I think Trizec Corporation and a few more. I have not had any information on them. And there is now space rented to a company downtown in Atlantic Place. But these are the only two that I am aware of off the top of my head. But because I do not have total knowledge at the present moment, and I can only base my opinion and my statement on the very limited knowledge I have, there could possibly be a point of privilege some time in the future on additional knowledge that I might then possess which would indicate that therefore I deliberately misled the House.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go back five years, I merely want to go back a year or two years and ask the hon. gentleman if there have been any discussions with developers with regard to putting up an office building downtown and renting space from these developers? Has that been discussed by the hon. gentleman in the last year, year and a half, couple of years?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD : Mr. Speaker, this is the problem; the question was quite all-embracing, it did not indicate whether it was a year, two years, five years or ten years. The main thrust that this government has put forward in the Five Year Plan - I do not know if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has read that yet or not, the Managing All Our Resources documents, I do not know if the member — perhaps when the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up again he can respond; I do not know if he read that document — is to try to encompass as best we can as many of the government's departments, especially the core government departments, in this particular building and we are hoping that we are going to be able to, in the next number of years, do a number of extensions on this building. So that some of the core departments, some of the key areas should be headquartered together in one building. So our priority is in that area and not in going into long-term leases for additional rental space.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Just so we will have it on the record, Mr. Speaker, that we - the exact words of the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman, I would not want to misinterpret what the hon. gentleman is saying, but is he saying this; that the government has no intention as of this moment of entering into long-term leases with downtown developers, that the government intends to give as its number one priority an extension to Confederation Building and/or a new building to house the public service, to house all the government departments and not go out and enter into long-term leases with any downtown developers? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would never want to misinterpret my words. The hon. member for LaPoile and former hon. member for Bell Island has never, as long as I have seen him here in the House, tried to misinterpret anything that any member has said. I mean, he is one of the few members, he is a veteran of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, such a veteran that he knows the rules and he knows Erskine May and he knows Beauchesne so well that he would never, never as a member of this House, he would teach the rest of us juniors on how we should operate in this House, and I am sure he would never, as he himself has already indicated, misinterpret anything said by anybody on this side of the House.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: I yield.

MR. NEARY: I am not sure if the hon. -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - Premier is refusing to answer the question or is evading the question, so I will just put

MR. NEARY: the question again. If the hon. gentleman does not want to answer it there is nothing I can do about it, Mr. Speaker. But I am asking the hon. gentleman is it now the policy of the administration to build a new building or put an extension on Confederation Building to house all government departments, to consolidate the public service and not enter into long-term or even short-term leases only on an emergency basis with downtown St. John's developers? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Now, there is a situation where the Chair can easily rule. Obviously, the member, admitting it himself, has asked the same question substantially as he has asked before. Maybe he did not agree with the answer received; if so, then there is another procedure to follow; but it is the same question as was asked before.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of ensuring that the hon. member knows - I am trying to find a page here now while I am on my feet. I guess it would be under the social programmes that are mentioned here in this document, Managing All Our Resources. And we talk about what we intend to do in the Department of Public Works and Services over the next couple of years. It is in the back part of Managing All Our Resources. If the hon. member would wish to turn to that document he will see what the government's programme is as it relates to office space and therefore familiarize himself with it, and then on the basis of this new information, which obviously he does not have now, he might be able to ask some additional questions on another day, armed with this very valuable information that is part of this book, Managing All Our Resources.

MR. NEARY: With the information I have, I could ask a lot of questions of the hon. gentleman, a lot of questions, and I will be asking them (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. WARREN: Could the minister confirm that the dormitory at North West River will be reopened in September to accommodate students from Mud Lake and Paradise River?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot confirm that that indeed will happen. It might be helpful to the hon. member if he asks a supplementary question to identify which dorm he is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, to be more specific - I understand there are two dormitories there - either one of them. Will either one of them be reopened to accommodate students from Mud Lake and Paradise River?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions involving myself, some of my staff, and interested people in the community of North West River in relation to the possibility of reopening what is referred to in the community as the junior dorm to accommodate some seven or eight students from the community of Mud Lake - both of which are in my district, by the way - and there was some inference during these discussions that there may be some interest in coastal communities of Labrador, both North and South, to send students in to that facility should it be reopened, but there has not been a decision made to this point in time on whether or not these dormitories, either one of the two, will be reopened as a dormitory.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Public Works. Could the minister advise this hon. House how much it has cost in the past year to heat and maintain those two dormitories at North West River?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to take that under advisement and give the answer tomorrow.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to get a handle on this strike with the workers at the College of Trades and Technology and to try and get a handle on some of the things that are happening. I want to ask the minister again the question that I asked on Monday, and at that time I asked the minister whether the union or the government had made any moves over the weekend to try and resolve that particular labour dispute. And I think the minister indicated that there were some approaches by government with respect to ascertaining whether or not the union would get back to the bargaining table. And I wonder if the minister would indicate - I think he said at that particular time that the union was not ready at that particular time to get back to the bargaining table. Would the minister verify that statement?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think I brought the hon. gentleman up to date with respect to the College of Trades and Technology and the Workers' Compensation Board up to the twenty-seventh, and I believe I brought the hon. member up to date on Monday or Tuesday or, yes, Monday. And I brought him up to date as to what the status was with that situation as I saw it Monday afternoon so I can give the hon. gentleman further information. The chief negotiator for NAPE involved in the College of Trades and Technology and the Workers' Compensation Board saw me on Tuesday morning. At that point in time he indicated that he would like to get back to the bargaining

MR. DINN: table. I immediately on his leaving my office contacted my Assistant Deputy Minister - the deputy is out of the Province at the moment - and asked him to arrange meetings. I believe, I am not one hundred per cent sure, but I do believe that meetings will take place in the near future.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: I thank the minister for his answers, Mr. Speaker, but on Monday, March 30th, when I asked the minister that question whether or not there had been any moves made by either side, the minister indicated that there were some approaches made by the government with respect to asking NAPE what their intentions were of getting back to the bargaining table or whether or not they wanted to get back to the bargaining table, and the minister indicated on Monday that NAPE replied that they were not ready to go back to the bargaining table. So I am just wondering where that information came from on Monday, because the statement in the paper today says that the chief negotiator never, ever said that he was not ready to go back to the bargaining table. So I am just wondering how that came about, whether it was a misunderstanding with the minister or whether he did not have this - or no information at all relating to this.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, now I have gone through that whole process with all the knowledge that I had available on the College of Trades and Technology and the

MR. DINN: Workers' Compensation and
brought the hon. member up to date. All he has to do is get
Hansard and read it.

MR. LUSH: I am reading it.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify,
I believe it was on the twenty-third, a communication was sent

MR. J. DINN: from me to the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower requesting meetings. The deputy minister communicated with the negotiators for NAPE and there was communication throughout the week-one or two or three or four telephone calls. On Friday there was a communication between the chief negotiator for NAPE, Mr. Andrews, I believe, and the Director of Labour Relations, Mr. Noseworthy. During that conversation, in discussing getting back to the table, the impression was left-or when I asked about it, at least, late Friday the impression that was given to me at that time was the Director of Labour Relations indicated to me that - and, you know, you are getting as close to the Board as you can get - the Director of Labour Relations indicated that the negotiators for NAPE were waiting for the outcome of Warders, I believe I mentioned it at the time, I stand to be corrected -

MR. LUSH: Right.

MR. J. DINN: - and the outcome of Farm Products, I believe, the outcome of those negotiations. Now, I will bring the hon. gentlemen up to date: I believe it was Tuesday morning having spoken to the hon. member -

MR. LUSH: Yesterday?

MR. J. DINN: - Tuesday morning, Yesterday, I met with the chief negotiator for NAPE again, and he said, 'I am always ready to go to the negotiating table. Can you set up meetings?' And I said, 'Well, I will see what I can do'. I said, 'Can you meet this afternoon?' He said, 'Well, this afternoon at 2:30 p.m. I have meetings on other negotiations'. I said, 'Okay, well, I will get to my deputy minister or my assistant deputy minister and see if he can arrange meetings' I am informed by my assistant deputy minister, I do not know the exact time, but my assistant deputy minister consequently got in touch with the chief negotiator for NAPE and he informs me that there is a possibility of meetings shortly. I do not know what time that is, he just

MR. J. DINN: said shortly. That made me very happy so I did not pursue the matter any further.

MR. T. LUSH: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. LUSH: I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members understand what the minister is saying. I gather from his statement that there is now a willingness on both sides to return to the bargaining table, is that correct? Both by NAPE and by the government?

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

MR. J. DINN: The very difficult thing here, Mr. Speaker, is that I talked - as I said to the hon. member - yesterday morning with the chief negotiator for NAPE. I got in touch with my deputy minister. I immediately reported to the House here yesterday afternoon, went through Question Period, stayed here until six o'clock, got up this morning and went into my office, and my assistant deputy minister indicated that meetings were being arranged, he did not give me an exact time. I then, you know, had other business to conduct this morning. I had to conduct a -

MR. T. LUSH: But there is a willingness on both sides, that is all we are asking, a willingness on both sides.

MR. DINN: Well there are meetings to be set up. I mean, I do not know who the meetings are between. I suppose they are between both sides of the negotiating table.

MR. LUSH: The government and the union.

MR. DINN: Well anyway, the -

MR. LUSH: It is all set up.

MR. DINN: - Assistant Deputy Minister said to me that there are meetings set up.

MR. LUSH: Good. Good.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: My supplementary is for the Minister of Finance but it is along the same lines, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when speaking on the Interim Supply Bill the other day, I do not know whether he just made an off-the-cuff statement, but he left the House with the impression that certain groups, units, in the Public Service who already had signed agreements were now trying to break their agreements. That was what the hon. gentleman said in the House the other day in interim supply. Could the hon. gentleman elaborate on that statement about certain units in the Public Service attempting to break agreements that are already signed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member refers to Hansard he will find I made no such statement.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the Hansard in front of me but I can get it. One thing about

MR. NEARY: Hansard, it does not lie. It is a factual report of this hon. House.

DR. COLLINS: I do not either.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So I will ask the hon. gentleman now if indeed there are units who have already signed agreements attempting to renegotiate the increases that were received under these agreements, if they are indeed approaching government now to try to reopen the agreement to negotiate a higher increase in keeping with the rate of inflation in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no information whatsoever that that is taking place. I am quite sure if it was taking place I would have been so informed.

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

MR. NEARY: No, I have a new question now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A new question, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: My question is for the Minister of Lands and Agriculture I think is the title.

MR. POWER: No, Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. NEARY: Forestry -

MR. POWER: Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. NEARY: - Resources and Lands. We restructured back in 1972 I think it was and now we are going to restructure again. It is a job to keep track of them, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. gentleman - they restructured themselves out of business, that was the problem. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he has yet selected the areas that are going to be sprayed with matacil this year against the spruce budworm?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, we have gone through

a very extensive process between government and companies and with the Pesticide Advisory Board to allocate the areas of high priority as it relates to the spray programme for this year. We have gone to the companies and looked at their harvesting programmes for this year and next year. We have gone to all of our own government officials, the Canadian Forestry Service, looked at the egg mass counts, and all of the other things that relate to what areas are to be sprayed. Government will be announcing either later this week or the first part of next week the spray blocks that are to be done this year.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I understand from the hon. gentleman's answer that the selection has already been made. Well, would the hon. gentleman care now to identify the areas that are going to be sprayed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I answered in the first question, we will be announcing those spray blocks either later this week or early next week.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the new Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth, and it concerns two huge polar bears in the community of Cartwright off the Labrador coast. First of all I would like to know if the minister is aware that there are two large polar bears there playing havoc with the residents of the area, and, if he is, what does he intend doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Your Honour, I am aware of it as of about a couple of hours ago, and I will have the information for the hon. member tomorrow.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the new and hon. Minister of Transportation. I do not know whether the minister would be informed of this matter, he certainly would be informed of it, whether

MR. LUSH: he would have the details of it because it is such an important matter and it is relating to the committee that was set up appraise or study intra-provincial ferry services within the Province.

