

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, MAY 30, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, it is with a very deep

sense of regret that I ask the indulgence of the House - and I have already conferred with the Premier and the House Leader opposite (Mr. W. Marshall), and I am grateful for their concurrence that I should lead off on these few rather sad words - in referring, of course, to the unfortunate deaths of some eleven young Newfoundlanders in Saskatchewan yesterday.

I asked for permission to move this motion because the families of virtually all of these young people are personal friends of mine. Most of them are from the South Coast which I represented for a great many years, and I know that the House unanimously shares my shock and sorrow over this situation. When I say that I was the representative for many years of most of them, it now is the case that my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms), my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. D. Hollett) and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. D. Stewart), I think all three of them have constituents who are among the deceased.

While perhaps, Sir, it is not possible at this moment for us to send individual messages of sympathy, because I gather the families have not all been identified at the moment, in any event, I do move, Sir, that this House go on record as being profoundly shocked by this tragic accident and that we do convey our sympathies to the relatives of the eleven young Newfoundlanders who died in such a tragic and unfortunate fashion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members

on this side of the House, I would like to share and to second the motion by the Leader of the Opposition. I guess it points up, Mr. Speaker, once again as we say so often in a sort of cliché way, that Newfoundlanders

PREMIER PECKFORD: are everywhere, and this unfortunate accident points that up again. I guess there are families all around Newfoundland and Labrador who today are somewhat more concerned about their relatives as they continue to work in Alberta or British Columbia or Baffin Island or wherever it happens to be around the world.

This unfortunate accident of young people, nineteen, twenty and twenty-one years old, is a great tragedy and I want to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on that score, and that when it is clearly determined, that the appropriate messages go forward from this Legislature of sympathy and condolences to the relatives and families of the people concerned. I think it is a very, very sad time and we only hope that in the hours and days and weeks and months and years ahead that the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundlanders who do go from this rock and go from Labrador look after themselves so we do not have to get up in this Legislature or listen to radios to hear these kinds of things coming back to our shores.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Hon. members have heard the motion.
Those in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary?
Carried.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, an exchange yesterday between the hon. President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) and I, I first raised the point of privilege because of fear that I had that his remarks might be taken out of context and with the concern that I had about the connotation of his remarks, I raise the point of privilege.

My worse fears have now been realized, Mr. Speaker, and last night CBC carried what was very clearly a misinterpretation of the remarks of the President of the Council. Very clearly CBC carried a report which attributed to Mr. Marshall, the President of the Council- they used the name Marshall- they attributed to Mr. Marshall comments which he did not make. And the exact CBC quotation of the offending part- the news item came late in the news and it was late in the day and I would imagine because of the rush in filing it, the whole connotation was that I had come close to being expelled, had to withdraw a derogatory remark- there was no comment about the context and the withdrawal-but the significant and the question of the point of privilege and the libel involved were these exact comments: "Marshall, who linked Stirling's name with alleged kickbacks, payoffs and other schemes during the days of the Smallwood government."

That comment, which was attributed to Mr. Marshall, was, in fact, not made by him. What I was concerned would be taken by the news media as the reference, when he brought up the discussion

MR. L. STIFLING: of the development conference, and since yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to talk to Mr. Marshall, the President of the Council - it is a very important and emotional point as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I may not use the correct terms. I talked to Mr. Marshall to find out what it was - I talked to the President of the Council by telephone last night to find out what it was in the context in which the comment was used.

AN HON. MEMBER: Smear, that is what it was.

MR. STIRLING: And he related to me, that I am not sure whether he was actually present at the development conference himself. It was a development conference in May of 1971. I was then Deputy Mayor of the city of St. John's, not involved in any way with any political party, Liberal or otherwise, was not actively involved in partisan politics. I was involved as the Deputy Mayor and I attended the conference and in one of the comments he recalled that somebody had, to use his expression, maligned a Newfoundland company - because I do not want this to go any further I will not name the Newfoundland company - that somebody speaking before me had maligned a Newfoundland company, and that I in my comments had said that this had to cease, that I came to the defense of Newfoundland companies and suggested to the effect that we had to get on past this day in Newfoundland. And that very well could have been a speech, Mr. Speaker, because I have made that speech in this House of Assembly, I have made that speech for the last ten years, that we have to get away from personal attacks and that every time a Newfoundland company shows some success we have a tendency to haul it down and be critical. So in that context I accept that I may have made those kinds of comments.

I did check with the Legislative Library, I did check with the Legislative Library, Mr. Speaker, to find out what is in the record from that development conference. The only record that the Legislative Library could find of a comment that I made at that conference is a question that I asked the hon. Eric Dawe, that I asked him if we could expect, meaning the city of St. John's could expect that the Province would provide a housing project in the Mundy Pond area.

MR. MOORES: There you go! There you go!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President of the Council (W. Marshall) will use this opportunity to confirm that certainly that this is the context in which he made the comments and it is certainly nowhere near the context of the CBC report which stated, and I repeat it, "Marshall, who linked Stirling's name with alleged kickbacks, payoffs and other schemes during the days of the Smallwood Government."

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) -boy.

MR. MOORES: Drop it, boy.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

MR. MOORES: The CBC press was drunk up there.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I asked for protection of the House, because I do not have any records, there is nothing I can do except rely on the House and the President of the Council to clear up this matter.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: As far as CBC is concerned, I intend to take legal action. I have sought legal advice and I -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - will be taking legal action against the CBC for libel.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

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

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: You can only have one point of privilege.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, coincidental with respect to the same thing as the hon. gentleman has risen on.

I first of all want to say that I would like to see Canadian Broadcasting Corporation retract the statement attributed to me, that was not made by me in the House yesterday, to the effect that I associated the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) with kickbacks and contracts. The Hansard is here to see, and it is here for all to see, and I did not do it. Now how did this arise? This arose, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly because of a misinterpretation. It was not me who uttered the words of association of the hon. member with kickbacks; it was the hon. member himself who did it by saying that my remarks at the time associated him with kickbacks. And I refer to Hansard which the hon. gentleman has seen. He said in the course of when he did retract, he said, 'I could not sit here and accept the connotation of kickbacks, payoffs, rip-offs with a comment that he says I made ten years ago at a development conference.' Now I have no intention of getting into that development conference over and above what I said yesterday in my remarks which, I reiterate - I do not reiterate, but I do not take back one single, solitary syllable of it except to say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not use these words.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now how did these words arise? These words arose, obviously, whoever was reporting from CBC came out and immediately came in on the situation when the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) got up on his point of privilege, when the hon. member for Bonavista North said he would not be associated with kickbacks. So it was the hon. member for Bonavista North who said this as a result of misinterpretation of what I said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now I want to make that quite clear. So I would hope that, as I say, CBC on the same bulletin tonight at the same time in fairness to everybody would report once again the fact that the hon. member for - as arising out of the incident yesterday where the hon. member for Bonavista North was forced to retract his remarks, I would hope that they will go on to say that they erroneously reported me as having said that the hon. member was associated with contracts and kickbacks, because I did not say it.

Now I want to make it perfectly, too, Mr. Speaker, crystal clear to everybody in this House and outside that when I make this statement, and I make this statement that I did not say it, that in this refrain I am in no way taking back or retracting one iota of anything I said because I have no reason to do it. The whole incident unfortunately arose as a result of a misinterpretation of the hon. member for Bonavista North. And, I believe, from my conversation with him, which he initiated last night, that he realizes the fact. He has had a chance to examine

MR. MARSHALL:

the Hansard, he knows in fact that I did not utter these words, and all I can say is that the hon. gentleman must have, with the CBC, misheard it.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, after having heard the hon. gentleman this morning and last night, that the hon. gentleman retracted yesterday calling me a bare-faced liar and a liar before this House in a full and sufficient manner to this House. But he did it in a certain way that obviously indicated he was not conveying a personal apology or retraction to me. I hope, because he is obviously misinterpreted as we do from time to time on things, and you can see in the Hansard it is there for everyone to see, that he will man-fashion give me a public, personal apology for calling me a liar and a bare faced liar because I do not particularly wish to receive that from anybody, not even the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

With respect to the points of privilege, I wish to reserve ruling on both points of privilege and take them under advisement to give me an opportunity to do a little more - I do not believe I need to hear much debate on the points, but I would like to take them under advisement and give a ruling at a later time.

I would also like to at this time, on behalf of all hon. members, and I know they would like to join me, in welcoming to the galleries the grade VIII class from Holy Cross Central High School from Eastport in the district of Terra Nova, accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Howell and Mr. Kelland, their bus driver and some parents. We hope that they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): And it is also a pleasure to welcome to the galleries two classes of the English as a Second Language School. With the exception of one student, I believe, they are all boat people. Their students are accompanied by their teachers Carrol Danylchuk and Bill Warshick. We hope that they enjoy their visit and find it to be informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement.

I am today laying, Mr. Speaker, on the table of this House a copy of a discussion paper on major bilateral issues between Canada and Newfoundland. This document has been forwarded to Prime Minister Trudeau, the appropriate federal ministers and the Newfoundland Members of Parliament.

We have prepared this paper to provide a focus for discussion with the federal government on those areas which my government considers to be of most fundamental and immediate concern to Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The matters which have been identified in this document do not represent all of our concerns. To attempt to list each individual issue would serve only to divert the energy which we believe should be directed, in the first instance, to removing very serious obstacles to our development. My ministers and their officials are now seeking, and will continue to seek, resolution of a large number of other issues. However, it is our wish that there be no doubt as to where our first priorities lie.

Newfoundland has a future potential which is unequalled in the federation but the realization of that future in the long term depends on overcoming a number of institutional and constitutional constraints which now exist.

However, we are starting from a position considerably behind our sister provinces. The paper before you, which will be distributed in a few minutes, shows that in terms of earned income per capita, the average Canadian citizen earns eighty six per cent more than the average Newfoundlander. In several provinces the average earned income is more than twice that of the average Newfoundlander. This is the situation we are seeking to change.

But to achieve that change there must be some fundamental changes in the historic approach of the federal government and there must be a renewed commitment to enabling the Province to close the gap in services provided to our citizens. This commitment must have more substance to it than mere words. It must be backed by financial resources.

There are a number of areas where such a commitment can be transformed into concrete action if there is a will to do so. We will continue to look to DREE expenditures as the most visible statement of that will and we will look to the federal government for a sensitive consideration of the infrastructure required to permit development of the Newfoundland economy.

In terms of principles, the Province

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1937

AH-2

PREMIER PECKFORD: believes that: (1) Challenges to our ownership of the continental shelf must be removed; (2) Measures to provide a meaningful role in fisheries management and jurisdiction must be adopted; (3) Barriers to the transmission of electric power to outside markets other than Quebec must be removed.