My understanding is that that report was supposed to have been submitted to government yesterday. I wonder if the minister is aware whether that report has been submitted yet.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as of yet I have not seen that report.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what budgetary arrangements will be made for intra-provincial ferry services this year insomuch as that these recommendations, or the recommendations from the committee, or the report from the committee, I should say, was expected, I think, previously by the middle of March, or certainly early March. It is not in yet. The budget certainly will be down, I suppose, shortly and here we are without that report. Does that mean that the government will not be making any budgetary arrangements for the intra-provincial ferry services here in view of the fact they are certain that this committee is going to make certain recommendations re the upgrading and improvement to the intra-provincial ferry services throughout the Province?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the system in place up to the present time, it is that as

MR. DAWE: of the 31st. of March
each year, the financial accounting of the various
operators of the ferries in the Province is evaluated
and based on a negotiating regime that has been set up
for some time now, the new ferry arrangements, or the
subsidy arrangements for the ferry operators will be
put in place.

As of yet that process
is ongoing and will continue to go on in a normal
fashion. If, in fact, the report indicates some changes
should be made, I am sure that they will be made in due
course.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon.
the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Still on this matter, Mr. Speaker, of the intra-provincial ferry services, is the minister aware that this is another group that as of yesterday, the last of March, were without - all of these operators are without contracts for the coming year? And if so, what will be the arrangements for future operations? How long are they expected to operate without contracts?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, again, as I understand it, it is a very normal practice that occurs every year, and the operators in the past have continued to operate under existing arrangements until such time as a new contract is made.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is time for a quick supplementary.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I know it is a normal practice, Mr. Speaker, but it is a very inconvenient one inasmuch as the operators do not know what to expect for the coming year, and it is not a very good system. I wonder if the minister has in mind any view of changing this so that contracts can be negotiated earlier so that these people are not operating without a contract? Is the minister thinking about some plan to make this a more effective and more efficient way for coming up with contracts with these intra-provincial ferry service operators?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, when I have had an opportunity to spend a little more time in this department I am sure that there will be some changes that will come about from time to time as it relates not only to ferry services but others, as times change and situations change. When I have had that opportunity to spend more time and to study the matter in some detail, if, indeed, changes are necessary, they will be forthcoming.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The time for Oral Questions has expired.

According to Standing Order 53, routine business also ends not later than 4:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and, therefore, I call now motion number 1, moved by the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock).

MR. DINN: By leave to answer a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon?

MR. DINN: Do I have leave to answer a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to provide Answers to Questions?

MR. NEARY: Yes, sure, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) during yesterday's Oral Question period.

I have communicated with the Chairman of the Board of Workers' Compensation and provide the following:

MR. DINN:

selling a line of cosmetics, one of the lines handled by ACM Sales. Since the suite would not be used on Friday evening, but in any case had been booked for the whole day, arrangements were made to invite some working staff members to the suite for a private party. The suite was not in use at the time that the first staff members, including Mr. R.H. Baggs, the Executive Director of the Board, arrived at the hotel. In order to get the key, Mr. Baggs signed a hotel slip at the desk. This signing of the slip in no way indicated that Mr. Baggs individually or on behalf of the Workers' Compensation Board was taking responsibility for the suite. The Board did not make arrangements for the party at Holiday Inn and is not paying any of the costs of the room during the course of the evening. The Board however did arrange - the hon. member asked this, this was one of his supplementaries, one of his many - did arrange and pay for a party held here at the Board - he says - at the Board building in the lunchroom on Friday evening, March 13th. The Chairman informs me he personally did not stay very long at that time. His information is that all the staff members had left the premises by about eight thirty. He also states that the Board has a responsibility to run the operation in the best possible manner under the present circumstances. In order to continue handling the operation, it is vital that there continue to be high morale and the Board has the responsibility to take whatever steps are necessary within the bounds of reason to maintain that morale."

I table that, Mr. Speaker. Also, Mr. Speaker, in one of the hon. gentleman's supplementaries, he mentioned the company's name and I did receive a communication from the company. As the hon. member will no doubt want all

MR. DINN: of the answers, I received a letter and it is addressed to Jerome Dinn, Minister of Labour and Manpower, Confederation Building, St. John's and it says; "Dear Mr. Dinn, Re: statements made in the House of Assembly by Mr. Steve Neary regarding a party held at Holiday Inn March 27th.,1981 by ACM Sales Limited. I would like to inform you" - this is to me - " that I am the owner of ACM Sales Limited and a distributor for cosmetics. I did have a Vanda beauty counsellor party at Holiday Inn on said date, as I have had on several occasions over the past year, and I can assure you I hope to have many more of them in the future" - this is the parties that she is talking about, " I am enclosing receipts as proof that my company did indeed pay for the parties. I am also enclosing some of our peel-off mask -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

- which is a deep and tough skin cleanser, which Mr. Neary may use to clean the egg off his face."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

She goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "I also have a large quantity on hand for the Workers' Compensation strikers -

MR. S. NEARY:

The wife of the Chairman of the Board (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

-"who tried to raid my party Friday night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

-"I am sure it would work as well on their faces as it did to remove -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

-"the egg off my car on Saturday morning."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am sure the hon. members will want to hear the rest of this as the Chair does.

The hon. the Minister.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have just about finished anyway but she has lots of this, apparently lots of this stuff on hand, so I table the receipts that the lady gave me, the letter that she sent, I table that. I also table Vanda beauty counsellors' catalogue for the hon. member and since I cannot table objects on the table of the House, I will ask the page to bring over - what is it? - mint peel-off mask for the hon. member.

MR. L. BARRY:

Any mouthwash?

MR. DINN:

And no mouthwash provided.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance,

I understand, has indicated he has an answer. Is there leave for the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to provide an answer to questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to a ques-

tion put to me in regard to the Budget by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, I gave an undertaking I would bring the information in today-and I thank hon. members for giving me the opportunity for so doing. Barring flood, fire and earthquake, on behalf of the hon. the Premier and the government I would hope to and expect to bring in the Budget on Tuesday, April 14th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have leave to give some answers.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there leave for an answer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yesterday, as related to the Motor Registration, I got some information yesterday afternoon and had it here on my desk but I did not pass it along to hon. members at that time. I got an update this morning. I think there were 200 or 300 in the lineup yesterday morning at the St. John's office of the motor Vehicle Registration, all processed by eleven thirty yesterday morning and the office closed as usual at four thirty. In Grand Falls and Corner Brook, no one

PREMIER PECKFORD: was turned away. All mail received at all district offices yesterday was processed last night and is now sent out. Eight thirty today, this morning, St. John's, eighty-ninety in lineup and they had all been processed by eleven o'clock. No lineup at any other offices, so it looks likely that there is no need of any extension and that all of the major applications have been taken care of for motor vehicle registration. The only ones really outstanding are some people with bikes and some commercial vehicles who come in from time to time.

And secondly, on page 148 of Managing All Our Resources, the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) will find the answer to the question he asked in today's Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We will move along now then to Motion number one, moved by the hon. member for St. Mary's the Capes.

WHEREAS THE PROVINCE of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada;

AND WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the Provincial average;

AND WHEREAS many areas of the Province depend on a single resource;

AND WHEREAS the resources already known and available to our Province could, if properly developed, provide full and permanent employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador labour force;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House fully debate all aspects of Resource Development in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government target areas

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): of high unemployment with a view to producing a plan for joint Federal/Provincial co-operation aimed at improving the economy of those areas and to creating long term jobs for unemployed residents of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for
St. Mary's - The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a new member I am always a
bit nervous on bringing Resolutions or speeches into the
House, I guess, but, Mr. Speaker, when you are put off for
an extra twenty minutes it does not help any.

MR. NEARY: Take your time, boy, take your
time.

MR. HANCOCK: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would
like to make a comment on what happened yesterday with the
appointment of the new Minister of Recreation, Culture and
Youth (Mr. Andrews). Being the spokesman for the Opposition
on that department, I would like to welcome the member to
that department. I wish him well in the future. I am also
sorry to see that the hon. minister who was formerly with
that department is in just Transportation now because he
was doing an excellent job there and I am sort of sorry to
see him go, Mr. Speaker. He is a young Newfoundlander who
was involved in recreation.

I am just wondering at this time
what will happen to the Green Paper that was about to be
presented. I hope that the new Minister of Transportation
will continue to get involved with that aspect of the
Green Paper. I know he was doing an excellent job in his
department also.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe he will get the roads done.

MR. HANCOCK: Maybe we will get some roads done
now, Mr. Speaker. He is a very understanding minister.
At the same time, I am sorry to see the hon. the member for
Trinity North (Mr. Brett) go. He did the best that he could,
Mr. Speaker. It just goes to show in public life that you
cannot afford any slip-ups and it makes one wonder why we

MR. HANCOCK: get into politics in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, because that man is smeared now for the rest of his life.

Getting back to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, the first part of the Resolution says: 'WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada' - and I do not think you would get an argument from anybody on that one, Mr. Speaker. I would personally like to see something done about it, Mr. Speaker. It is not good enough when we have a 12 per cent to 14 per cent unemployment rate, a dead drop last month, as the Premier indicated, to 12.6 per cent, I think it was, Mr. Speaker. And anybody can put two and two together and figure out that if it were not for the Canada Development projects and projects of that nature, the unemployment rate would have been a lot higher now than it would have been two months ago because those projects start up somewhere around the first of January and there are said to be thousands of Newfoundlanders working on those projects. But I do not agree with the wages being paid on those projects; they are not high enough, Mr. Speaker. It just gives a guy an opportunity to get enough stamps to qualify for U.I.C., and that is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see something introduced where we could have permanent employment in those areas and every Newfoundlander, especially in areas where we only have one resource, Mr. Speaker, could have something to turn to to make an honest and a decent living for himself and his family.

Mr. Speaker, like I say, the unemployment rate has dropped but it has not gone down anywhere near what it should be. I think everybody on this side and the other side of the House would agree, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I brought in this Resolution. The main thrust behind it is to try to target areas, and I do not have to

MR. HANCOCK: look any further than my own district, Mr. Speaker, to look at exactly what we have in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes. It would make you wonder what is going to happen if we ever have a blowout off our shores, because it is very obvious to everyone right now that Hibernia will be developed somewhere down the road. I wonder has anyone ever stopped long enough to think, Mr. Speaker, what will happen if we ever have a blowout or if we ever have oil spills of a serious nature that will affect the fishing industry of this Province? I would not venture to stop to think what would happen to my own district, Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent, if we did have a blowout. We have a district right now that depends entirely upon the fishing industry, and especially at this time of the year, Mr. Speaker, we have about 80 per cent to 85 per cent unemployment in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes. And that will taper off

MR. D. HANCOCK: in the next month or so when the fishing season opens, Mr. Speaker, but if the fishing season did not open, what would happen to areas such as that? It scares the heck out of me, Mr. Speaker, to realize what people would do if they could not go fishing next month or the month after, This Province would be in really rough shape. You have to bear with me, Mr. Speaker, I have a sore throat today. We had meetings last night in Bellevue and we had a hard couple of days.

MR. WARREN: How does it look down in Bellevue?

MR. HANCOCK: Bellevue looks good, yes.

We continue to hear, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) talking about the 900 jobs that are created in the offshore. That brings me back to the local preference policy. And I agree to a point with the local preference policy, Mr. Speaker, but I do not agree with the way that the government is handling the local preference policy. You do not have to go publically and say that you have a local preference policy only for Newfoundlanders. I am sure this is not the way it is done in Ontario and Alberta, and if it were, Mr. Speaker, we would have an unemployment rate that would exceed 30 per cent, I am sure. If the Premier of Ontario or the Premier of Alberta said to all the people in Ontario, 'Newfoundlanders, go home, We have jobs here filled by Newfoundlanders that can be filled by Ontarioans or Albertans, we do not want you here any more,' what would happen to Newfoundland then, Mr. Speaker? I think we can handle this matter in a discreet manner, it can be handled through the Canada Manpower Centre which does the hiring for offshore and other resources that we have, but I do not think Mr. Speaker, that we should go publically and brag about our local preference hiring policy, Mr. Speaker, because it is wrong. Because if every province in Canada develops the same type of

MR. HANCOCK: policy, then I pity poor old Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can go back to my own district again and I look at some of the tourist attractions that we have that should be developed in that district that have not been developed. We are fortunate to have one of the largest bird sanctuaries in North America, I guess, in that district; it could be and should be a major tourist attraction for this Province, Mr. Speaker, and for that district itself, but there has been very little advertising done on it, Mr. Speaker. We do not have a Department of Tourism as such, it is in with - what is it in with? - Development -

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. HANCOCK: No, it is in with Development, Mr. Windsor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Industrial Development.

MR. HANCOCK: - Industrial Development and Tourism is just thrown in with it, Mr. Speaker. That is not good enough. I think tourism is the main industry that we have in this Province and I think it should be a Cabinet post by itself, it should have its own minister and deal directly with the tourist industry in this Province. There are a number of areas that can be developed but the disturbing fact is now that we have a new Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) I hope he will have a look at the roads leading to this bird sanctuary, Mr. Speaker, and try to do something about it. Because I have had tourists drop in to see me, Mr. Speaker, in the Summertime who have turned around on the way to the bird sanctuary and realized they had to travel over thirty-five to forty miles of dirt road and would not go, would not venture of that road, Mr. Speaker, because they did not want to destroy their vehicles. It is alright for Newfoundlander, we have been used to it for so long that we just take it for granted

MR. HANCOCK: that a section of dirt road is a common occurrence. I can assure you that tourists coming up from the Eastern states do not want to have to drive over sections of dirt roads and will not drive over sections of dirt road, Mr. Speaker, to get to those - it is a resource but is undeveloped, as I say.

We also have one of the largest caribou herds in the Province, Mr. Speaker, in a section of that district and at certain times of the year that could be and should be a main tourist attraction. And I personally, Mr. Speaker, do not see why we issue licences to hunters but I do not see why - there is nothing in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, looks any more beautiful on a wall or on a plaque than a caribou head or a moose head. It is something that everybody should treasure, but what happens? We issue a licence, Mr. Speaker, and the head of the caribou or the moose is left in the woods to rot. I do not think any more licences should be issued, Mr. Speaker, until those heads are brought out, whether it be a government department, a private enterprise take them or a taxidermist do them up and sell them, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure I have a large eagle in my rec room, Mr. Speaker, that I have been offered as much as \$5,000 for, would not sell it because it was given to me by my grandfather.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. HANCOCK: An eagle.

So I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if we had - I know that the eagle is an endangered species but a caribou head, Mr. Speaker, or a moose head can be done up in such a way that it will be a sellable item and I am sure that somebody can make money off of this, Mr. Speaker, because, like I said, there is nothing more beautiful to look at than a caribou head.

MR. TULK: I have often looked at something more beautiful than that.

MR. HANCOCK: Can you? You have not been looking at the ones I have been looking at lately.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) problems of Bellevue.

MR. HANCOCK: No, I am not worried about the problems of Bellevue. They will take care of themselves. The people in Bellevue will speak for themselves on the 10th.

Mr. Speaker, like I said, the fishing industry is the main industry that we have and if it is not protected and we do have a blowout from Hibernia, what is going to happen to areas such as my own and other areas around this Province, Mr. Speaker? It makes one wonder and if we do not sit down, Mr. Speaker—the government does not realize that this is a possibility that we can have a blowout -and try and bring secondary industries into this Province, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are going to be in deep trouble.

And we go on in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, 'AND WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the provincial average', and no one can argue with that, the facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: This is the highest unemployment rate. And I agree to a point with the Premier that we have to have control of our resources and that is why I, for one, Mr. Speaker, was supporting him on ownership of the offshore, because we have to have that, Mr. Speaker, that will create a large number of jobs for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, even though at times we tend to forget Labrador. But I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to have control, we have to have ownership because if we do not have ownership, then we cannot regulate the rate of control at which Hibernia will be developed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HANCOCK: That is very important. A lot of people do not realize that if we do not have control of it, then -

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on over.

MR. HANCOCK: I do not have to come over to make a point, Mr. Speaker, There are enough silent people over there now.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do have a mind and my mind leads me to believe that we should have ownership. Because if the federal government have it - there is no doubt in my mind that the federal government does have an interest in Newfoundland, the same as they have in Alberta, or in British Columbia, or in P.E.I. Mr. Speaker, they look at the whole area, at this country as one. Newfoundland is a Province but it is also a part of the country. We have to share, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to get 100 per cent ownership. I do not agree with that either. But, Mr. Speaker, we can, I think, control the rate of development of Hibernia if we have ownership, whereas the federal government may have a tendency to develop it too quickly, to let it run out on

MR. HANCOCK: us and, therefore, I think we should have ownership. I do not know if I would go as far as to say 100 per cent ownership and control, but we should be the major controllers and owners of Hibernia.

Whatever I say here, Mr. Speaker, I expect the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) to get up and say, 'Well, we have done this, and we have done that and that is all that can be done about it'. But I do not think we have done enough, Mr. Speaker. We do not look at areas where we have an unemployment rate of 80 per cent four or five months of the year. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. We have to bring something into this area.

I was just reading through Mr. Smallwood's -

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, my God!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Yes. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite should read this. I was looking at a section under Resources here just now, and I was looking at the mining industries that that man, or his government, brought into this Province.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: Then we have -

MR. STAGG: Sold us short.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Sellout, all right.

MR. HANCOCK: Sellout, Mr. Speaker, but somebody had to put it there in order to sell it out.

It is up to this government here now, if they think we are getting such a raw deal, to close it down or pull the plug or whatever, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, some of the mining industries that have taken place:

MR. HANCOCK: Tilt Cove Mine, Rambler Mine, Little Bay mines, Great Gull Lake mine, Baie Verte mine, Daniel's Harbour mine, Knob Lake mine, Labrador City mines, the City of Wabush mine, the St. Lawrence Fluorspar mine, the cement mill, Humbermouth, the gypsum mill, Blacktop Paving Processing Plant, Clarenville. It goes on and on and I could read it off, Mr. Speaker, but it would take me all day - the oil refinery at Come by Chance, the oil refinery at Holyrood -

MR. BARRY: That is a beaut.

MR. HANCOCK: That is a beaut, yes. It was a beaut, Mr. Speaker, but it created a lot of jobs when it was being put there. It created a lot of jobs, Mr. Speaker, and I -

MR. CARTER: Does it pay to create jobs to bankrupt the country?

MR. HANCOCK: What are we going to do now, Mr. Speaker? We talk about oil companies - this reminds me of something. We have Hibernia out there sitting right now ready to be developed, or it is getting pretty close to being developed, Mr. Speaker; what is going to happen?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) not be developed.

MR. HANCOCK: No, it will not be developed, Mr. Speaker, because they will sit on it till hell freezes over, if the people of Newfoundland will let them. But we will let them know as soon as an election is called.

But I can assure you of one thing, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders do not want to see this oil being shipped to the Eastern States or the Eastern seaboard of Quebec to be refined, they want to see it come ashore here, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know if members opposite realize how long it takes to build a refinery,

MR. HANCOCK: or how long it would take to convert Come by Chance to handle the type of oil that we have in Hibernia. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not get our act together and sit down and start coming up with another Come by Chance, that what is going to happen - you know what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker? The oil is going to be loaded aboard tankers, it is going to be shipped to the Eastern Seaboard of the States, or the Eastern Seaboard of Quebec to be refined and that is basically where most of the jobs are. I say no, bring it ashore here, refine it and ship it off, Mr. Speaker, because if we do not do that, like I say, there are a lot of jobs going down the tube.

MR. CARTER: A disgrace.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, it is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, because something should be done. We should be negotiating another Come by Chance, or building another one to handle Hibernia because as I said before, the oil is going to be - as sure as there is water in the harbour, Mr. Speaker, that oil is going to be shipped to the Eastern

MR. HANCOCK: States or Quebec to be refined, you can mark it down, because of the lack of action taken by this government, Mr. Speaker.

The same way we have now, Mr. Speaker, this government could create tomorrow two or three thousand jobs yet they only started building the transmission line, Mr. Speaker, between the Lower Churchill or Muskrat to the Island portion of the Province. I do not know if they can read, Mr. Speaker, but the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro states in its brochure or its book published there that we are going to be faced with a power storage in Newfoundland in the year 1984. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long it takes - it takes in the vicinity of four or five years that report said to build a transmission line from the Straits down through and into the Avalon Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, or down through the West Coast. I do not know if the government really realizes how long that takes, and I do not know if they think they can step it up and build it in a year, but they are stalling, Mr. Speaker, they are stalling. That transmission line should be started immediately.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HANCOCK: It would create in the vicinity of two or three thousand jobs. It has to be done, Mr. Speaker, and whether we have to build another Holyrood in order to supply power to the Island portion of this Province, Mr. Speaker, at a phenomenal cost, Mr. Speaker, to the taxpayers, we might have to do that, Mr. Speaker, when we could and should be building this transmission line now from St. Anthony down through the Straits, Mr. Speaker. I get an awful feeling that that is going to backfire in the face of this administration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: To go on into resolutions, Mr. Speaker.
AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House fully debate all aspects of Resource Development in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government target areas of high unemployment with a view of producing a plan for joint federal/provincial co-operation -Mr. Speaker, something we have not seen since this administration came into power; they cannot even talk to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. It seems like they are a government of negotiating through the press, it has been very evident in the last year, although in recent weeks it seems like the Premier is backing off. I do not know if he realized it was a mistake not to negotiate or try to come up with a better deal for Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, we know that you have to negotiate and make deals, Mr. Speaker, because if you do not then this Province, Mr. Speaker, is the one that is going to suffer, and I would call on the Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker - and he could be, Mr. Speaker, one of the better Premiers that we have ever had if he ever stopped playing politics, Mr. Speaker, cheap, political politics with issues and get down to the real needs of the people of this Province. Sometimes I think we put politics ahead of everything else, Mr. Speaker, and that is what is wrong; we become so possessed with it that we overlook the basic needs of the people that we were elected to serve, Mr. Speaker. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there has been even a working relationship with the federal/provincial government over the last two years. I do not know if one is as bad as the other, but the two sides just cannot meet, Mr. Speaker. It is like a hatred that has built up between two people. It is like somebody went out and took another man's wife and then

MR. HANCOCK: all of a sudden they cannot look at one another for the next ten years and that is the type of thing that has happened here. I do not know what is going on, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to see it stopped because this Province is the only - and the people in this Province are the people who are going to suffer because of it, not the politicians because we are going to get our salaries, Mr. Speaker. It is the jobs and the resources that are going to suffer, because we have not got the money, Mr. Speaker, and the quicker this crowd over here realizes we have not got the money, Mr. Speaker, to develop the resources that we have. And we are one of the richest provinces, Mr. Speaker, in resources in Canada - I will go as far as to say North America, Mr. Speaker. But we cannot do it on our own. If somebody else does not come in and do it, Mr. Smallwood, as bad or as good as most people seem to think he was, if you just read the 333, and I will have the 666 in a couple of months, Mr. Speaker, if you would only take the time to read what that man brought to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, then I do not know how you could honestly say anything about the past administration. Sure there have been mistakes, but you only make mistakes, Mr. Speaker, if you do something, you only make mistakes if you do something. That man brought more development and more industry to this Province, Mr. Speaker, that I -

MR. STAGG: Tell us how he developed the fishery.