Some of these matters will also be addressed within the context of the forthcoming constitutional discussions.

In terms of immediate actions which should be initiated, the Province believes that: (1) In transportation, it is vital to arrange a new Trans-Canada Highway Agreement, to upgrade the railway and begin work on a Trans-Labrador Road; (2) Several DREE agreements which have been held up for an inordinate length of time must be signed and the commitment to overcoming regional disparities must be re-affirmed in a tangible way; and, (3) A greater effort must be made with regard to research and development.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The resolution of rights with regard to fisheries, the Continental Shelf and the development and export of electrical power will lay the cornerstone for the development of a Province which can be equal to other provinces. If these issues are not favourably resolved, Newfoundland will be permanently handicapped and forever dependent upon the transfer of wealth from other areas.

In the coming months my Government will be striving to overcome the main stumbling blocks to our future economic development and we look forward to the coming constitutional discussions which affect some of these matters and to successful negotiations with the Federal Government in the other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I table this statement and with it the Discussion Paper itself which, I might add, contains the recently adopted flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

the Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, as you yourself can observe, I am only at this moment getting a copy of the statement and have not, of course, seen the documentation at all. Consequently, it is quite impossible to comment in any detail on what the hon. the Premier has introduced here this morning.

I certainly, from just listening to it, can say that the objectives of maximizing benefits from our resources etc. for

MR. JAMIESON: Newfoundlanders is something with which we can be in total and full agreement.

I will confine myself this morning to saying, and I hope the House will concede that I have had some experience in federal/provincial matters, that I can assure the House that I certainly hope that these discussions and the like can be carried out in amicable and a conciliatory non-partisan way; and that if that is done then I suspect that before the year is out there will be clear evidence of a new kind of federalism. It may not be any one of the various formulas that have been advanced over the last several weeks, but there is no doubt that there is a mood in this country which is designed, I believe, to ensure that we do get a constitutional reform, or whatever name one wishes to put on it, that is consistent with the seventies behind us but now with the eighties ahead of us, and I feel very confident, personally, that as long as these talks, whether they be within the frame work of first ministers meetings or if they be at the, both ministerial and official level, will be productive for both sides as long as there is an understanding, I think, that there is much more to be gained by an awareness, both federally and provincially, of common objectives than a confrontational approach.

But I will probably be able to say something further when I have had a chance to peruse this very substantial document.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Further statements? The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot

MR. OTTENHEIMER: distribute this statement because I do not have it dictated, I have a few notes and they would be illegible to anybody but myself.

MR. NEARY: The weekend is (inaudible) twenty-four.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now that I have the hon. gentleman's attention: I make this statement in view of statements made yesterday by a gentleman from the Mainland, presumably here advising the President of the Brotherhood, and in view of statements made by the President of the Brotherhood. There are four matters on which I wish to inform and confirm and clarify certain matters; to inform the House and, obviously, the people so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Number one, Mr. Coady, whose appointment as Deputy Chief I announced approximately a week ago, will, of course, be commencing his duties on Monday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: This will fill out, complete the upper management at the Chief and Assistant Chief level in the Constabulary with Chief Roche, who was appointed a few months ago, then the second in command, Deputy Chief Randell, whose area is operations, and then with Mr. Coady's commencement of duties, the Deputy Chief in the area of administration, Mr. Coady, and that will commence on Monday.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: The second point which I wish to inform hon. members, and then through them the people so that there is no ambiguity, is that, obviously, the government fully expects the men of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary to live up to and honour their legal obligations in terms of the Constabulary Act, the Constabulary regulations and the oath of office that each of them takes. The government fully expects that of our force.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Thirdly, as hon. members are aware also, the approximately 100,000, which is close to 20 per cent of the population of the Province, who live in the St. John's area obviously have the right to expect the same level of police protection and its continuity as people in other parts of the Province, and that, of course, is closely linked with what I said before, and that is the government's full expectation that the men of the force will live up to their duties.

And the final matter that I wish to make clear -

MR. S. NEARY: You are on a collision course.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: The hon. gentleman will have to choose his courses, and the government will choose our courses, and we do so - I have no intention of debating with the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - unless there has been a change in the Justice critic over there, and sometimes I am not sure. Number four, the fourth issue on which -

MR. S. NEARY: That is not nice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: I hate to interrupt. Mr. Speaker, we have seen here this morning the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) as he sits in his seat interrupted the hon. the Leader of the Opposition,

MR. W. MARSHALL: he is now interrupting the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), Mr. Speaker, and we cannot conduct the proceedings of this House when one man completely ignores the rules and the modus operandi of the whole institution.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: We saw yesterday, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is capable of through his innuendo and smear tactics.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member must be relevant to the point of order, which is interruptions.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I would submit to Your Honour that there is no point of order. I am merely trying to point out that that self-righteous point of order is coming from a gentleman who attacked a member's mother in this House one time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I might point out again, as I have on many occasions, that certain interruptions and interjections are allowed in the context that they are acceptable to everybody in this House. However, shouting from the seat and loud and consistent interruptions, I think, do not do much to enhance the dignity and decorum of this hon. House. I would ask for hon. members to heed that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the final point I wish to make is this, and I think this is a very important one, and that is in my opinion and in the opinion of the government, there is a fundamental and extremely important issue at stake here. That is the fact that the responsibility for law enforcement policy in this Province and in our society rests with the civil authority. I repeat that: The responsibility for law enforcement policy in this Province and in our society has always historically rested, does now rest, and as long as this government is in

MR. OTTENHEIMER: power will continue to rest with the civil authority elected by the people, accountable to the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And what obviously flows from that, what necessarily flows from that is that this civil authority has no intention of surrendering its responsibility to any others, including gentlemen from the Mainland who are down advising the President, or to the President, or to anybody else. We intend to stand by the principle that it is the civil authority which is responsible for law enforcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we again see what I referred to yesterday, the conversion of what is normally a mild-mannered, rational Minister of Justice into an arrogant member of this administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious situation in St. John's today. No one on this side of the House, no one on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, condones any illegal work stoppages by any sector of the work force in this Province. Nobody condones that. But what the Minister of Justice does is stand up in the House this morning and fuels the fire. I mean in effect what he is doing is challenging -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe the hon. member is beginning to drift into the area of debate and must watch his comments.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Justice is doing with his statement this morning is to fuel the controversy, is to dare, to put a challenge out to the police force. Now I do not for one moment condone a walkout, or even the threat of a walkout, but I can sympathize with the police force in the city. I mean, they are being practically driven to doing what they are threatening to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are condoning it.

MR. THOMS: I am not condoning it. I am certainly not condoning it. But neither do I condone a statement that flings out the challenge, it flings it out. We have a minister who will not consider the setting up of a police commission in the city -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: - and taking appointments such as this out of the hands of the politicians, out of the hands of the politicians. Every police force practically in Canada has a police commission, almost every one. But the Minister of Justice in this Province absolutely refuses to consider it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice and I would like to ask whether or not the minister would advise the House

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1941

EL - 1

MR. L. THOMS: if the new Deputy Chief, who is taking over obviously on Monday, if the new Deputy Chief has requested, made a request either to the Department of Justice or to the Chief of Police to have his appointment withdrawn?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly not to me nor to my knowledge and, I am sure I would know, to the Chief of Police. So there has been no such request, absolutely not.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) this morning has indicated to us that he is going to stand on his principles on this matter and there is nobody going to run roughshod over this administration. But the Minister of Justice and this government have a responsibility to the people of this Province to provide them with Police protection. Now, in view of the stated intention of the police force that they will walk out on Monday if the new Deputy Chief of Police takes up his position, in view of their stated intention, what contingency plans does the minister have for the provision of police protection in this city?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment or clarify what was part of the preamble of the hon. gentleman's question, and that was in view of the stated intention of the police force to walk out on Monday. I must make clear that there was no stated intention of the police force. There was a stated intention by, I believe his name is Mr. Ross, who was down from the mainland advising the president -

MR. L. THOMS: No, no! Mr. Speaker-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. OTTENHEIMER: I did not interrupt the hon. members when they asked questions and I expect the same courtesy from them - and also there was a stated intention

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

from the President of the Brotherhood. I am not aware of a stated intention of the police force. I am aware of a stated intention of a gentleman from the mainland who was presumably down to advise the President of the Brotherhood and I am aware of the stated intention of the President of the Brotherhood. I am not aware of a stated intention of the Police Force. The other part of the question was what are the contingency plans in this eventuality. I will point out and repeat what I said in my statement and that is that the government expects that the police force will live up to its duty and it is not my intention, therefore, to answer speculative or hypothetical questions because we fully expect the force to live up to its duty.

MR. THOMS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, you know, the minister is becoming involved now in semantics. He does not seem to care less what is going to happen on Monday just as long as there is a clear distinction between the Police Brotherhood and the police force in this Province.

MR. NEARY:

He is hoping they will walk out.

MR. THOMS:

But is the minister then indicating that if there is a strike on Monday, if

MR. L. THOMS: there are no plans whatsoever to police the city, we are going to be left in chaos? That is a dereliction of his responsibility.

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question, I think really what it is is since we expect that the force will live up its obligations.

MR. L. THOMS: But they said otherwise.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - that we have no contingency plans and therefore we are quite irresponsible. That is not the case at all. If the hon. gentleman will recall the statement I made a few minutes ago, I stated to the effect that the approximately 20 per cent of the people of this Province who live in the St. John's area have the right to expect a continuity and security of police protection that people in other parts of the Province do and that we intend to take all necessary measures to assure that that right is recognized.

MR. L. THOMS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated the final supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) and it relates to the answer given by the Premier yesterday to a question specifically concerning the Buchans - Burgeo - Southwest Brook road.

The Premier indicated that one of the considerations before that road would be completed - now there are only twelve miles to push through and make the hookup so one could drive from St. John's to the West coast by that road - that that road would have to be the subject of an environmental impact study, that there are concerns about the damage to the environment or the wildlife or whatever.

Would the minister confirm that that is indeed a consideration on that road, that it has to be subject to an impact study?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I was not listening to every word the Premier said, but my understanding is that the Premier's remarks were along the lines that there are major roads in the Province that will be built or have to be built and before they can be built an environmental study may have to be done. I am not sure he was referring specifically to that particular section of road.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer will show that the Premier did indeed indicate that particular road. And I want to ask the minister how that would jibe - and I am not for or against an impact study at this point until I understand exactly what the ministry has in mind - but how would that kind of reasoning jibe with the fact that the Province has already built almost ten miles of road in one of the most sensitive areas of the road, in the Lloyd's Lake area? Over \$1 million spent by this Province up to this point in time in the very sensitive area and a contract completed last year, so how would the ministry jibe the necessity of an environmental impact study with the work already done on that road?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Two things, Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier indicated that an environmental study might have to be done, he did not say that it would have to be, and secondly, the section of road that was built was built before the Environmental Act was passed in the House.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated, whether he is aware of it or not, that all road construction in this Province will now come under the auspices of that Environmental Act, but we will wait and see. But another most important question, Mr. Speaker, re this road is that the minister knows that Price (Nfld.) had intended

MR. G. FLIGHT: and still intends to move wood to the Stephenville operation from that area - Lloyd's Lake, Southwest Brook - and they have indicated that if the government does not complete that road that they intend to build their own access road - I mean, that is the policy of that company - and not by the same route that the government is talking about. So would the minister assure the House that if the Buchans - Burgeo highroad is going to be subject to an impact study, that any woods access road built by Price (Nfld.) in that area for the purpose of getting their wood West, which that road would serve, will also be subject to an environmental impact study?