MR. HANCOCK: Never mind that. He brought more industry to this Province, Mr. Speaker, than this government will if they are elected for the next fifty years at the rate they are going right now. There is no member over there who can stand up and say that they brought one single industry, Mr. Speaker. If they did, I wish they would name them, Mr. Speaker. They keep talking about what we brought or what the Liberals

April 1, 1981

Tape No. 849

AH-4

MR. HANCOCK: brought or what was given away on us, but they cannot stand up and commend the government for bringing one industry to this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: Sure they worked out a good deal on ERCO, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate the Premier, and be the first one to do so, but who put ERCO there in the first place, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: It is a hell of a lot harder to get something in the first place, Mr. Speaker, You can always negotiate after you get it because it is there, but when you try to bring something there in the first place! So in concluding - I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker - in concluding I would like for both levels of government, Mr. Speaker, and I would like for this provincial government to approach - I call on the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) - to approach Ottawa with a reasonable attitude, Mr. Speaker, to go up and sit down and try and negotiate a better deal for the Trans-Canada and a better deal for secondary roads and roads like my own in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes where we have resources, Mr. Speaker, but people

MR. D. HANCOCK: cannot go and get to the resource because they do not want to destroy their vehicles at the same time. People out there lose \$2,000 a year depreciation on their vehicle and they just accept it, Mr. Speaker. But the tourist industry and the tourists coming into this Province just cannot and will not accept it, Mr. Speaker.

So I would like to see relationships improve, Mr. Speaker, and call on this government to target areas of high unemployment and try to bring some type of industry to the Province and to those areas in particular. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this resolution has some merit. And there are certain parts of it - the preambles to it - that I certainly endorse. The resolution paragraph may need amendment, or it may, in fact, be redundant. But I think the issue itself is one that well deserves to be debated and I compliment the hon. member for having brought it forward. Now having complimented him on having brought it forward, I cannot compliment him on his presentation and his argument on it, because apparently he is so bereft of ideas, as is his party, that he presents a document that harkens back to the good old days of resource development under Mr. Smallwood which would ill behoove any government to point to the previous administration, the administration of Mr. Smallwood, as that which you should look to for guidance in resource development. And I suggested to the hon. member, in one of my intemperate remarks from my desk, to speak to Mr. Smallwood's involvement in the fishery. The classic slogan of the Smallwood days was, 'Burn your boats,' and it has lived in infamy. And it is an accurate assessment of

MR. F. STAGG: the philosophy of hon. gentleman who were in that administration, and it appears to me to be at least an approximate assessment of the kind of philosophy that is being espoused by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). Now the present Leader of the Opposition has made some rather startling and heretical remarks. He has said that we should trade off the offshore, that we should trade the offshore - resource development - and the ownership of it for hospitals and roads and that sort of thing. In effect, the kind of trade-off where you get things that you should get anyway, where you get hospitals, schools and roads and all of these social benefits that all other provinces of Canada have gotten in abundance from federal sources in the main, that we should trade off our birthright for that mess of pottage. And biblically the person who did that has been looked upon as a person who, well basically, has no imagination, no vision with regard to his particular individual progress. And in the case of a Province, that would be the philosophy of its government and obviously that government deserves to be defeated.

So I would submit to government and the Premier to steer away from the detail as outlined by the hon. member, the detail on his well-worded and comprehensive motion albeit I may not agree with all portions of it. But the detail that he enunciated must be steered away from at all costs. The principle is sound. Unfortunately, when he tries to put the body around the principle he failed miserably.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has been in power since 1972 when we took over from the Liberals on January 18th., 1972. And this particular administration has held office, I suppose you might say, since the election of June 1979. Now I have had two tenures in the House of Assembly, from 1971 to 1975 and from 1979 to the present. From

MR. STAGG: 1971 to 1975 many visionary things were commenced, the regaining of our provincial pride, the pride in being a Newfoundlander that we were striving to become, not the butt of jokes from our Upper Canadian colleagues, or our Upper Canadian - or the people from Upper Canada, but, to be a reasonable contributor towards Confederation and reasonable citizens of this Province. Unfortunately, in the previous twenty-three or so years the Newfoundland psyche had been dealt many terrible blows, all of which were designed to have the people consider themselves subserviant, servile and generally speaking to be less equal than their Mainland fellows. Well, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that has happened since 1972, and it began in 1972, until - well until the present, but in my tenure from 1972 to 1975 I had many moments of great pleasure when this government - when it took over and had certain objectives to fulfill, it fulfilled them. Even to the extent of taking over the Labrador Linerboard mill, which was the Javelin paper mill at that time, it made a commitment, government made a commitment that they would take it over and they would try to make it work. And, Mr. Speaker, having lived in that community, that community of Stephenville for those years from 1972 until 1977 when the government finally bit the bullet and closed it down, I can say that I lived through the Smallwood philosophy in resource development. I lived through it. I as a businessman in the Stephenville area, my income and my - primarily my income - and my ability to earn money ebbed and flowed considerably during those years with the success and failure of that mill - my income and that of thousands of others - basically put there on the whim of Mr. Smallwood. And this government on a matter of principle, I attended the meetings in the elections of 1971 and 1972 where a decision had been made that they would make that resource based industry work, and a genuine attempt was made.

MR. STAGG:

But, Mr. Speaker, it was not the proper industry for that particular area. It was not making the proper product, and government, unfortunately, having had to move in and take it over, government is not properly into the resource business. The proper people to be into the resource business are private enterprise. And you will find that everywhere you go throughout the world that the private enterprise is the primary developer of successful labour intensive industry, especially in the paper industry. And that particular mill failed.

Now, this government since 1979 has been embarking upon a realistic and impressive journey towards resource self-sufficiency, towards resource ownership in this Province, towards managing of our resources, to managing our destiny and the destiny of our children. Because we only have to turn around, figuratively speaking, and we will be twenty years older, and in twenty years very few of us will still be in this House of Assembly. I may still be here but I may be getting tired of it by that time. My hair may even be gray by that time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Speak for yourself.

MR. STAGG:

But there are very few of us who will be here in the House of Assembly in twenty years time, but our children will be here, or the children of our contemporaries will be here, the people who are in high school or grammar school, elementary school now, some of them will be sitting here in the House of Assembly and they will look back,

MR. STAGG: they will look back and say, 'What did my father and/or mother do in the 1970s and 1980s that is of significance to us here today?' And I say to you that the kind of resource development, the kind of biting the bullet, the matters of principle on which this government is standing are the sort of things of which children are going to say that their parents were wise, that their parents stood for something in the 1980s. It is a legislative code of conduct that we must not deviate from. It is not something that we can slough off. We are not here because it is a job. Any man or woman who is in this House of Assembly because it is a job and affords him an income is not here for the right purpose. We are here because we are sent here by our constituents to represent them, probably that is number one, but we are also sent here as legislators to frame the kind of development that this Province is going to have going into the twenty-first century. That is what we are here for. And any member who thinks that he is here solely for the purpose of answering his telephone and getting more welfare for a person or fixing up somebody's unemployment insurance or getting somebody an apartment or that sort of thing, that is not what we are here for. Members get re-elected doing these things, and we all do them, but that is not our primary purpose. Our primary purpose in this House of Assembly is to legislate and to stand on matters of principle, and these matters of principle are before us every day. And I would like to say to you people here today that matters of principle are being espoused by more than the people in this House of Assembly. Yesterday, the Appeals Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland made a landmark decision and I commend these honourable gentlemen, these fine Newfoundlanders, who made a unanimous decision yesterday which basically throws a roadblock, a legal roadblock in the legislative intent of the Parliament of Canada which has hungry eyes on the resources

MR. STAGG: of Newfoundland. What resources? you may ask. Well, the number one resource that they are after is our offshore oil and gas. That is the short-term resource that the Government of Canada through Mr. LaLonde and Mr. Trudeau and Mr. MacEachen - that is the short-term resource that they want to get. They want to get out there and tanker off our oil and flare off our gas so that the Canadian balance of payments, which is running close to \$20 billion a year - so that they can have access to it. Now, we are standing in their way. We on this side of the House are

MR. STAGG: saying, 'No, no, That is Newfoundland's resource and you cannot have it.' What are hon. gentlemen opposite saying?

MR. CARTER: Why do you not give it all away?

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentlemen opposite are saying, 'Whatever it takes to defeat this government here! And one day it says, 'we agree with you, we should have it all,' well they will do it. But then another day the Leader of the Opposition comes out and says 'Oh, we should trade off, We need this, we need that.' You cannot have it both ways. Either you stand for something or you stand for nothing. Now, we on this side, we stand for something. We stand for resource ownership, we stand for our children and our children's children. That is the kind of people that we have in this House of Assembly, that is the kind of people who are on this side of the House. On the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I grow more and more - I despair more and more each day for the kind of-unprincipled, I do not think is unparliamentary; unprincipled in the sense that what they stand for appears to be short term gain for long term pain. Now, that is the sort of thing that the -

MR. NEARY: That is original.

MR. STAGG: It may not be original. The hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) heaves contempt at me saying, 'That is original.' Well, it is not original but it is certainly appropriate, and if a person had to stand up in this House of Assembly and be original all the time, there would be very few speeches made. The hon. gentleman has not been original and he has been here for twenty years. He is the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Now, what about the northern cod? What about our stand on that resource, that traditional Newfoundland resource? Now, it is a controversial stand. It

MR. STAGG: is a stand whereby we have to occasionally, and if necessary continuously point out our position with regard to that particular resource. Now, there are many communities on the East coast - I am from the West coast myself-but the same principle applies and I have a great deal of admiration and respect for the people on the East coast of this Province. This government is standing for the northern cod for Eastern Newfoundland. Now, who is Eastern Newfoundland, these fisheries based district? Are they all PC districts? Mr. Speaker, I do not think they are. Traditionally there is a division, although it is becoming less and less a division throughout this Province, that the urban districts are more conservative and elect conservative members and the rural districts are Liberal. That is becoming more and more the exception rather than the rule. And the member for Fogo (B. Tulk), is his district going to prosper as a result of the Northern cod stand of this government? I say, yes, the member for Fogo.

The member for Twillingate (W. Rowe), what about him? What about the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bonavista North (L. Stirling)? Does his district have a vested interest in the Province's decision on this? I say it does. What is the Leader of the Opposition's stand? His stand is, 'Whatever it takes to defeat this government, I am going to say it.' It is a stand of expediency. It is a stand of the political cynic. It is a stand which says that 'I have no respect for the intelligence of the average Newfoundlander. If I can dupe them and deceive them and get them to vote for me and get them to despise the government well, so be it, we will do it.' Well, that is a typical Liberal standard. That is the standard of behaviour that their Federal Liberal colleagues have adhered to for, well, ever since there has been a

MR. STAGG: Liberal Party. I can understand it but I am certainly going to deplore it. And I am certainly going to speak out against it here and elsewhere. That is the way it is. That is the Liberal philosophy. Over here we have the party of the 1980's but we are projecting into the years, into the twenty-first century and we are going to carry out, we are going to carry out and are carrying out the prayer of this resolution by the member for St. Mary's - the Capes (D. Hancock), a fishing district that will prosper from the northern cod and from the offshore oil and gas if - when it comes, when we get it ashore, not if, when we get it to come ashore and when we get the revenues to go with it.

MR. STAGG: What is his philosophy?
He says we need another Come by Chance. That is what the man said, that we need another Come by Chance. Well, he is the spokesman for resource development in the Opposition. We need another Come by Chance. Now, is that what we need in this Province? I suggest to him we need another linerboard mill too, and we need another rubber boot factory making left boots - we will have that one on the East coast and we will have one making boots for the right foot on the West coast and we can assemble them in Badger.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about some second ones?

MR. STAGG: Some second ones, yes.

I mean, it is so deplorable, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost laughable. But these are things that we as members of this House cannot ignore.

The constitutional issue: They say, 'Let us get off the constitution and start talking about things that are bread and butter'. Well, the constitution is a bread and butter issue for Newfoundlanders, it is a bread and butter issue because our children and our children's children are depending on us at this time to stand up against a parliament of Canada, a Liberal majority in the parliament of Canada with their unseemly and - well, with their colleagues, their bed mates the NDP, at least some of the NDP, who are trying to ram this thing through, that is trying to take our rights and our birthright away from us.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have not clearly enunciated their position on this. They say, 'Oh, yes, we own our offshore resources', and they say 'Go to court' with a smirk. Mr. Speaker, they say it with a smirk. Because if we ever went to court on our offshore resources, they would hope that we lost. They would hope that Newfoundland lost.

MR. STAGG: Yesterday when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) got up and read his statement on the decision where three great patriots of this Province, three judges of the Appeal Court of Newfoundland went unanimously, we gave them a round of applause on this side - we should have gone into the hand clapping as they do in the House of Commons - we gave them a round of applause, and we applaud the Premier, we applaud Cabot Martin, we applaud Mr. Thistle, we applaud the Minister of Justice, and we applaud them all because they did for Newfoundland, they did for Canada what the official Opposition has been trying to do for the past six months, they have dealt, hopefully, a death blow to the federal Liberal attempt at grabbing resources in this Province.

And I must say that I was amazed - no, I was not amazed, but I was again dismayed to find that on the other side the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), a Q.C., sat there assiduously signing his mail or reading a book, it was all passing over his head. He was disappointed.

The Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Stirling) disappointed, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), well, he was almost in tears he was so disappointed that the Newfoundland judges had found in favour of Newfoundland.

And they would dearly love for the Premier's position to have been totally wiped out by the judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up and I hope somebody proposes an amendment to this motion because I have other things to say. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have no

MR. NEARY: bring it to the attention of the Speaker and never again allow it to happen in this House. And the Premier gets over there with a smirk on his face, a grin on his face, laughing at such a provocative statement, instead of tossing the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board out on his ear. Because he is the one who is going to have the egg on his face when the Public Accounts Committee reports to this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The motion before this Chamber is a motion with respect to resource development. Now, the hon. gentleman is getting on his feet and in an unparliamentary manner is referring to items that occurred during a certain period of the proceedings. If he objected to them then, Mr. Speaker, it was his prerogative to get up at the appointed time on a point of order, but it is certainly not relevant to this debate and, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest he is again transgressing the rules of this House by attempting to lecture the Chair on the way in which he feels the House of Assembly should operate. I think, Mr. Speaker, the House has to suffer a little bit too much for the hon. member in the way in which he tries to carry this House on his back. There are rules of procedure, Mr. Speaker, that have been obeyed for generations in the parliamentary system and the hon. gentleman could well apprise himself of them and obey them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To rule on the point of order. I believe there certainly is a legitimate point of order there. The hon. member was not referring to the motion but, indeed, something that came up earlier in the day and therefore I would ask him to confine his remarks to the motion introduced by the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock).

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will deal with the previous matter when the report of the Public Accounts Committee comes before this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me congratulate the member for St. Mary's - The Capes - and the hon. gentleman had better stay in his seat. He had better not run out in the back. The hon. gentleman had better stay there because there may be some things that he may not like to hear -

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman has tried to muzzle the Opposition in this House long enough. He may not like to hear what I am going to say. He may run away like a coward, slink out in the back rooms.

SOME HON. MEMEERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) for making such a wonderful contribution to Private Members Day. The hon. gentleman, as members know, is a rookie in this House, a newcomer to this House, and has now introduced one of the probably most important private members' resolutions that we will see in this session of the House. I commend and congratulate my hon. friend for his initiative, Mr. Speaker, and his foresight in introducing this very important Resolution.

Now, what is the Resolution all about? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Resolution is to try to encourage

MR. NEARY: debate, to try to motivate the provincial government into doing something about the development of the natural resources in this Province.

The Tories took over in this Province, Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1972, and let nobody be fooled, let nobody be misguided by statements made by the government that the administration, that the Tories took over in 1979. That is incorrect. The Tories took over in this Province in 1972. And what was the first thing that they did, Mr. Speaker? Well, the first thing that they did, almost their first official act when they became the government of this Province was to shut down the steel mill down at the Octagon, shut it off.

MR. CARTER: You know why that was.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why it was.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) ignorant.

MR. NEARY: Maybe I am ignorant, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know why, because we have never been told.

The hon. gentleman who just took his seat told us that these matters of operating linerboard mills and paper mills should be left in the hands of private enterprise and yet, Mr. Speaker, that same gentleman who just took his seat supported a government that took out of the hands of private enterprise the Linerboard mill at Stephenville and then ran it into the ground, put it in the hole, Mr. Crosbie and his gang. If the Linerboard mill had been left in

MR. S. NEARY:

the hands of private enterprise, they would have been on the hook, they would have had to see it through, whereas the government took it over, nationalized it and, Mr. Speaker, then spent \$500 million of taxpayers' money recklessly and carelessly. So they shut that down and gave it away to Mr. Desmarais, one of Mr. Moores' buddies, gave it away to him. Then they shut down the oil refinery. Mr. Speaker, what we have is a shut-her-down government, shut her down. There are a number of other industries they tried to shut down, Instead of going out and trying to create new industries, instead of trying to salvage the old industries, they adopted a policy, a philosophy of shut-her-down. And it is a wonder they had not shut down every industry in the Province. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me, with the hostile attitude, with the political climate in this Province created by this government, that industrialists or business people would look at Newfoundland at all. The attitude of this government, I would submit to Your Honour, is costing Newfoundland and Labrador plenty. I should refer to the nationalization of the Churchill Falls. We had in this Province one of the conglomerates that was considered to be a giant in the world, BRINCO. And what did this government do to BRINCO? Nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation and kicked them out thus creating, Mr. Speaker, so I have been told, a terrible attitude and a terrible feeling amongst the international and national business world towards Newfoundland. The big industrialists, the medium sized industrialists and business people are very nervous about Newfoundland, they will not risk capital in Newfoundland, they are worried about what may happen to their investment. The Premier of this Province may get out of bed some morning on the wrong side of the bed or in a bad mood and kick them out or nationalize them. And so, Mr. Speaker, as a result of

MR. NEARY: this policy that the government has been following, we have not seen a single new industry that I can think of established in this Province since 1972, not one.

MR. HANCOCK: We have seen some closed down.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) blind as a bat.

MR. NEARY: I would like for the hon. gentleman to name one.

MR. CARTER: How many (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. gentleman name one?

I challenge him now to name one.

MR. CARTER: What about Stephenville?

MR. NEARY: What about it? It was built by the Liberal government -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) funny at all (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I see. I should not be taking the bait, Mr. Speaker, I should not be taking the bait.

It is the attitude of this government that is stopping the development of this Province. It is costing us, apart from new industries, thousands piled upon thousands of new jobs. You can travel anywhere in Canada or in the United States, talk to business people and industrialists and they will tell you unless they can come in like they are with the oil where there is a shortage of raw material - or there was - there is not any more in the world and try to capitalize off that, they are not interested, Mr. Speaker, not the slightest bit interested in

MR. NEARY: putting their risk capital into Newfoundland. They are not interested. They are afraid of what might happen. We are not quite as bad as a banana republic -

MR. HANCOCK: We are getting there.

MR. NEARY: - but we are very close. We are getting there.

Now, what is happening now, Mr. Speaker, what is happening now when the government is following this disastrous course that they are on? Is Newfoundland suffering? In answer to that question I would have to say, yes, Mr. Speaker. We are suffering already as far as the offshore oil development is concerned, except, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, except where it is to the advantage and to the benefit of the oil companies and the companies that are servicing the offshore oil drilling rigs, except when it is to their advantage to locate in Newfoundland, that the spin-off benefits, the spin-off industries are springing up in Nova Scotia.

MR. HANCOCK: They will continue to spread.

MR. NEARY: And if the attitude of this government continues Nova Scotia will benefit more from the offshore oil than Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, that is only one example.

We have a similar situation happening in the fishery. The minister from Nova Scotia the other day, the Tory Minister of Fisheries in Nova Scotia, a Tory Minister of Fisheries, when he was trying to defend himself against vicious attacks by a Tory administration in Newfoundland, made a statement that has not yet been refuted by the government, has not yet been denied by the government; he said all the Minister of

MR. NEARY: Fisheries and the government of Newfoundland are trying to do is drag in a red herring, distract from their own incompetence and their own ineptitude and their own inability to be able to come up with a realistic fishery policy.

The Minister of Fisheries said the fishery in Newfoundland is in chaos, in complete disarray. And so it is, Mr. Speaker. There is no policy. Ninety-nine point nine per cent of the fish plants built in Newfoundland were built before 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Only one new plant, I think, has been built apart from replacement plants, and that is the one in Arnold's Cove. That is the only new plant that was built, all the rest were built under a Liberal regime. You cannot call that a new industry, it is just an extension to an old industry.

But what worries me, Mr. Speaker, is today the fishery is in chaos. It is frightening, Mr. Speaker. It is frightening when you look down the road a year or two or three or four or five to think what is going to happen to the fishery with this policy, all because there is no master plan for the development of the fishery in this Province.

I was told today, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this outburst, this vicious attack on the Government of Nova Scotia by the Minister of Fisheries in this Province,

MR. NEARY: I was told that our own fish plant operators in Newfoundland and our own fishermen who are fishing off the Nova Scotia coast at the present time have been told that if this government continues its policy that they will be kicked off the Sydney Bight, that they will be driven away from the coast of Nova Scotia and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that not one pound of Newfoundland fish will be allowed to be trucked through Nova Scotia.