MR. S. NEARY: A good point.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate that he is aware of Abitibi-Price's position in this area and indeed has indicated to them that any access roads built in that particular area will be subject to an impact study?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, everything that the gentleman said is all based on a hypothetical question sort of, you know.

MR. G. FLIGHT: No, it is not.

MR. C. BRETT: We do not know if Price (Nfld.) is going to build an access road or not, and I would assume that if it is necessary to have an environmental study done, well then it will be done whether Price (Nfld.) builds it or whether the Newfoundland government builds it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1943

AH-1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. Windsor). I understand some time ago the Labrador East Integrated School Board submitted a submission to the minister and I am just wondering if the minister could advise if his department, through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, are planning to transfer several mobile trailers to the Labrador coast to alleviate housing for teachers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the situation to which the hon. member refers. We say that the responsibility for providing for teachers rests in the first instance with the school boards and we have so advised them of it. We have offered to co-operate in any way possible with the boards in making housing available; however, it is not possible for the Housing Corporation to either operate or maintain or to make units available free of charge. The boards are prepared to accept these units that are available in Happy Valley, to relocate them to the areas where they need teachers' and to administer them themselves, since we do not have officers of the Housing Corporation scattered all along the coast of Labrador, whereas the schools obviously have people there who operate and maintain the schools, I am sure we can find some arrangement. We are still negotiating with them.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister may have misinterpreted my question. I asked the minister was his department, through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, planning to transfer several mobile home to the coastal Labrador region. Now I did not ask for who was going to be responsible or anything, so I presume there have been negotiations ongoing. Will the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1943

AH-2

MR. WARREN: Corporation through your department transfer any of those mobile homes along the Labrador coast? Yes or No?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: It is early in the morning, Mr. Speaker, but I thought I answered that question quite clearly in stating that we have had dealings with that school board, we have offered to make them available under certain terms and conditions and if they accept indeed we will make them available.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: My final supplementary question is to the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). In view of the fact that there is no agreement reached between the Labrador East Integrated School Board and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, could the minister assure the hon. House that students along the Labrador coast will not be deprived of their education come September because of lack of housing accommodations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the matter of providing adequate schooling for students along the coast of Labrador is one that will be handled by the school boards responsible under the direction of the churches and the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you leave the good wine till last. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir, and it has to do with constitutional reform and constitutional changes. The hon. gentleman tabled this morning a document that is in my opinion based along partisan political lines. Now Canadians are not going to get very many more opportunities to get a crack at amending the constitution and I have been very concerned about this matter because the people have no input. Usually a half a dozen or so politicians and their experts get together,

MR. NEARY: their advisors, and work out position papers and so forth and the people really have no involvement. My question for the Premier is does he not think - seeing that we are not going to get very many more cracks, this may be the last chance we will get - does he not think that it would be very worthwhile to initiate a programme whereby Newfoundlanders, ordinary Newfoundlanders could become involved in expressing their views on the constitutional reforms and the constitutional changes that they would like to see brought about at future constitutional meetings that will be held in Canada?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) said a few minutes ago, I guess it is early in the morning for some people; I thought I made clear a couple of times this week the government's position on this. This particular document is not a constitutional document. Two of the issues contained in it deal with some constitutional change which has been a part of government policy for a long period of time and which had been the subject, may I say, of intensive and extensive public debate over the last number of years, especially the ownership of mineral resources on the Continental Shelf, White Paper and all, so

PREMIER PECKFORD: those areas are taken care of. This is a discussion paper and a position paper on bilateral issues between ourselves and the Government of Canada. There will be a second document which will be tabled in this House and which will then be available for public discussion on constitutional reform specifically, and that will be out shortly, as quickly as we can do it. It is under intensive discussion now by people in the Department of Justice and at the Cabinet level and so on. So we intend to do exactly as the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just mentioned, that is to table and to have public discussion on the positions which the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador deem important in the ongoing constitutional reform debate which will continue for a number of years now and which only got initiated since the referendum and which, hopefully, will continue the kind of momentum that has been built up. So we do, we intend to do exactly that and it is why we are going to table this constitutional reform document in the not too distant future.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just stated precisely what I do not think should be the procedure. They are going to table the document first and then ask the public for input after. What I am suggesting to the hon. gentleman - I am trying to get his reaction to this - is why not initiate a programme whereby the ordinary people of Newfoundland will have input before the document is tabled in the House, whatever document it is, because this is going to be the position of the Justice Department, the officials and the politicians? Why cannot the government initiate a programme whereby people all over the Province, young and old

MR. S. NEARY: and middle-aged, will have involvement and then end up with a great assembly of people somewhere in Newfoundland to bring all these thoughts and all these recommendations and ideas together and then table the document in the House. Why does the hon. gentleman not do it that way?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member realizes it or not that the whole question of constitutional reform is a fairly complex one. It is not like asking people to comment upon the question of Northern cod or the question of something else which is clearly identified with Newfoundland and for which we have had a lot of experience. Here what we want to do - the government, the members on this side of the House have been elected to lead and we must work out and table in this House for discussion and for Newfoundlanders generally to talk about and organizations to talk about, various proposals which we think are important for constitutional reform. And this is the process which we initiated -

MR. S. NEARY: But you have the cart before the horse.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and if the hon. member does not agree with that position, well, then, of course, he is entitled to disagree with the position. But that is the position we are going to take. We think it is a reasonable position to take and we intend to pursue it.

MR. S. NEARY: You do not believe in public involvement. You do not believe in letting the ordinary people have input.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am rather saddened and deeply hurt and shaken and crushed by the fact that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not see fit to agree with the government as to how we should proceed on this very significant and important matter in our history.

MR. S. NEARY: You should get the people's views first.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am having a little difficulty, too, and it is not because it is early in the morning, with the Premier's statement. I repeat a question I asked him a couple of weeks ago because it was indeed, in the Speech from the Throne opening the session last year that a mechanism would be provided. Now that does not seem to be in the answer, at least, as I heard it this morning. I can see putting it on the table of the House, let us say; we would have preferred discussion before a paper but all right. But even if the paper is put forward, is it merely going to be 'letters to the editor' or is going to be 'open line shows' or is there going to be some formalized manner through which people can come and make representations. The government has done a great deal of boasting about the exposure it gave with regard to the flag - and, by the way, the first evidence of it, I have not changed my mind. We did have a lot of hearings on something, on single issues like that. Is there a mechanism proposed through which - and, incidentally, while I am at this subject I do not think the Premier really meant to be that the repository of all wisdom on constitutional matters rests with the government, that there are surely people in this Province who have legitimate views to express. So how are they going to express them?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is the whole point of tabling the paper in the House and to widely distribute it around the Province so that organizations and groups can communicate their concerns and their points of view as it relates to changes in the constitutional reform.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the whole point of it.

Now there are two elements of the whole constitutional package which are extremely important - well, under the constitution there is really one and that is the whole question of division of powers. And, I guess the other one, because it really does not - I suppose it does come under division of powers to some degree is the offshore. And the two major concerns that the Province has as it relates to constitutional change, although there are many, many others which we will have to deal with and which will be part of this document that I am talking about, are these on which there has been substantial public input - is that where on the question of the ownership of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf and shared jurisdiction as it relates to the fishery. These are two components of a whole

PREMIER PECKFORD: constitutional reform package which are extremely important for the Province, and on which already there has been massive public input and debate and discussion over the last decade. On the other ones dealing with communications policy, on the others dealing with declaratory powers, on the others dealing with charter of rights, of entrenchment of linguistic rights into the constitution, they will all be part of this additional document which will then be available for public discussion and public input after it is tabled here in the House. And I think that is a very reasonable proposition and proposal and mechanism to use -

MR. NEARY: No it is not, it should be the other way around.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in this whole process.

MR. NEARY: It should be the reverse.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: I think the Premier must recognize that he is not the source of all wisdom or the source of all knowledge, neither he nor his government. And I do not hear too many Newfoundlanders going around talking about constitutional reform. I do not hear that. Now I think that the Premier must agree that in order to find out - in order to give our chance - in order for us to find out what our people are thinking about constitutional reform, constitutional change, that the people must be given some opportunity to have an input, and not the other way around with the government forcing something down their throats.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Now my question to the Premier is that this constitutional reform naturally is going to go on for a while, it is not going to be just June, this is not going to be the only meeting, so I am wondering over probably the next few months whether the Premier would not give consideration to setting up a select committee of the House so that we can go around and try and find out what the people are thinking about constitutional change, what reforms they have, what are the big things on their

MR. LUSH: mind as opposed to the Premier throwing his views down the throats of the people of Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: Right on.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be very reluctant to establish a select committee because I am afraid the committee might come in with a unanimous recommendation only to find a number of people on the Opposition do another flip-flop, so we would not be any further ahead than we were before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, you know, I think the whole process of select committees has fallen on bad ways in recent weeks and months because there are members around who will politically use it and make all kinds of flip-flops and all the rest of it so I regret that I cannot be more serious about the suggestion primarily because- I think the hon. member is very serious, but I think some of his colleagues have brought into question that whole mechanism.

MR. NEARY: No wonder the people -

PREMIER PECKFORD: However, if one looks across Canada, Mr. Speaker, if one looks across Canada what has happened has been and by most of the provinces - by only some of the provinces, as a matter of fact; I think British Columbia has done, I think Alberta has done it as well, and a couple of other provinces have actually gone about the whole constitutional reform procedure and put a document on the table. Alberta did it that way. British Columbia did it that way, and that is the way we intend to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is better to set up a select committee.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now let me just say, Mr. Speaker, the national government, the federal government, has to this point in time not, for example, entertained any notion of trying to put a framework for constitutional reform on the table so all Canadians could see how the federal or national government is going to approach this very critical issue. It has talked in very general terms about it. So I think what we can do is do something

PREMIER PECKFORD: like British Columbia has done, something like Alberta has done, and prepare as a government, representing the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, a document which outlines directions, positions on the constitutional reform process and some of the major components of any reform, and publicize it in this House, in the Parliament of Newfoundland representing all the people. Have it distributed widely around the Province and allow for public debate and input and discussion into it. And I am sure that the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), because of his great concern in this matter will see to it that a major public meeting in the Terra Nova district is held which he will chair, to ensure that he gets from his people the kind of concern because he is a parliamentarian and because he believes in democracy that we will have perhaps the first meeting of constitutional reform being held in Musgravetown, in the district of Terra Nova, which will be chaired by the hon. member for Terra Nova, to ensure that the mechanism is open, that democracy is in operation, and that we get that kind of input from the people that he so desirously wants.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please !