MR. MARSHALL: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: I hope it is not true. If this assassinating of the Government of Nova Scotia and the fish companies in Nova Scotia continues, Nova Scotia is not going to take it lying down. They are going to retaliate. There will be sanctions, and we have to truck our fish - if we do not truck it we have to fly it and it is too expensive to fly it out - we have to truck our fish through Nova Scotia, and reports coming back from across the Gulf indicate that our people have been told that if the Newfoundland Government keeps it up that not one pound of fish will be allowed to be trucked through Nova Scotia.

MR. HANCOCK: What will happen to the resources?

MR. NEARY: What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, to that resource?

MR. HANCOCK: Expensive.

MR. NEARY: But that is only one, that is only one problem.

There is a freeze on boats. Bounties are being eliminated every day. No new boats are allowed to enter the fishery. Only this morning I tried to get a hook and line licence, not a drag licence, a hook and line licence for a new dragger for Burnt Islands, and when I called I was told there is a freeze

MR. NEARY: on licences. No new boats are allowed to enter the fishery. You cannot even change your old boat for a larger size boat, there is a freeze on.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot get a licence transferred.

MR. NEARY: You cannot get a licence transferred. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely frightening, frightening. There is no planning in the fishery, none at all, none whatsoever, and if the Premier of this Province wants to do the people of Newfoundland a favour what he should do is follow the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee when they said that the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was guilty of violating the Public Tendering Act and should have been tossed out of the Cabinet. What the Premier should do is reshuffle his Cabinet quickly, immediately, before further damage is done to our most basic industry, Mr. Speaker, the fishery.

MR. BARRY: You would not say that about him if he were here?

MR. NEARY: I would say it - I would not say it if he was here. Do not make me laugh. Do not make me laugh. There is nothing on that side of the House that I am afraid of and they can come in with their somber faces and they can try to belittle us all they can but we are still going to try to protect the public treasury and do a job for the people of this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: It is getting harder though, is it not?

MR. NEARY: And it is getting more difficult all the time, Mr. Speaker, because of the attitude of the government in trying to muzzle the Opposition. So this is a good resolution, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

an excellent resolution.

I wish I had more time to go on and give the House some ideas that I have for the development of some of our natural resources. I will mention one or two before I take my seat. We have a coal deposit in St. George's. I have not heard the member (Mr. Dawe) talk about it, but with the price of coal today, Mr. Speaker, and the demand for coal in the world, is it not about time that we took a look at that coal deposit to see if it is

MR. S. NEARY: worthwhile developing, if it is feasible to develop it.

MR. L. BARRY: We are looking at that.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) says they are looking at it. Well, I am glad to hear that. Maybe if I stay on my feet long enough, if I had leave to speak for another hour or two, maybe we could get some more information from the minister. But there is the makings of a good industry.

Mr. Speaker, what about the salt deposit? Has that been abandoned? And the potash and the quartz. There is quartz all over this Province. Mr. Speaker, what about the gold mine down near Burnt Island Pond? Rio-canex have been carrying out exploration and drilling there for five years, have spent millions of dollars near Burnt Island Pond, is it not about time now that we were told whether or not a mine is going to open near Burnt Island Pond? What about all the other exploration that is going on in Newfoundland for minerals? Down in LaPoile Bay, Falconbridge were down there for the last couple of years, looking at silver, lead, zinc, copper and gold. Is it possible to get some more mines open, Mr. Speaker? I know Your Honour is looking at me, I am running out of time.

The point I want to make in conclusion is that I think it is about time now, Mr. Speaker, that this government stopped dwelling on the past, stop dragging poor old Mr. Smallwood's name on the floor of this House. The man is going on eighty-one years of age, is now the elder statesman in this Province, is it not time to leave him alone and get on and do something of their own? Do something original! Do something constructive! Never mind being negative and playing little political games! The people of this Province are fed up with that and are demanding action.

MR. S. NEARY: They want action and they want jobs and it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that this government faced up to their responsibility. And forget dragging Mr. Smallwood's name into the House or being negative or playing cheap politics and do something for the people of this Province. That is what they were elected to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am not an astrologist, in fact, I do not believe in it -

MR. STAGG: But if you were.

MR. J. CARTER: - if I were I would say that the hon. gentleman's outbursts are, you know, paralleling the phases of the moon. And I could not help but notice - I was looking through the paper today. We are allowed to read the paper, there might be some current news in it of some use in debate - and I happened to look through the astrological column, 'Your Individual Horoscope'. Now, I do not have any idea of when the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was born, in fact, there is some doubt that he ever was born. But assuming that he was born, he must have been born on a date and I will just go down through part of this and the advice is extraordinary. There maybe something to this after all. I will table if it is necessary, Mr. Speaker. 'Aries: March 21st. - April 19th.: 'You will receive confidential news now' - how like the member for LaPoile - 'the time is right for parties. You make a good impression on others' - well, they are wrong there - 'enjoy popularity' - well, that is certainly not so. Taurus: April 20th. - May 20th.' listen to this, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER: Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, they are right on. I will bet he is a Taurus. 'Behind the scenes career moves pay off. You have the initiative to get things going but may have difficulty completing tasks.' Gemini:

MR. J. CARTER: Join friends in cultural endeavours - well, I do not think the hon. gentleman is very interested in those - 'Plan a get-together with somebody at a distance' - John Doyle, perhaps? 'Conscience is a factor in dealing with children' - well, I think that 'conscience' there does not apply. 'Cancer: - now the hon. gentleman is certainly a cancer on this House - 'June 21st. - July 22nd.' You can raise needed capital for business ventures, consult with advisors. Meetings with higher-up's' - well, it is not hard for him to find higher-up's. Everyone he runs across is a higher up. 'They should be productive'. 'Virgo: August 23rd. - September 22nd. -

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

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The hon. member for Carbonear, do you have a point of order?

MR. R. MOORES: No.

MR. S. NEARY: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), when he was out in the back room could not wait, rushed back into the House to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that I was irrelevant to the resolution. I do not think anything could be more irrelevant than what the hon. gentleman is doing now, Mr. Speaker, and I ask you to call the hon. gentleman to order. And if he does not follow the instructions of Your Honour, ask the member to take his seat.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: By way of correction, Mr. Speaker, I rushed into the Chamber to allege that the hon. member was irrelevant, not that he was irrelevant in the debate. The hon. gentleman is getting up and reading horoscopes and soothsayers and what have you from - what is it? - astrologers and he is just reading and I think he is leading up to a point. I can see the relevancy, Mr. Speaker. This matter is resource, it is resource development. The hon. gentleman is trying to figure out the birthdays of the hon. members opposite to find out how they can be so maniacal, how so much lunacy can abound when they reject our basic thrust on resource development, such as being against the Province of Newfoundland having control of its offshore jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I think I have heard one from each side, that is enough. We all realize that debate is far reaching. I would assume the member is over his preamble and is just about to go into the motion that we are debating.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point that I was wishing to make was that astrology probably is a more reliable guide to the policies of the former administration, the Smallwood administration than any rational thought was. I was surprised how accurate some of these things were in describing some of the members opposite. *I will just read one more and then that is all.

AN HON. MEMBER: On what date is the (inaudible) birthday?

MR. CARTER: Aquarius is rather good. January 20th. to February 18th., 'Make important phone calls now', - possibly get through to Panama. 'You will be convincing and effective. Disregard the advice of a pessimist. Remain optimistic.' But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I commend the daily horoscopes to hon. members opposite. I think they will be

MR. CARTER: far more useful than their other advisors.

MR. STAGG: I have got more here.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about - this resolution is about economic development and I think it is important that we should very quickly, very briefly review the first twenty-three years of Confederation because I sense a very pernicious development and that is hon. members opposite to a man are trying to gloss over the failures and the enormities of the Smallwood administration and they should never be allowed to forget that. The people of Newfoundland should never be allowed to forget it. And if I live to be 105, I will make every effort to acquaint people with the lacks and the enormities of the Smallwood administration which I think were glaring and shocking and have put us in a position from which we are now desperately trying to extricate ourselves.

First of all, the rubber plant. I remember arranging a dance for a Conservative party. And we had a programme and in addition to serious ads we put in a few frivolous ones and one was compliments of the rubber plant, "Boot Licking Good" or compliments of the hockey stick plant, "Where the Puck is Passed".

MR. HANCOCK: The House of Assembly has become a big joke.

MR. CARTER: All joking aside, this is not a joke. The hon. member will not find this a joke. The Come By Chance Refinery bankruptcy was the greatest on record, the greatest in the whole world. Even allowing for inflation, for a 200 year inflationary period, it was greater than a South Sea bubble.

MR. HANCOCK: Where are you going to refine Hybernia?

MR. CARTER: Well, not in that tar pot out by Come By Chance, that is for sure. Something sensible will have

MR. CARTER: to be built.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Merely, Mr. Speaker, merely to read a list of a few names illustrates the enormities that went on in the Smallwood era. John Doyle, Alfred Valdmanis, John Shaheen, O.L. Vardy, J.R. Smallwood, William Smallwood, Les Curtis -

MR. NEARY: John Crosbie.

MR. CARTER: The list goes on and on and on. Just to read that list calls to mind the enormities that we went through.

Now, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked about the steel mill. The steel mill was badly conceived, poorly managed and the machines that were put in there were the wrong size. The machines did not match each other. One machine would have a much greater productive capacity than the one which it fed into. And furthermore, the mill was located not at tide water but at the top of Topsail Hill. So that every bit of heavy ore that came in had to be trucked all the way uphill - I suppose the elevation must be 300 or 400 feet - had to be trucked all the way uphill, brought to the mill, then processed somehow, then trucked all the way downhill again. I suppose it could cost downhill but at least it had to

MR. J. CARTER: be loaded aboard trucks and unloaded into a ship. The whole thing was foolishness and one of the best and wisest things this government did was to close it down. You know, our memories are just too short. And what about the Bell Island mines, what about the contract that was on the former, former Premier's desk? 'The contract is just right on my desk.' Now he did not say it, I will grant him that, but the implication was clearly there, 'I am busy out campaigning, all I have to do is get into my office and as soon as I sign that contract, Bell Island will be saved.' Now, there was a scandalous, scandalous thing to do and say, shameful, rotten, awful, frightful. And, of course, I am not surprised. The is the type of person he was and he would do it again, and his successors have been capable of the same sort of thing. But it really was disgraceful!

And, of course, the former, former Premier ruined the poultry industry, got into that boots and all and started over-producing eggs so the price of eggs - the bottom fell out of them and a great many people went out of business. And that is something that should be recorded. And I would like to see a list -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) read them all.

MR. CARTER: Do you not remember egg day at the Confederation Building when his hands came in selling eggs and woe be tied the civil servant who did not buy one or two dozen eggs.

AN HON. MEMBER: They would end up scrambled.

MR. CARTER: Yes, they would end up scrambled, out of a job. And the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) suggests that we should start mining coal over in St. George's. Well, I think that anything that gets him closer to hell is a worthwhile endeavour, so I hope he does go mining coal, far better than what he is doing in here. Because I think the display earlier this afternoon was the most disgusting

MR. CARTER: display I have ever seen, or even ever heard of or even thought of or imagined or read. It was frightful and I hope it will be dispatched by the Speaker and we will not hear any more of it. It was just a disgraceful display of lowness, it really was. I have never seen such dirt, I really have not.