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly accept that invitation and that challenge to be chairman of that meeting in Musgravetown.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier has got a problem.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Premier arising out of his answer: Are we to interpret from the Premier's statement that there will never be another select committee set up in this House ? Are we to interpret from that that there will never be another select committee set up ?

May 30, 1980

Tape 1946

EC - 1

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, he cannot interpret

that there will be no more Select Committees. We believe in the Committee process. All I was doing, Mr. Speaker, was - and I guess I am allowed to do that - comment upon the Select Committee just recently reported and to see, disappointingly, that a number of members of that Select Committee on the one hand supported something and then when they got into this House, made a flip-flop.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That does tend to throw some confusion

on the process. But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of that, we will barge ahead, we will move ahead to ensure that members of the Opposition and that the people of Newfoundland get some input. We do not mind if the Opposition do flip-flops, Mr. Speaker. We do not mind at all. We are still going to be consistent and we will still have Select Committees established regardless of what the Opposition do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Talking about flip-flops, Mr. Speaker,

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer). It relates to the Matrimonial Property Act which we passed in the House some time ago. I was here, Mr. Speaker, for the duration of that debate and in response, I believe, to a question from my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) concerning the future efforts on the part of the government to curtail the cost vis-a-vis the lawyers, curtailing the cost of agreements, the making up of agreements to opt out of the provisions of the act, I would like to know what the minister's efforts have been in curtailing legal fees and legal costs in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, of course, this goes back some months ago and it could be that either the hon. gentleman's memory or my memory is at fault. I certainly did not say that I would - you know, I have no authority to establish legal fees. As the hon. member is probably aware, it is not required that a domestic contract be done up by a lawyer. It may be done up by the two parties concerned, signed and witnessed, so there is no requirement, and indeed I would think there will be many instances where that would in fact be the case if people did wish to have a domestic contract. In areas where they do wish to have a legal one, then obviously they would have that done by a lawyer, but I could not establish the fees for that. If the hon. member or anybody had evidence that fees were extremely or prohibitively high or that type of thing, obviously it is a matter which I would discuss with them, but I do not have and I do not think the hon. gentleman does, any evidence that that is in fact the case as of now.

MR. R. MOORES:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I brought the question up is because during the debate it was also indicated or implied by the minister and by the government that every effort would be undertaken to inform the public of the provisions of the Matrimonial Property Act how they could opt out of that act and what they should do in order to opt out. Now, I read the government's brochure and there is absolutely nothing in that brochure to indicate a) that if the person involved so desires it would cost nothing to opt out, and b) it is implied because of the legal connotation of the brochure that a person wanting to opt out of the provisions of the act would have to go to a lawyer. Now, part two is that I have in fact incurred a constituent who has paid to a lawyer \$500 for something that I could have done myself for that constituent free of charge, and if that continues, Mr. Speaker - that is only one case that I know of, and if I know the legal profession in

May 30, 1980

Tape 1946

EC - 3

MR. R. MOORES:

only one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

this Province, it will not be the

Hear, hear!

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the last matter where the hon. gentleman said he was aware of a situation where a domestic contract was done up by a lawyer and there was a cost of \$500. I think what I am going to say there is that what that person should do is apply to the Taxing Master of the court where such, you know, fees can be reviewed if that is the situation. Then certainly that would be - I would suggest to the hon. member that he advise that person who presumably is a constituent or an acquaintance of his to apply to the Taxing Master, because that, certainly, I think, would require - there would appear to be a strong prima facie case there for review.

With respect to the pamphlet itself, actually most comments that I have heard have been laudatory and people have found it to be quite helpful and well done, given the complexity of the issues. So, obviously, there are different strokes - I need the hon. gentleman's permission presumably to -

MR. FLIGHT: Different Strokes. He watches T.V.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Different strokes for different folks so I can well see there may be some people who do not think it is well done, but certainly the comments I have heard is that it is very well done and it has been very helpful. And I am pleased to say not one cent in public expenditure in terms of public relations, not that I have anything against public relations, but it was all internally done by the department.

MR. STIRLING: Witness the situation with the Constabulary.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, and the hon. gentleman is quite right. I mentioned that on the Open Line programme that I was on a few days ago. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), when we were talking in general about an advertising campaign, did suggest a pamphlet to go to each household and we, I think, agreed immediately and have, in fact, done that.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is very true and I am pleased to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Just one other matter - The hon. gentleman said that in the pamphlet it did not say that the person did not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, when a question is asked it is wise to get the answer.

- that is did not state that a lawyer was not necessary. No, it does. It does state down here under section, 'What is a domestic contract?' It does explain what it is and does point out that it is not necessary to have it drawn up by a lawyer.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act" and I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to

MR. WINDSOR: introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipal Grants Act".

MR. FLIGHT: Ah ha, Windsor is going to get their money.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Remove Anomalies -

MR. FLIGHT: (inaudible) talk about Melville Lake.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, no, do not let the hon. gentleman get worried, I was not referring to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law".

MR. F.B. ROWE: Boy, you are some witty this morning.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 4. Concurrence motions, Government Services Committee.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I started I suggested that I wanted to talk about two items in particular for starters, and that is, there are two departments I want to talk about, the Department of Labour and Manpower and I wanted, also, to talk about the Department of Transportation and Communications. I might not get the opportunity to do both these things the first shot because I said I wanted to suggest a new name for the Department of Transportation and Communications but I will leave that

MR. LUSH: until I get to it.

I was referring to the minister's remarks about Statistics Canada yesterday when the minister in a state of fury, here, sometime ago, called the statistics by all sorts of names and indicated that they were not accurate.

Now, I was saying yesterday that the labour force statistics are accurate, very accurate, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

A point or order has been raised by the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to quote another hon. member, has an obligation to quote the hon. member accurately. Now, I did not make all kinds of remarks about Statistics Canada, I explained very clearly that in a review of Statistics Canada across the Island, in one population, we had statistics that indicated that 6,000 jobs were created. When they were broken down into different areas it

MR. J. DINN: indicated that 8,000 jobs were created and, therefore, there were anomalies. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should quote me correctly.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order. I really do not think there is a point of order but the minister has taken the opportunity to clarify or explain his position.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is only wasting my time because he will get the opportunity to come back and debate the same as I am doing. But the minister did indicate that Statistics Canada were - that the statistics issued by Statistics Canada were inaccurate and, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that these statistics are not inaccurate. They are very accurate according to the criteria used.

Now, they are inaccurate. They are inaccurate and the minister ought to be very proud that they inaccurate. He ought to be on his knees praying and thanking God that they are inaccurate because they are inaccurate on the side of not predicting the full numbers of unemployed and that is where they are inaccurate. But they are not inaccurate in the true sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, because what happens, as all hon. members will know, is that the -

MR. J. DINN: (Inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: We will get that cleared up. We will get that cleared up.

MR. F. B. ROWE: He cannot understand.

MR. T. LUSH: What happens, Mr. Speaker, is that they are totally accurate in the number of employed. They are totally accurate in the number of employed people but where they are inaccurate is with the numbers unemployed because in order to be reported as an unemployed person, the person that is called, that person that is contacted by

MR. T. LUSH: Statistics Canada must have sought work in that period, in that measurement period, if you will. And if a person has not reported to Canada Manpower to get a job well, then, he is not counted.

So the minister ought to be very thankful for the fact that Statistics Canada does not give the accurate number of unemployed, that, indeed, we have more unemployed. But that is something that the minister should be very proud about. That is something he should not go around the Province condemning Statistics Canada for, because they are inaccurate in not reporting the true numbers of people unemployed. And the minister ought not to be talking about that - ought not to be talking about it. He ought to be very proud about it and just keep silent, just keep silent that Statistics Canada does not give the accurate number of unemployed people but employed people, very accurate, very accurate and, of course, it does give us a yardstick.

It is not the gospel. It is not the gospel. We know that it gives us a yardstick but for the criteria used, that Statistics Canada are very accurate. Now, I hope I am making myself clear.

MR. NEARY: Yes perfectly.

MR. T. LUSH: So the minister ought to be very thankful, as I said, that the Statistics when they do err is that they err on the side of the numbers of people unemployed but they are not counted because they do not register at Canada Manpower centres.

So what I am saying is that even though the unemployment rate for Newfoundland at this particular point in time is somewhere close to sixteen per cent as measured by Statistics Canada, we know that that is not the true measurement because there are indeed more people unemployed than that - more people. So the minister should be very proud about that and never again, never again allude to the fact

MR. T. LUSH: that Statistics Canada are inaccurate. He should never again allude to it. He ought to be very proud that they do not tell the truth in this respect. Very proud, very proud indeed.

But with respect to the numbers employed, as I said, they are deadly accurate - deadly accurate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to get on to the job creation program announced by the Premier almost a year ago of 40,500 jobs for the people of this Province and point out what a hoax that was. What a hoax it was. Because it is only now that I am beginning to figure out what the Premier meant when he said he was creating 40,500 jobs and I want all hon. members to listen, because it is only in the last day or so that I figured out what it was that the Premier meant by creating 40,500 jobs. It was very smart. Very smart! And of course, the event that led me to understanding what it was that the Premier meant was a statement by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J. Dinn) and a statement by the Premier himself to the effect that they are right on course with creating these 40,500 new jobs - right on course.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just takes a little bit of simple mathematics. If you are going to create 40,500 jobs over a five year period, which is what the Premier said, 40,500 jobs over a five year period, that means a little more than 8,000 jobs a year - 8,000 jobs a year because five times eight, of course, make forty. Right? So 8,000 jobs a year is what the government had themselves committed to, right.

MR. LUSH:

exactly, 8100 jobs exactly, that is what the government had submitted themselves to if at the end of five years they were going to have indeed 40,500 jobs. So they are right on course the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) says, right on course. So if they are on course they should have created this year 8100 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts because, as I said, this was a little bit of smart thinking. We know that each year, just by the natural growth of the economy, that we get about 6000 jobs. If we had the PC government, if we had an NDP government, if we had a Liberal government, if we had no government at all we would get 6000 jobs. Just by the natural growth in the economy we would get 6000 jobs. Now, if the Premier were really serious then about this commitment of creating 40,500 jobs, that we would reasonably expect is 8100 jobs on top of that 6000 which would be 14,000 jobs a year.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Right.

MR. LUSH:

But what he did, as I said, was very smart. We know that there are 6000 jobs created a year so over a five year period that is going to be 30,000 new jobs. So how many jobs did the government say they were going to create in reality? 10,500 because with the natural growth in the economy, if we had no government at all or if we had the most inefficient government, we would get 6000 jobs.

MR. R. MOORES:

That is right.

MR. LUSH:

So this is what the Premier did, this is what the people who helped him design this plan did, they said, "Well we will get 6000 jobs a year anyway, certainly goodness you know that we can create another 10,000 over five years and make that to be 2000 jobs a year and we will do it". Then the minister said that this year, even though Statistics Canada report that we have 6000 new jobs, which is the normal growth, the minister says that is wrong we have 8000. So they are 100 short now of meeting their commitment if that is so, they have 8000.

MR. LUSH:

But, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE:

When did he say that by the way?

MR. LUSH:

Oh, he said that a couple of days ago, that we have 8000 jobs. So that is the formula, Mr. Speaker. The Premier really did not mean, he was not serious about creating 40,500 new jobs, he was not serious about that but that is what he tried to make the people of Newfoundland believe, that we were going to have 40,500 -

MR. NEARY:

Was he waving his arms?

MR. LUSH:

Waving his arms, abrasive and blantant, saying we are going to get 40,500 new jobs, Mr. Speaker, And what are we going to be getting, Mr. Speaker, is 10,500 new jobs over a five year period, that is what we are going to be getting. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) told us that because we have our 6000 which is created anyway by the natural growth in the economy, the natural expansion in the fisheries, the natural expansion in the forestry. So we have 2000 jobs.

MR. F. ROWE:

When did he say that?

MR. LUSH:

This was said June 7th, I believe, during the election when we got this new freshly sanitized government. On June 19th when we got this new freshly sanitized government they were going to create 40,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, now that I have exposed the insincerity of the Premier in this respect, the people of Newfoundland know what it is that the government really meant, what the Premier meant by creating 40,500. He was counting on the natural growth of 6000 jobs a year in the economy and subtracting that from our 40,000 which would have been 6000 jobs over a five year period which makes 30,000 and 30,000 from 40,500 meant that the Premier is really going to create 10,500 jobs, Mr. Speaker, which is 2100 a year and they are still short on that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will get a chance to elaborate on this a little later. I want to get back to it and have a real go at some of the questions that I have asked the minister that he has never yet answered with respect to Statistics Canada and other things.

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1949

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Labour
and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to welcome the hon. member into the debate. It is the first time he has spent any time on Labour and Manpower in the debate on the estimates. He did not attend any of the seven hours of the estimates time when we were in Committee and I welcome him to this debate here today and I would like to address all of, every one of the points made by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to employment and with respect to jobs. I do not know how the hon. member can compare 1979 to 1980 when 1980 is not finished yet. When Statistics Canada report the

MR. J. DINN:

1980 statistics, they will report statistics for the whole year and give us an average as they do every year. I think we can compare 1978 and 1979 because 1979 has concluded and we have the statistics for the whole year. Even though the hon. the Premier was not the Premier for the whole year, I do not know if we can give him all of the credit for all of 1979 because he only became the Premier on March 17th.

So, Mr. Speaker, now let us see, let us see what actually happened. First of all, I will get rid of the first myth any government could create the jobs. Well, in 1968 and 1969 the number of people employed, using Statistics Canada accurate employment figures - in 1968 we had 127,000 and in 1969 we had 129,000, that is not 10,000 a year, that is not 5,000 a year, that is not 4,000 a year, that is 2,000 a year, simple mathematics. Now, there were 2,000 in 1968 and 1969. Now that was not a Tory Government, I believe that was a former, former government, it was a Liberal administration at that time. Now, that eliminates, that destroys the myth that any government can create 6,000 or 7,000 or 8,000 or 9,000 or 10,000 jobs. We do not know that. All we know is that a P.C. Government can do it because that is the government that has created the jobs. Now, what has happened between 1978 and 1979? Well, Mr. Speaker, we can compare those two years because, as I said to the hon. member, we have a complete full year's statistics. We can compare that. We know.

Now, the hon. member pressed me and said that we should, according to the Premier who announced something in June, we should have created at least 8,100 jobs. Well, in 1979 over 1978 which is the years that we can compare we created 9,000 jobs, if you average it over the year, 9,000 jobs created in 1979!

MR. J. DINN: And the hon. the Premier was only around for six months of that year.

So, Mr. Speaker, 9,000 jobs in that year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that destroys two myths. Number one, that any government could create them. We know the Liberal Government can only create 2,000, that is what they created from 1968 to 1969. And we know that between 1978 and 1979, which are the years that we can compare, we created 9,000 jobs which was over the estimate that the hon. member gave us, which was over his target of 8,100 jobs.

MR. LUSH: Plus 6,000 which makes 14,000.

MR. J. DINN: 8,100 jobs in six months, it was 9,000. So, Mr. Speaker, those are two myths. The hon. member is not good at mathematics. The hon. member during his speech - he should be good at mathematics because he is one of the most respected people in the education field in this Province. He should - I do not think it is his mathematics I think it is the way he looks at figures. I think it may be a biased, a political biased approach that he takes to figures, Mr. Speaker. I think he knows the difference but it may be that he does not want to see. There are none as blind as those who will not see, Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that. The hon. member has all the statistics available to him, he is using Statistics Canada statistics and he has all the figures available to him that I or any hon. member of this House can have. I will give him a figure: that is a better indication, a better indication of employment in Newfoundland and that is the employment rate. And what that is, Mr. Speaker, the employment rate is the number of people employed in the adult population and that is from fifteen to ninety.

MR. J. DINN:

All the people, if you take that whole population, all the people in that population and you take the number of people employed in that total population - now we know that there are people in that population from fifteen to ninety who: are going to school, who are not working, cannot work, who are retired, cannot work, who for some reason are sick and invalided who cannot work. We know all of these things. Well, the employment rate is probably the most accurate thing with respect to employment in a population that one can look at. And the hon. member can call Statistics Canada and get that statistic if the hon. member is really interested in finding out

MR. DINN: informing the people of this Province how this Province is doing in its progress towards that day in the sun that we know we will reach.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the employment rate in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador today, the figure is 44.6 as a percentage, and that is the best, that is the best employment rate, the very best since Confederation. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the most accurate thing that one can look at. That is how many people in the population, from fifteen to ninety, how many people are there, and then take how many people of that population are employed. And I want to inform the hon. House through you, Mr. Speaker, and through you all the people of this world, of this Province, that -

AN HON. MEMBER: This world ? It is a world figure ? Oh, yes.

MR. DINN: Yes, that Newfoundland is on the march - Newfoundland has reached -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - the highest employment rate, the highest employment rate in all of that population, the highest employment rate since Confederation.

MR. NEARY: How bad must it -

MR. DINN: Higher than any other year. Not one year - even though we had some boom and bust years, we had the great boom years of the Upper Churchill construction, we had the great boom years of linerboard mills and third mills and we had the great boom years of refineries, Mr. Speaker, 1979, and it will not go down in history because 1980 will be better, but in 1979 we had the best employment rate, we had the best employment rate since Confederation. There was not one year -

MR. WARREN: It is worse in Labrador.

MR. DINN: - since Confederation.

MR. WARREN: It is worse in Labrador

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1951

NM - 2

MR. DINN: There was not one year since Confederation
that in that total population - there was not one year -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: The true figures, Mr. Speaker, I will give
the hon. member all the figures, Mr. Speaker, if he wants them.

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

A point of order has been raised by

the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon.

MR. MOORES: Could we have a quorum call, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the Clerk to count the House. There is a quorum present.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to spend a lot of time again on the statistics, I just want to reiterate again that the minister ought to be very thankful that in so much as Statistics Canada do err that they are on the side of right for the minister because they do not measure the numbers of unemployed totally accurate. So the minister ought to be very thankful about that. And again the minister certainly did not allude to the formula behind the 400,500 jobs which, as I say again, got to be 8,100 jobs a year plus 6,000 taking the natural growth in the economy which means that this government should be creating 14,000 jobs a year - there should be 14,000 new jobs a year to meet the Premier's commitment if, indeed, it was a serious and a genuine commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to get on to mention a few things about the Department of Transportation and Communications. I put a series of questions to the minister yesterday and the minister did not answer these questions in a very satisfactory manner. The question that I directed to the minister yesterday was, in view of the representation on that side of the House and in consideration of the percentage of the total popular vote that his government got in the last general election, did that warrant the distribution of monies the way that they were distributed this year and, indeed, last year? And I mentioned that 84 per cent of the total monies allocated were going to members on that side of the House, were going to government members. That means, 16 per cent went to members on this side of the House. Now, the minister said that was sort of distorting the fact, the figures. Well, I did not put the figures in, I just added them according to the districts in which they were allocated. And I am sure the minister is cringing now because of the way that he did it, because the minister knows that he should not have included Trans-Canada Highway expenditures in the districts. Now, if you want to subtract them from the districts in the West, well, by the same token you subtract them from other districts,

MR. T. LUSH: for example, if he is going to subtract -

MR. BRETT: What about Glovertown?

MR. T. LUSH: - that is exact, if he is going to subtract \$18 million from the Minister of Tourism's district (Mr. R. Dawe) then he is going to subtract \$2,700,000 from the Terra Nova district which is all Trans Canada money. And the figures will come out basically the same way if you extract the Trans-Canada Highway figures, the figures will work out just about the same way in terms of the provincial money.

MR. HOLLETT: That is better than (inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: So I did not do the figures, I am calculating the figures according to the way the minister put them in his programme. That is the way I interpreted them and the interpretation is very simple, very straightforward. There were \$58 million allocated for the capital works programme this year, for the roads programme in this Province and out of that approximately \$8 million came to members on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, eight out of fifty eight, - what is that? You can twist these figures, you can work them, you can distort them, you can do what you like, eight out of fifty-eight is 16 per cent -

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. T. LUSH: -for members on this side and fifty out of fifty-eight is 84 per cent. So 84 per cent on that side of the House, 16 per cent for members on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, and the minister says, yes he can justify that on the total vote that they got and on the representation they have got, he can justify that kind of a figure, 84 per cent for members on that side of the House, 16 per cent for people on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HOLLETT: You did not what? I did not say you did boy.

MR. T. LUSH: That still does not change the figures -

MR. R. MOORES: Nothing for Carbonear (inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: . . . and it is too bad and I would hate
to think what would happen if the member did get it. If the member -

MR. MOORES: . . . None for Carbonear 'Charlie' (inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: . . . - got any then we on this side of the
House would have gotten nothing, absolutely nothing. These are the
facts, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts of these figures.