So there it is, I do not think - oh, an orange juice factory, I have just been handed a -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: - I will table it, Mr. Speaker, so it will be alright to read it. Premier Smallwood, the only living millstone, is hopeful that Newfoundland can be a market for frozen concentrated orange juice to be exported next year from Panama. The Premier returned February 14th from Panama where he visited the groves and processing facilities of a Captain Ludwig'-I suppose I should say heil Hitler here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: 'California shipping magnate Rickhart Winter, Managing Editor of Browning Harvey Company Limited, accompanied Mr. Smallwood. Mr. Smallwood said planned delivery of our juice has been delayed a year'-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: - while experiments are conducted!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: I can imagine the kind of experiments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: 'The Premier said Captain Ludwig wants to' - and then it is cut off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: I will table it for hon. gentlemen.

I had forgotten about the orange juice factory because presumably this orange juice was going to

MR. CARTER: be shipped back in empty oil tankers.

So perhaps the hon. gentlemen across the way have stomachs strong enough to drink oily orange juice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CARTER: So anyway, I do not disapprove necessarily of the hon. gentleman's motion. It seems like, you know, it is reasonably conceived but I would have to wait and hear some other speakers before I decide whether to vote for it or not vote for it.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) you cannot make up your own mind.

MR. CARTER: So with those few remarks, and with the concluding remark or the theme or the thought I would like to leave in the hon. gentlemen's minds, is that the first twenty-three years of Confederation and the many, many failures should not now or ever be forgotten.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.
In 1949, Mr. Speaker, the member for Carbonear had not even been conceived. He never attended school until 1955-56, finished school -

MR. CARTER: You were a mid-Summer night's dream.

MR. MOORES: - finished high school in 1967 and by the time that the Smallwood government had eventually been defeated or had eventually been given cause to retire as a government, I was a slim age of twenty years. And it just irks me to no end to see a member, any member of this House, whether he is on the government side or the Opposition side, stand up and relive somebody's past, whether it is Joey Smallwood's or mine or anybody else's. And that is essentially what it is. If the only defence of the Moores and Peckford administrations is the twenty-three years of

April 1, 1981

Tape No. 861

SD - 4

MR. MOORES: Smallwood rule, then I think it
is a shameful, shameful testament to what government is all
about and what politics is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MOORES: I hate this seat where I am sitting, Mr. Speaker, and I was placed here not by my choice, and it is just that I have a tendency to look right, you know. It makes me uncomfortable at times when I am speaking. Anyway we will discuss that in the next Cabinet shuffle.

Apart from the - and I would like to dwell, Mr. Speaker, just a little bit more on that topic because it is a favourite one of mine, it is a favourite one in the sense that in 1971, I supported at that time the hon. Dr. Gus Rowe who eventually became the member, the PC member for Carbonear. And he won the election, the first election against the former Speaker of the House, George Clarke, by about 120 votes. And I recall his emissary visting me as an undergraduate student at Memorial University and asking me if I would be kind enough to organize the Carbonear electorate of Memorial University campus on his behalf. And I said at that time, no problem. I admired Dr. Gus Rowe, but more importantly I had some very serious reservations about the Smallwood administration,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: - as I believe did most people in Newfoundland at that time.

Subsequently, of the 147 students, I believe, there from Carbonear who were eligible to vote, 125 of them, under my auspices and with some help from my friends, as John Lennon would say, we effectively gave the election to Dr. Gus Rowe. He won by 120 votes, and of the 120-odd that voted at Memorial, over 120 of them, two or three, if I recall correctly, voted Liberal.

MR. MOORES: So I am proud on the one hand to stand here today and say that I am, in fact, an example of how the Province of Newfoundland was misled by the Moores administration and now by the Peckford administration. I believed that a change in Newfoundland would mean a change toward development of our people, our Province, and its economy.

MR. MOORES: How sad, Mr. Speaker, am I today at the age of thirty, ten years later, I have to stand up here and say that in the ten years of Tory administration this Province has gone from a vibrant economy to a belly-up situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bankrupt.

MR. MOORES: The people of this Province have no trust in its government, have no belief in it,

MR. J. CARTER: Speak for yourself.

MR. MOORES: - and it is based upon good rationale.

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) gets up and says, 'Smallwood plundered this Province, sold it out'. And so I say to you, very well, let us balance that with some of the positive things of his regime.

MR. CARTER: Name them.

MR. MOORES: And there were many, Memorial University being one of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Badly built.

MR. MOORES: Student aid being another that enabled not only the member for Carbonear but the Premier himself to attend university as a poor

MR. MOORES: Newfoundlander, and subsequently receive degrees.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. MOORES: This is no joke. The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), who has been relatively independently well off -

MR. CARTER: Memorial was here before Smallwood.

MR. MOORES: Yes, and who could attend it? - only the blue bloods from St. John's.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: That was all who could attend Memorial University, the blue bloods from the city aided and abetted no doubt by the anti-Conservatives of the day.

MR. CARTER: Large scholarship programmes.

MR. NEARY: Anti-Confederates.

MR. MOORES: Anti-Confederates, yes.

I say it is no joke to someone who has not lived through that era. I know nothing of Smallwood and his regime except as a young boy growing up in Newfoundland. But I do know of the man, I sat with him down there for two years and I can tell you now he is one of the finest men you would ever want to meet-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Fairy tales.

MR. MOORES: - as an individual.

MR. CARTER: Fairy tales, Mr. Speaker, are they parliamentary?

MR. MOORES: Now the Premier of this Province, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province got up today and said, in relation to a point about a minister of his, that he had not been provided the information. And on many instances the former Premier of this Province told me himself that many of the things that went on in his Cabinet and in his government, he was no more aware of than I was. And I say there is proof today of that because the Premier of the day, this afternoon in this House and tomorrow, is going to use the argument that he was misled by his minister, that he did not know that the information was incorrect. And that is the same argument -

MR. NEARY: He had plenty of time to find out.

MR. MOORES: - the same argument that Mr. Smallwood uses, And this government, particularly the members for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and St. John's North (Mr. Carter), they have battered the man to hell, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of false and misleading propaganda -

MR. NEARY: Royal commissions to carry out witch hunts.

MR. MOORES: -propagated and promulgated mostly by the former Finance Minister in the Moores years, Crosbie, perhaps the man most responsible today for sucking the people of this Province dry directly and indirectly through his family and through his political machinations.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. CARTER: Disgusting!

MR. MOORES: And to think, Mr. Speaker, that I have to stand here, a young man in politics, never in the Smallwood Government, never in any government, entered this House in 1975, just a few short years ago, and I have to relive a person's past because of the almost reactionary - there are adjectives, Mr. Speaker, which I would like to use but I would like to get on -

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. MOORES: - I would like to get on really to the thrust, the real thrust of my speech. And let us talk about industrial development and the creation of jobs in this Province. In 1966 to 1969 we had 6.5 to 7.5 per cent unemployment. The construction industry in this Province was booming. I have hundreds and hundreds of my constituents, not dozens, not a few dozen but hundreds and hundreds of my constituents who are heavy equipment operators and people who are involved in the construction industry and they had twenty-five or thirty years of prosperity. And now highly skilled and highly devoted Newfoundlanders cannot find jobs in the construction industry because she is bottom up. There is no construction. There is no development in this Province of roads and industry and services.

AN HON. MEMBER: Up in Harbour (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: Where are they?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: Where is the industry in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: All working. All employed.

MR. NEARY: They are not all working, do not believe it. They are all unemployed and they have not even got enough stamps to get their unemployment.

MR. MOORES: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) stands in his place and talks about the Newfoundland fishery. Well, up until the 200 mile limit was declared by a Liberal Government in Ottawa, the Newfoundland fishery either by Liberal governments or by P.C. governments was not fit to look at. And the 200 mile limit primarily, and secondly and just as important the rise of the fishermen's union in this Province, has led - and only those two things, by the way - has led to the prosperity the fishermen are enjoying today. And so now that there is such prosperity over the last five or six years everybody wants in on it, every Tom, Dick and Harry,

MR. MOORES: anywhere in the Province, wants in on it and that has forced the federal government to bring in what I consider to be an equitable fishing license programme. The union agrees with it. The fishermen's union is 99 per cent in favour of it - there are some modifications which they would like to see - and I know that the organized fishermen in my district are in favour of it. There is no moonlighter in favour of it, no one who wants to drag the fishery down, raiding other people's cod traps and lobster traps and trying to glut the market in the Summertime

MR. R. MOORES: and take away the availability of the saleable -availability of fish from the fish plants from the full-time fishermen. No, there are no moonlighters- and those are the people who are complaining, by the way. I have received approximately two dozen complaints, as the member for the district of Carbonear, official complaints. And of these twenty or so complaints, I would say ninety-five per cent of them are from part-time fishermen who slurked into the fishery in the last year or two, bailed out of Edmonton or Toronto or somewhere like that, and come back and say they have been fishermen for twenty years. I do not agree with it and I will defend it any time at all with anyone. But if we do not now take the necessary steps to curtail over-fishing, that is to say too many fishermen taking not enough resources, then the fishery will just collapse overnight as a viable economic income support industry. And what is wrong with the Minister of Fisheries of this Province? What in the world does he want? What is he trying to do? Every single day he is at Ottawa's throat, or he is at Nova Scotia's throat-

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants to get fired.

MR. R. MOORES: -or he is confronting somebody with what appears to be right now the only viable industry in this Province, the only industry, the only resource that is employing people and -

MR. FLIGHT: He heard you.

MR. R. MOORES: - is creating real dollars, new dollars -

AN HON MEMBER: He heard you.

MR. R. MOORES: - into the economy. The tourist industry, for instance, has been maligned over the last couple of years. We have seen lots of half-hearted efforts

MR. R. MOORES: by the Moores administration to beef it up. We have seen half-hearted efforts from this government to talk about it, because they have done nothing. They have not even half-heartedly tried to beef it up, all they have been doing is half-heartedly talking about it. And tourism has in the last few years, and I am not talking about the number of people who come into this Province, I am talking about the potential of the industry, the number of people who could come in if there were some new programmes developed and new regulations governing accommodations and eating facilities and negotiation with the federal government about easing up the ferry service on the Gulf, all sorts of things that could be positively undertaken by this government to produce jobs and to make the tourist industry flourish. You talk about resources and you talk about what this government - and you cannot part the sea on this one. This administration is the same as the Moores' administration because there has been no intervening period.

MR. S. NEARY: It is a continuation.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right. And they would like to think that there has been an intervening period, that the year or so that Don Jamieson spent over

MR. MOORES:

here indicates an intervening government, but it does not because he sat here on the Opposition side and poorly, I might add.

MR. CARTER:

Who backed Mr. Smallwood?

MR. MOORES:

Poorly.

MR. STAGG:

Poorly?

MR. MOORES:

One of the worst twelve months that this party went through.

You cannot separate the two.

As hard as you might try, Mr. Speaker, you cannot separate the two. You cannot say now that there is a new government at the helm. There is a new administration but it is the same government, the very same, the same government of inaction, of inability, of incapability, of irresponsibility -

MR. NEARY:

Incompetence.

MR. CARTER:

In Power.

MR. MOORES:

- incompetence, the same government, the same tribe, the same tribe and their cronies, and it is going to become, if it not already is, this administration is going to become as equal in corruption as the Moores administration. And only now are we seeing, from 1972 until 1979, seven of the most corrupt years of government in Canada. Not only did they feather their own nests but they feathered the nests of their friends from top to bottom, and any person in this Province who thinks that the Premier of this Province is Mr. Clean, then he has to be from St. John's or in the press gallery, one of the two, Because if you go outside the overpass you see the rifling unemployment in this Province, you see people on social assistance literally starving to death in pigsties. Go outside of the overpass where there are miles and miles of road in this Province in disgusting and deteriorating conditions. Do you not think for a minute, Mr. Speaker- I heard my hon. colleague

April 1, 1981

Tape No. 865

GS - 2

MR. MOORES: from the Strait of Belle Isle
(Mr. Roberts) get up the other day and acknowledge what I
have been saying here for the last two years,

MR. R. MOORES: and when somebody like the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) says it, it gets coverage in the paper, but I have been saying it now for two years, that the only obstruction to good government in this Province is the St. John's controlled and abetted media who cover the gallery here and unless it changes I will tell you something -

MR. NEARY: Only the CBC, the rest of them are all right.

MR. R. MOORES: No, the CBC - you just listen to what went on on the CBC last night when the Premier tried to weasle and worm his way out of that one on the topic on his minister. They gave the Premier seven and a half minutes and the Opposition spokesman got nothing. Nobody from the - and time and time again, Mr. Speaker, they are getting away with it. And I point out to this House that the CBC is publicly owned and is, under its constitution, forced to be impartial and unbiased, forced to give equal time to both parties and they do not do it! They did not do it last night when the Premier was on television! They did not do it when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was on television talking about the constitutional thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you think the Daily News is all right?

MR. R. MOORES: Are you asking my opinion of the Daily News?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, I certainly am.

MR. R. MOORES: I have not read the Daily News in five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: And I tell you, furthermore, I would not read it. I think it is just a piece of junk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member has about one half a minute.

MR. J. CARTER: By leave.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) says 'By leave', Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: So, Mr. Speaker, in summing up as quickly as I can in the next few seconds; with regard to the resource development and the creation of jobs in this Province, I predict that the Peckford administration will produce no more than the Moores administration. It will create no more in industry or industrial development in this Province than the Moores administration. And the only losers are going to be the people outside of the overpass, not the people in here, no question about it.

And am I ever biased, Mr. Speaker, against St. John's? Dear God, do not let any man hear me say otherwise. And I say to my leader time and time again, 'Give them the eleven seats and let them put them where they want to put them and let us go to the people, the real people of this Province, outside the overpass. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thank you for leaving, after that exhibition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird):

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to join in with

those -

MR. STIRLING:

(Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE:

I would like to join in,

Mr. Speaker, with those previous speakers in congratulating the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) for bringing in this resolution. It will certainly give us an opportunity to talk about, I suppose, various aspects of potential development and present developments in the Province. And it will certainly give me a chance to have a few words about the economic situation in the district of Naskaupi, which I maintain and, I think, some of my colleagues on this side of the House and perhaps some gentlemen opposite would agree, holds probably the greatest potential. Naskaupi district is one single electoral district, provincially speaking, than any another district in this Province in terms of potential for resource development. And I would go on to say that a couple of other districts in Labrador, Torngat Mountains, and Eagle River, in particular, are beginning to realize their resource potential in terms of the fishery and developments taking place there. And I do not refer at this point in time to the potential for the development of uranium at Kitts-Michelin, that is an issue that will be resolved or at least addressed and resolved one way or the other, either for or against, somewhere down the road, when BRINCO or BRINEX decides to pursue the matter further.

But in any event, in the coastal districts of Labrador the fishery has been coming on stream and I am

MR. GOUDIE: vaguely familiar with some parts of it, in that when I first assumed responsibility for the department known then as the Department of Rural Development, it was involved directly in the operation of two fish plants, one at Makkovik, another one at Nain, in terms of processing salmon and Arctic char and some other species as well. But since that time the the responsibility for these plants has been passed over to the regular line Department of Fisheries in the provincial government. There have been expansions taking place and improvements, I think, taking place in these plants and other facilities have either been constructed or are in the process of being constructed. And new species have been, I do not know if the proper word is 'discovered', perhaps the gentleman for Torngat (Mr. Warren) can elaborate when he gets up to speak a little later on as I understand he is going to do either today or next Wednesday, but new species were discovered or at least put on the market four or five years ago, because traditionally the residents of Northern Labrador have been involved, since the decline of the cod stocks in Labrador, in prosecuting primarily the salmon and char resources of Northern Labrador. And it was only recently, for instance, that a bit of an unusual quirk, if you will, was discovered by the fisheries officials about

MR. GOUDIE:

the Arctic char. Everyone knows that the Atlantic salmon is migratory in nature and everyone thought that the Arctic char was migratory in nature but as a result of fishing that had been going on for the last fifteen or twenty years, the stocks seem to be declining fairly quickly and after an extensive investigation they discovered that the Arctic char is not a migratory fish. It spawns in the fresh water rivers and stays within very close proximity in the salt water to these rivers and as a result just ferries back and forth. And setting nets, not in the river but near the river mouth, has resulted in many smaller fish being in evidence today as compared to what it was a few years ago. But in any event, with new species like turbot, increased stocks in cod fish-queen crab, I understand, has been found in some areas. Everyone is aware of the potential for extra or additional development of the shrimp industry on the coast. Some fisheries people I have been talking to -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Scallops.

MR. GOUDIE:

- and scallops, yes - some people I have been talking to in relation to the shrimp fishery predict, now I do not know how accurate this is, but their prediction is that the shrimp resources could result in a possible \$100 million a year industry to this Province and, hopefully, with improved facilities on the coast and the ability of the Fishermen's Union and the Fishermen's Co-operatives on the coast being able to get into larger vessels which are designed primarily to prosecute the shrimp fishery, then many of the benefits from the shrimp fishery will accrue to the coastal residents of Labrador. But in any event, this potential is there for development on the Coast of Labrador and I would suggest that before too many more years expire, you are going to find a situation

MR. GOUDIE: on the Coast of Labrador, both North and South, where there will not be enough resident fishermen there -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: - to properly prosecute the fishery. As a matter of fact, I think they will have to be brought in from other areas of either Labrador or the Province itself; hopefully not from other provinces of Canada but from within this Province. So the potential is there for development in terms of the resource and, hopefully, with agreements like the proposed native people's agreements, and there are two involved there as I indicated in another debate earlier this month, and the proposed DREE agreement for Coastal Labrador,

MR. GOUDIE: then the social requirements will be developed in coastal Labrador as well. But just let me talk for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, about Naskaupi district which, I guess, has gone through more of a transition in the last five or six years than most, I think, districts of this Province in terms of the impact socially on three particular communities and the impact economically on these three particular communities. I do not think any hon. member of this Assembly would take any pride from making a statement that I have to make or that I will make now. That is, that since I was elected, my district has lost more than 50 per cent of its population and that is directly as a result of the closedown of Labrador Linerboard Limited in 1976, I think it was, whereby 655 jobs were lost directly. These were not all jobs where the people resided on a year-round basis in either Happy Valley, Goose Bay, North West River or Mud Lake, but came from other parts of the Province, a great number of them from the Northern peninsula, to prosecute that particular industry which was set up initially by Mr. Smallwood and his administration to supply black spruce and fir to the linerboard mill at Stephenville. Now, I could go into a great long dissertation about the pros and cons of that particular move, but I will not since the industry, as it was originally conceived, is now defunct. In any event, in addition to Labrador Linerboard closing down in the late seventies, prior to that, about a year prior to that, the other largest employer in the area, the United States Airforce, began its phase-out. It has now come to a point where there are, I think, fourteen or fifteen American Forces personnel stationed at Goose Bay which, obviously, is quite a drop from the 13,000 or 14,000 American people who used to reside there, counting the

April 1, 1981

Tape No. 869

GS - 2

MR. GOUDIE: military people and their
dependants. So, we have gone through quite a transition
over the last seven or eight years in Naskaupi district.
But I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker,

MR. GOUDIE: point in time, as I did earlier in my remarks, that that district as a provincial district has the greatest potential for resource development. We are all, I think, now familiar with the efforts put forth by this provincial government and by the federal government through my colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Windsor) just a little while ago, whereby the icebreaker, Arctic, came into Lake Melville and proved, I think, beyond any shadow of a doubt that if not year-around then at least ten or ten and a half or eleven months shipping can be carried on in and out of that area with a vessel which is suitably designed for Lake Melville and the Labrador Sea. That, I think, has more implication for my area than any other development which has taken place in the last fifteen or twenty years.

In the area of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, North West River and Mud Lake, prior to the American and Canadian forces locating there in the late 1930's, early 1940's more accurately, people prosecuting the trapping industry and, to a very small extent in the Summer months, the fishing of Salmon, sea run trout, and that was it. That was the extent of our industry in the Western Lake Melville area and I am fairly familiar with that having come from a family of trappers, my father and two older brothers having prosecuted that industry for quite a number of years. But then with the influx of American, Canadian and now British, German and possibly one other foreign country becoming involved in a military presence there, low level bombing exercises, then obviously that military presence is going to exist for some time.

I do not know if I ever pointed it out before, Mr. Speaker, or not in this hon. House, but I think one of the most negative effects of a military presence in that part of our Province - I do not know if this effect was felt in other areas of the Province represented

MR. GOUDIE: by my colleague, the member for Placentia or not, but with a great number of people having come in from not only outside of our area, outside of the Province but outside of our country, our society for about thirty years was very cosmopolitan, there were people there from all over the world. And the money was good. When I was growing up, when I got out of high school, it was easier for me to become employed with one of the forces there and get a bigger salary for a fifteen or a twenty year period than my friends, the very few friends that I had who left high school and went on to either University or trades school or whatever. But there was no incentive for young people in our area to further their education because they could get out of school in Grades IX, X or XI and make better money with no experience whatsoever than they could if they went to University or to trade school. As a result of that, just as an example of one of the effects, we have a

MR. J. GOUDIE:

plant in Goose Bay called the Central Heat and Power Plant, with which the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is familiar, which employs twenty-five or thirty men who have been working there, some of them for as long as twenty-five years. They moved into that operation after they got out of school, in Happy Valley, became gainfully employed, learned their trade and have been proficient operators, competent operators over the years. But in the last two or three years- and my colleague the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is familiar with this because he has been involved in it, there is a need, a requirement now under legislation for these operations, if they are to continue to work, to be properly registered as technicians I, II, III or IV or whatever the appropriate level would be. And we had to put in place, over the last couple of years, a programme whereby these people could be certified based on their experience not on their actual schooling. They all went to upgrading school and became properly certified so that they can now operate in that plant only, no other plant in the Province. And that is twenty-five or thirty examples of the difficulty we had, one of the effects felt by our community with the presence of the military, Canadian and American, establishing there in the early 1940's.

But I made reference to the trip of the motor vessel Arctic and its possibilities for developing in our area. I suggested through the media a couple of weeks ago that Happy Valley/Goose Bay and North West River/Mud Lake have the potential right now for becoming the second largest city in this Province directly as a result of the potential for resource development. We are all aware of the wood that we have there. It is classified as one of, if not the best black spruce and fir in terms of fibre content in the world. There is none better. The hydro resources, obviously, are

MR. J. GOUDIE: familiar to everyone in the Province, one resource being twenty-two miles from Happy Valley/Goose Bay, the other being seventy miles away. And I am sure, I feel confident that my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is working at his utmost capacity to make sure that these two, at least one if not both of these resources comes on stream, Muskrat or Gull Island, either one, and that leads up to the possibility of -

MR. W. MARSHALL: Would the hon. minister like to call it six o'clock?

MR. J. GOUDIE: I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 p.m.