MR. T. LUSH: \$50 millions out of \$58 millions went to members on that side of the House, and Mr. Speaker, I do not know the percentage that was federal government monies. I do not know. It is very easy to pull out Trans-Canada figures.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what the minister did last year. See if the minister can explain this. Last year in the Terra Nova district, working it the same way, of course, by including Trans-Canada monies - last year - I am just wondering whether I have a copy of last years, but I remember the figures pretty well anyway. Last year there was something like \$7 million allocated for the Terra Nova district. All of the Trans-Canada Highway -

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman on the other side is trying to leave the impression that we got all kinds of paving money on this side. Now there are three members here sitting close, the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins), the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) and myself, who did not receive one cent for road work.

MR. T. LUSH: You do not need any.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I just simply want to say that of all the specious points of order that have ever been brought up here in the last several months, that surely has got to be the worst.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule there is no point of order in this particular instance.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not care who got anything over there or who got nothing, Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves, 84 per cent of the total expenditures over there, 16 per cent on this side.

Well, let me tell you what the minister did last year. Listing the monies -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence, and has requested it.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in the Terra Nova district last year, to give the false impression to the people of this Province and to the people of the Terra Nova district, this is what happened. We had the Trans-Canada Highway being upgraded, reconstructed from the Terra Nova National Park to the Gambo access road - Gambo, to my knowledge, clearly falls under Bonavista North - to the Gambo access road, and all of that paving was included in the Terra Nova district. Now, Mr. Speaker, to make it worse, imagine the minister putting something out under his name, under his department, in which it said, 'The Gambo bridge coming under Terra Nova' - the Gambo bridge coming under the Terra Nova district, \$544,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Gambo bridge is about ten miles West of Glovertown, the furthest point West in my district. It is about two miles from Gambo and it empties right out into Bonavista Bay, Gambo, Fresh Water Bay, and that was included in my district. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is great! The people of my district really appreciated that! Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened. All of the Trans-Canada Highway from the Terra Nova National Park to the Gambo access road was in the Terra Nova district. Why?

MR. MOORES: They did not know the difference.

MR. T. LUSH: Well, I could tell you what was in

MR. LUSH: Bonavista North, you know the road down to Pool's Island, the road in Newtown, the road in Wesleyville. And that is what we were looking for. That is what we were looking for in Terra Nova, a road down on the Eastport Peninsula, not the Trans-Canada because Trans-Canada happened to pass by my district, that the minister was going to say there was \$7 million spent in my district. What a lot of malarkey, Mr. Speaker. What an attempt to try and deceive the people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Any in your district ?

MR. HOLLETT: The road in Port au Port was done last year.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help it if that is the way the minister wanted to put the figures.

MR. MOORES: What about the \$55 million for the arterial road?

MR. LUSH: If a district happened to be adjacent to the Trans-Canada and he wants to include that, that is his problem. But working it on the basis of these figures 84 per cent went over there, 16 per cent over here and how can the minister justify that kind of expenditure.

MR. MOORES: Over \$250,000 for one intersection.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is clearly, it is clearly a pork barrelling department. It is clearly a pork barrelling department. And this is what it should be called. The Department of Pork barrelling.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. LUSH: The Department of Pork barrelling, this is what this department should be called. And Mr. Speaker, I make a further recommendation, that in view of the fact, in view of the fact that a large percentage of these expenditures came from the federal government, a large percentage, I do not know what it was - I do not know what it was - but I make this suggestion, that if this government cannot spend the public dollars of Canada in a more equitable fashion than that, it is my recommendation that the federal government never give them another cent for roads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Never give them another cent to spend at their whim and their fancy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can we prove that?

MR. LUSH: But that the federal government will earmark where the money goes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Give it to us but earmark where it goes. They did not do that. They did not do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOLLETT: They cannot.

MR. LUSH: And if that is the way this government is going to waste the public dollars and abuse their power and misuse the public dollars of Canada, then the federal government should change the system. They should change the system and I am going to recommend it, that they change it. Not give this crowd any more money to spend because all they are doing is pork barrelling, putting it in their own districts.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: (inaudible) and arterial roads.

MR. LUSH: And I am going to recommend strongly that they never do it again, that the federal government will earmark where the monies are to be spent, but earmark where they are going to be spent. Because we cannot trust these hon. members with the public dollars. We cannot trust them with the dollars of the people of Canada. We cannot do it. We cannot do it. And, Mr. Speaker, we will get back to it again. But the point that has got to be made, 84 per cent of the monies allocated for road construction in this Province, the Trans-Canada Highway and secondary roads, 84 per cent of it is on that side of the House, 84 per cent of it leaving 16 per cent, a measley 16 per cent to 40 per cent of the voters of this Province. Is that not ridiculous, Mr. Speaker? Ridiculous! Ridiculous! Scandalous! A complete abuse of power and a complete misuse of the public

MR. LUSH: dollars of Newfoundland and of Canada.

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I took the advice, the sound advice of the Minister of Labour last night. He said go home and do my homework, I did. I not only went home and did it by myself, I asked our Whip, the distinguished friend of mine from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) to have dinner with me and we spent the entire evening doing our homework. And I want, before I get into - the only thing that we want to talk about, that I want to talk about at least, having to do with roads in the Province, and roads programmes in the Province, I want to take just one minute to give, perhaps, the best response possible to the glowing words of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn). The truth of the matter is, the truth of the matter when he talked about Newfoundland being on the march and so on is that while the Newfoundland economy grew at a very satisfying rate in 1979, as he mentioned, and while the general outlook for the 1980s is undoubtedly quite promising, the forecast for 1980 itself is for very slow growth once again, largely because of the anticipated major recession in industrialized countries, particularly the United States. Overall it is going to be a about a one per cent growth rate in the Province this year. And if it is only one per cent then 6,000 or 7,000 or 8,000 jobs, I suspect, is not going to be very easy to produce.

Now, the reason I say that is that I have quoted that from the Premier's document which he put on the table this morning. So it is obvious enough to anything with which the other side can argue. But I just want to -

AN HON. MEMBER: The war with (inaudible).

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1954

NM - 4

MR. JAMIESON:

- in terms of what we were discussing,

in terms of our opener -I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
is not here, but the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett),

MR. JAMIESON: I checked last night and it was a number of years ago, but about seven, or eight, or nine years ago, when the whole concept or the whole idea of DREE participation in road construction originally emerged. And at that time, the Newfoundland Government, probably about eight years ago because it was this government, whether you want to call it this administration or whatever, produced a document, and it is an extremely interesting document, produced it at my request, by the way, and the weight and the burden of the argument was, in a sense, if not - I think, maybe, even the phrase was used that Newfoundland can no longer afford gravel roads.

Now, what I am getting at here is that the document in question pointed out that while we have not seen what the maintenance bill is going to be in 1980, I imagine it is several millions and perhaps the minister at some point can give it to us, the point was made by the Government of Newfoundland in argumentation in favour of DREE highways and the like, that in fact, virtually all of the maintenance money was being wasted, that by the end of a year - the statistics were all spelled out there which showed that by the end of the year most of what had been done by way of grading, by way of gravelling and by way of this and that, and ditching, all of it was, again, lost particularly, by the way, when the figure for daily usage passed, whatever it was in those days, I presume it is even worse today, but let us say it was 200 or 300 cars a day, if the traffic level was so and so. The document must be in the hands of hon. members somewhere. But the point was that, really, it was a rather senseless policy

MR. JAMIESON: to continue with the maintenance of gravel highways, that is was pointless to do that.

And by the way, there was also a section in there pointing out that some of the old pavement was even more expensive to maintain, I am thinking about the Conception Bay way and over in that region, and that it was deteriorating extremely rapidly and that patching and this sort of thing was costing an enormous amount of money which quite literally, one can say, went down the drain, in other words, that everytime there was a rainstorm or whatever the case might be.

Now, I am sure the hon. the minister is well aware of what I am saying, and I do not think he will quarrél a shred with it. So in an effort to be constructive, in an effort to make a suggestion here, I should put in, by the way, on the record, as well, the fact that when DREE and the federal government undertook to look after what were called the trunk highways in Newfoundland, and they were identified; there was the Bonavista Loop Road etc., there was the Burin Peninsula Highway, the Great Northern Peninsula, virtually all of those have now been done, that DREE lived up to its commitment in that regard and we can see it again from the figures to day. And by the way, the most recent example of what I am speaking of came in the argumentation presented by Newfoundland with regard to paving the road to Harbour Breton from Bay d'Espoir on the grounds that the Government of Canada having financed the extension of the road, that it was wasting its money if it did not put hardtop on it.

And there is another document - obviously I did my homework, you can see

MR. JAMIESON: this, last night - there is another document which says, 'The Newfoundland Government does not believe that DREE funds should be spent unless there is sufficient money allocated to put the hardtop on before the first contract for the building of the road is let because, in fact, when that happens', as I have outlined it, 'all the money just is wasted, or a large part of it is wasted in deterioration as soon as the bad weather arises, or as soon as the bad weather comes'.

Now, the suggestion that I have to make is this, and I think I am fiscally responsible, I think I understand that it is not possible for governments to go out and borrow interminably, but it is pennywise and pound foolish to put the kind of halter on the Minister of Transportation and Communications that he has had in this particular year. Setting aside all of the reasoned arguments that have been put forward about the distribution of the money, the truth of the matter is that it is pennywise and pound foolish.

And what I propose is, given the fact that, first of all, the construction industry is in very much of a slump this year, according to their spokesman the worse year they have had in many years. Secondly, that despite what the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has said, in fact, there is a large amount of unemployment, double the amount it says in the government's own document, of the Canadian average, in view of all of those circumstances I propose that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should bring in a supplementary budget, or that at the very least he should, while we still have the budget in front of us, alter the figures to put in the maximum amount that it is

May 30, 1980, Tape 1955, Page 4 -- apb

MR. JAMIESON: practical to spend this
year in terms of upgrading and paving roads in
Newfoundland.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Now, I believe quite sincerely and the argumentation has been made repeatedly, the present Minister of Fisheries (J.Morgan) made it, incidentally, among others, that we should do the maximum amount we can in any one year with regard to paving because to do anything less than that, and I realize that sometimes when a new road is built it has to wait for a year or so to settle, but, God knows - what is it - a couple of thousand miles, close to it of unpaved highways, one thousand plus in Newfoundland? - then a comprehensive program which would see the government deliberately borrow. Now, there must be a maximum you can do in any one year. The construction season can only go so far. But there must be a maximum.

Now, one other point I would like to make. Make then a clear distinction, a clear distinction between those highways which it is going to be the government's intention to ask DREE to deal with under the - when you have the rationale for the DREE program, specify those, work out a plan with DREE for whatever it takes, three, four, five years whatever the case might be, then say the rest of it is our responsibility and borrow whatever is required in order to do the maximum in a given year.

I suspect it would not be an enormous amount. And I suspect that if you took the cost benefit analysis of what I have been speaking of, that is the taxes from the construction companies working at a pretty high level, the employment that would be added on as a result of doing that, the fact that seventy-five per cent or sixty per cent of the money on upgrading or grading and the like is wasted - if you did a cost benefit analysis you would probably find that you would be working with fifty cent dollars at the very worst. They would be fifty cent dollars.

So there, Mr. Speaker. I was asked for a concrete proposal - some demonstration that perhaps I had done some homework on it. I believe in this principle very, very strongly. And

MR. D. JAMIESON: I think the government would be well advised and even though they make the arguments about restraint, I emphasize once again that this is one area where I think it would make an enormous amount of sense to move ahead at a maximum practical level for as many years as it takes, three, four, five to complete those roads which would unmistakably and without any question fall within Provincial jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed that. The remarks of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition are quite different from the emotional remarks of the hon. the member for Terra Nova (T. Lush). And I have to say that I do have some sympathy for the hon. member. I know what it is like to have to go back to your district on a weekend or whatever and be bugged to death and that is what is going to happen to him. I do not know if he realizes it or not, that that happens to me every single day of my life almost and weekends are no different. I happen to be in the middle of the hon. member's district - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on one side of me and the hon. the member for Terra Nova (T. Lush) on the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are in good hands.

MR. C. BRETT: So I am used to getting telephone calls, anywhere from seven o'clock in the morning until twelve - one o'clock the following morning.

MR. JAMIESON: We wait until he is comfortable.

MR. C. BRETT: No, I do not think the hon. members do that.

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1956

EL - 3

MR. JAMIESON:

(inaudible) phone the minister.

MR. C. BRETT:

I guess as long as we have party politics we will have accusations of pork barrelling and I do not know if any member who is in government and regardless of what the party is can ever stand up and say that there is absolutely no pork barrelling.

I do not know if - I doubt if any man in this Province was ever accused of pork barrelling any more than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

It was not true.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Oh, oh !

MR. MORGAN:

He did a fair job though.

MR. C. BRETT:

And it is quite possible that I might have even - it is quite possible that I might have even made that accusation at times when we were out trying to win districts for our party. So that is not uncommon and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just said - that is not true - so I suppose I could go back and say that it is not true what the hon. the member for Terra Nova said. The program that was tabled in the House here a few days ago,

MR. BRETT: particularly the DREE programme and the Trans Canada Highway programme, that was agreed upon by the federal government in Ottawa when the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) was a very strong Cabinet Minister in Ottawa at the time. So I indicated, when the hon. member was speaking, that obviously he did not know very much about the way the federal government works, or the way that these programmes work, because we send our list, our shopping list or whatever to Ottawa and it has to be approved by both the federal government and the provincial government. So the hon. member's colleagues in Ottawa were a party to what is happening this year, the overpass to Glovertown, the paving that is going on between Glovertown and Gambo and so on. So the hon. member should not get up and advocate that the federal government should take over all and every bit of authority we have because we do not have to spend our money. In actual fact, the money that we are spending was agreed upon - where it was spent was agreed upon by both the federal government of the day, and the provincial government of the day.

MR. LUSH: Well, let me get my (inaudible).

MR. BRETT: The question of boundaries; my staff sit down and they look at a map and the boundaries, the geographic boundaries, whatever money is spent within the geographic boundary then they put it under - or the political boundary, that is how it is written on the paper. I am not sure but I would assume that if the Gambo Bridge was included in the district of Terra Nova then it is quite possible that the bridge is within the geographic boundaries of the electoral district of Terra Nova.

But anyway I do not think that we should get up and waste the time of the House arguing over whether or not the Gambo Bridge is in the hon. member's district or whether it is not, because it is on the Trans-Canada Highway and we all use it. It is a nice bridge. It is a good bridge. It is now safe. We did an excellent job on that section of the road and I think we should all be proud of it.

MR. LUSH: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. BRETT: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Never had anything

as a question from the Opposition, never.

MR. LUSH: Although the federal government arrangement with the Province, and I certainly was aware that once the government made its request that the monies were earmarked for certain areas naturally, my question to the minister is though, it is the provincial government that determines the priorities is it not in requesting a road? For example, last year the minister sent along a certain shopping list and he obviously, he and his government together, decided which list they would be sending. Is that not right? So in that sense the provincial government determines the priority.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, how many Trans-Canada Highways do we have? I mean what priorities can you have with respect to - we only have one Trans-Canada Highway and obviously we made a request to do the sections of the road which needed to be upgraded the most. So -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: What are you talking about? Are you talking about DREE or the Trans-Canada Highway? I do not know what you are talking about.

MR. LUSH: I am talking about the federal government. Tell us (inaudible) on both.

MR. BRETT: The hon. member is still talking about pork-barrelling. I do not really know if I should be answering this or not.

MR. LUSH: Oh sure you should.

MR. BRETT: No, I think it is really wasting the time of the House actually.

MR. LUSH: 84 per cent.

MR. BRETT: You can do a lot with figures, with percentages. You can make it look really bad. But in actual fact, there were nine Progressive Conservative members, or nine people on this side of the House who did not receive any money and there were -

MR. LUSH: Ten on the other side.

MR. BRETT: - ten on the other side.

MR. LUSH: Ten on this side.

MR. BRETT:

Like I say you can -

MR. LUSH:

Do it the other way. Work it the other way.

MR. BRETT:

You can do what you like with figures but in actual fact, I feel there was a fairly even distribution. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through you. The hon. member has the figures there and if he wants to go out in the next two or three days and get on the radio and play politics and make some mileage then I say to the hon. member, go right to it. Because I have a feeling that he is going to be elected in that district for a long, long time and I am reasonably certain that I am going to be elected in Trinity North. I think probably we would be wasting the time of the House.

As the hon. Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Jamieson) indicated, we do have over 1,000 miles of road that are unpaved in this Province and it is not easy to sit in the office day after day and have to keep telling people that there is no money. But I think most people, on both sides of the House, recognize that we can only do so much each year. But my main concern, actually, is not the 1,000 plus miles of road that are not done, one of my main concerns right now is that some of

MR. C. BRETT:

the main trunk roads in the Province are breaking up and there are several hundred miles of road that are practically gone. The main road down through Carbonear, Harbour Grace, Bay Roberts is gone. The old Conception Bay South highway is gone. Some of the major trunk roads around St. John's here, for which we are responsible are gone, and it is going to take millions of dollars to recap these roads. Honestly, I do not know how the Province is ever going to stand it if we do not get some funds, some revenue, whether they come from the federal government or whether we can generate our own revenue I do not know. But I would have to say to be very honest that it is going to be a long, long time before all this is finished.

Our programme this year is not all that bad. Some hon. members were wondering how much the provincial government is actually putting into the \$58 million that we are spending. Well, the provincial programme was \$15 million and I think we can take some credit for the \$18 million that is being spent on the Trans-Canada Highway because the Province has to find \$13.5 million of that, so altogether that is around \$28 million that the Province is spending this year on roads. So it is not all that bad.

I would like to get into some of the points made by the Leader of the Opposition. There is some meat on it, it made a lot of sense and probably I will get an opportunity. I only have two minutes left or maybe down to one now, so I will not get into -

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (D. Hollett):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Incidentally, I am not sure we should not do this more often. I have not seen the House so quiet in weeks since the distinguished member for Burin - Placentia West is in the Chair. He is an extremely good Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON:

His mere presence has an awesome effect, clearly.

MR. D. JAMIESON: In order that the hon. the minister can continue, let me ask a question of fact for which I would presume there must be a ballpark figure. He talks about the breaking up of highways or the need to pave highways. What is the rule of thumb now with regard to upgrading and paving or repaving a mile - or since we are into kilometers, a kilometer of highway?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the figure for recapping because we have not done that much of it, but to reconstruct and pave, not Trans-Canada standard but the ordinary trunk road, we are talking roughly \$100,000 a mile today. To recap would not be that expensive, but just to illustrate, eight years ago when I came into politics, the cost of a ton of asphalt was somewhere around \$14 - anyway, less than \$20, and this year it is \$48 a ton. Now, that is just the black tar before there is any stone or anything added to it. So hon. members can appreciate that eight or ten years ago, if you had a million dollars, you could do an awful lot of work. If you have a million dollars today you cannot do very much.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the maintenance bill. The maintenance bill for this year will be in excess of \$50 million. Now, I do not think it makes sense to say that we will take that \$50 million and go and spend it in pavement. I do not think that can be done.

MR. D. JAMIESON: No, we are not arguing that.

MR. C. BRETT: No. First of all, you are talking probably \$200 million or \$300 million to finish the road system in the Province, so \$50 million would not go very far towards doing that amount of work. And even if we had all the road system in the Province paved there would still be a certain amount of maintenance. Now, obviously, there would not be \$50 million but there would still be a big bill.

To say that the Province cannot afford gravel roads or to say that that was an argument that was put forward

May 30, 1980

Tape 1958

EC - 3

MR. C. BRETT: seven or eight or ten years ago,
that argument still holds true, and very, very true. When the hon.
the Leader of the Opposition was talking and made that statement,
I immediately thought of the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. R. Tulk)
and the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) in that Fogo
Island and Change Islands are two of the most difficult places in
this Province to maintain roads, and there is no question at all
in the world

MR. C. BRETT:

that it would be to our advantage from a monetary point of view to pave these roads as quickly as possible. There is nothing on Fogo Island with which to maintain a road, absolutely nothing. The only way you are going to get anything to put on a road is to bring in a crusher and crush it. There is no aggregate, no sand and no whatever, there is just nothing there and Change Islands is probably worse. So that still holds true, that the Province can not afford gravel roads.

I also agree with the statement by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) that we would prefer that DREE did not build roads unless they pave them. And, of course, the prime example is the road to Burgeo. Now, if that is not paved then my staff are going to go right completely out of their heads -

MR. ANDREWS:

Your staff?

MR. C. BRETT:

- and the hon. member for the area.

That road is going to cost a mint to maintain and it just has to be paved, otherwise the Province will never be able to stand up to it. We will have to have a large percentage of our equipment down on that road just to keep it passable.

I wanted to make some comment with respect to DREE and DREE programmes. Now, short sections of road do not give us the same kind of problem. If the government has a mile or two miles of road, then we can do it this year or we can see if we can do it down the road next year or the next year, but the problem that the Province runs into is with roads like Southern Labrador. Now, I do not know what the cost is but way in excess of \$20 million. Now, at the best of times, which probably would be an election year regardless of what party was in power, your total provincial programme is going to be up around \$20-million, \$25 million. So if you took the whole provincial capital programme and put it into Southern Labrador you would finish the road but then you have fifty-one other districts that would be down your throat and you just would not be able to live with it. So the best that we could do in Southern Labrador or any area like that, would be to give them a portion of the money. Let us say that we gave them

MR. C. BRETT: \$2 million a year and very seldom does any district get \$2 million from provincial funds, then we are looking at ten or fifteen years before we could finish the road in Southern Labrador. So with roads like that we have to get help from DREE otherwise they will never ever be done. And it is useless for the government to go - just using Southern Labrador as an example - up there this year and piddle away \$500,000. What are you going to do if you do spend \$500,000 on the Southern Labrador road? It is not going to make any difference. So unless we do get a DREE agreement or something of that nature, then, you know, we are looking down the road twenty or twenty-five years before that road can be completed.

MR. R. MOORES: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) mentioned or spoke about the possibility of - at least this is the way I understood it and we did discuss this behind the curtain one day - the possibility of government borrowing - let us say that it would cost \$200 million, it is a hypothetical figure - \$200 million to finish all of the roads in the Province, should the government go out this year and borrow the \$200 million -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Borrow the amount you need for maximum use this year.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. D. JAMIESON: And in each other year.

MR. C. BRETT: But in actual fact that is happening now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. C. BRETT: You know, because the only capital money we have is what we can borrow and you can not take your total capital borrowings and spend it all on roads, you still have to build schools you have to build hospitals and what have you. You could not take your total -

MR. JAMIESON: You could borrow more than you are borrowing.

MR. C. BRETT: But that has already been done because every year the Province is spending \$15 million or \$20 million plus Ottawa is spending, you know, up to now, two or three times that much so, you know, I do not think it would be possible, as much as I would like to

MR. C. BRETT: see it, but I do not think it could be done from an economic point of view, if the Province were to go out -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Could I ask a question just to be helpful, I hope?

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, go ahead.

MR. D. JAMIESON: There is obviously a construction season, there is a certain point before which you can not start and there is a certain point beyond which you can not go. There is obviously, also, an optimum amount of construction capability within the Province. In other words, there is only so much, presumably, unless you brought in companies from the mainland. Now, the question I would like to ask the minister, let us have the best of all possible worlds, how much could he actually spend in a particular year? Now, I am setting aside the DREE roads, I am setting aside the big projects, I am talking about the 100 miles or so in my constituency, the number in various other constituencies on both sides, what is a practical budget if you could get what was actually needed in a given construction season?

MR. C. BRETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is kind of difficult for me to answer that. It is a rather technical problem and probably an engineer could answer it better than I could. I have some idea. Last year our total programme, that is DREE and T.C.H. and everything, was approximately \$90 million. I was told by the engineering staff that it would be difficult to spend much more than that in a given year. Now, bearing in mind that last year was one of the best construction years we have had in this Province almost ever in our history, because the construction companies started work in March and they went through until December. Now I think that was unheard of, Usually for two reasons, one, it is usually late when government gets out their programme and two, because of the weather, you know, for these reasons very seldom do they start until May or June. So taking everything into consideration I would say that we would have some difficulty in spending anymore than \$100 million -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Including DREE and the Trans-Canada?

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, that would be the total programme. Just one other thing and again I only have two minutes. The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned a realistic plan to DREE, you know, in conjunction with us borrowing the money and so on, and I would like to think that that is being done. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in Ottawa, the hon. member was responsible for signing up a five year agreement and then that was added on to year after year after year and, you know, it was a fairly good plan. And the present shopping list, that is the terminology we have been using, that has gone to Ottawa now, and I think it is, and that, again, is a fairly realistic plan. I would love to see the Federal Government do all the roads in the Province but I do not think that is

MR. C. BRETT: sensible. I do not think they will ever get down to doing roads in the hon. member's district or my district. So the hon. Leader of the Opposition can recall when there was a list that long went up and I would suggest that it was very difficult for anybody in Ottawa to know what to do with it. The list that has gone up this year is very realistic, we have just listed the roads that we feel the Federal Government should be responsible for and I hope we get some positive response from that request in the not too distant future.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hollett): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should congratulate you on occupying that seat. However, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak about roads because, I believe - I will not have too many arguments with the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) pertaining to roads because number one I do not have any roads in my district, I guess it will be a long, long time before there will be any roads in my district.

However, I do have reservations with the comments made by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). You know, the minister got up and he started going with his hands and acting like a mathematician.

MR. THOMS: Follow the leader! Follow the leader!

MR. G. WARREN: Follow the leader! It is almost like a game I used to play when I was a kid in school, you know, follow the leader. This is exactly what the Minister of Labour and Manpower was doing. Now, I want to bring some figures out to the Minister of Labour and Manpower that are not only going to shock

MR. G. WARREN: him but probably they will shock the news media of this Province. The minister started by talking about how many jobs this administration has created in the past year. Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back further than the past year, I am going to go back to the year that the P.C. administration took over governing this Province and show their absolute neglect of the largest land mass of this Province and that is Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in 1972, when the P.C. administration came to power, there were 13,500 jobs in Happy Valley/Goose Bay; in 1974, that is two years later, there were 12,000, in 1976 it was reduced to 8,000, in 1979 - and now we are coming to it, when our good Premier, as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) called him, a good Premier - he may be a good Premier, in creating jobs for St. John's from the overpass in -

MR. THOMS: He cannot even do that.

MR. G. WARREN: But I will tell you one thing, the Minister of Labour and Manpower or the Premier or anyone else in this government is not anticipating or creating any jobs in Labrador. For example, since June 18th. when this government came to power, up to the present day, we have lost approximately 1,000 people. We have lost approximately 1,000 people in Happy Valley/Goose Bay. I think the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) can verify this.

The population in Happy Valley/Goose Bay today is roughly around

MR. WARREN: 6000 people compared to over 13,000 eight years ago. Now this is what the PC administration has done to Labrador. I will also venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at the population in Wabush and Labrador City, within the past twelve months, we will also see a decrease. If we look at the population in any of the larger centers in Labrador we will see a decrease because this government has not addressed the labour problem in Labrador, they have just totally neglected it. Mr. Speaker, to illustrate more carefully - in fact, probably the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) may be giving the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) some facts to find but to illustrate more clearly, Mr. Speaker, not only have people moved out of Labrador but, also - I will not say exactly what the figure is, but there are six or seven businesses gone into receivership, six or seven average businesses have closed their doors because of the economically depressed area. Now, is this government going to continue to let Happy Valley - Goose Bay become a ghost town? It is happening. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) gets up and starts shouting and going with his arms, following his leader, and talking about the number of jobs that this government is creating let us look at all the parts of this Province, not just St. John's and the overpass. Mr. Speaker, this is what is happening. I venture to say if the minister will go down, we will say, on the Southwest coast - How many jobs has this government created on the Southwest coast?

AN HON. MEMBER: St. Mary's - The Capes is coming up.

MR. WARREN: In St. Mary's - The Capes again, Mr. Speaker, the district where we have the most unpaved roads, the worst roads in this Province, how many jobs are created there? How many jobs are created between Cartwright and L'Anse-au-Clair where there are 7000 people? I would say not one. Mr. Speaker, this government is playing politics with all of the Province because of the offshore oil and everything.

MR. WARREN: else that is proposed. The jobs are created in the St. John's area and not around the rest of this Province. And when this government can come out district by district and show, lay on the table and show how many jobs this government has created in this Province, right through the Province, using the overall figure for the Province, using the figures district by district, then the people of this Province will know exactly where the priorities of this government lie. The priorities of this government lie in St. John's and with the big businesses in St. John's.

MR. L. THOMS: That is because you are a Tory government and dance to the tunes of the true blues in St. John's.

MR. WARREN: It is so disgusting when the minister could use Statistics Canada, use their statistics to say how many jobs are being created. Mr. Speaker, I would say if the minister would really do his homework and other ministers also would do their homework they would really - and lay on the table, as I said earlier, the number of jobs that this government has created - not in the past year, no, but since 1972. Mr. Speaker, if this government was creating all the jobs that the minister was saying, we would not have 20,000 people in Alberta. How many Newfoundlanders are in Ontario? How many Newfoundlanders are in Manitoba because this government has no jobs for them? That is why. That is why they are there, because this government has created no jobs. The Come By Chance Refinery has closed down, the Labrador Linerboard has closed down so all the jobs from these two companies have gone West, young man.

MR. G. WARREN: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes it would be good for the Minister of Manpower and Labour (J. Dinn) to go West because I am sure that his statistics do not coincide with

MR. D. HANCOCK: Make the hon. member get a one-way ticket.

MR. WARREN: - with the overall problem. Probably it is

MR. L. THOMS: But you know you would not (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: - but like I said it is for the St. John's metropolitan area not for the whole Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Before I recognize the hon. the Minister, I would like to welcome to the Galleries, on behalf of all hon. members, a group of 100 students from the Donald C. Jamieson Academy in Burin - in the gallery - from the district of Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: They are accompanied by their teachers, Gary Driscoll, Robert Wells and Bertram Cluett. We hope that they enjoy their visit.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, after that vicious personal attack on my person by the hon. member from Labrador -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: I would like to just talk about a few of the things that he mentioned in his few remarks plus I would like to get back also to what the hon. member for Terra Nova said and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I listened very intently and obviously the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did do his homework last night and came in this morning with very accurate information and some of the

MR. J. DINN: concerns that we have in government about the downturn in the United States and I have been accumulating, ever since the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me some questions in the House with respect to the iron ore industry in Western Labrador, I have been accumulating information on that and hope to have it ready by Monday or Tuesday so that I can report to the House. I just received some more information on the Western Labrador situation this morning.

But with respect to Labrador, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (G. Warren), I believe, in his questions in the House of Assembly has talked about offshore oil and gas jobs and I gave him some of the registration forms. Now, with respect to employment for this year there are going to be three rigs off Western Labrador, on off the Labrador Coast, and in talking to some of the companies, because the hon. member expressed concern, and because the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (J. Goudie) mentioned his concerns about employment down in Labrador - I talked to the companies and indeed went through the registration list that I have and the companies in attempting to hire for the rigs that will be off the Labrador Coast this year, as I understand it, they informed me that they contacted every person that was registered on the list - every person individually, to see if they were interested in working off the Labrador Coast, either by letter or by telephone or in some way, they informed me that they did indeed - anyone who was registered, on the list, anyone who had contacted the government, had registered, they had contacted individually in one form or another to make sure that they had an opportunity for the jobs up there.

Now, for two reasons, not only because we believe that, you know, everybody should have an opportunity for those jobs but because it is better for the companies - if a company has twenty-

MR. J. DINN: eight people, people working on three rigs in the offshore off the Labrador Coast, it costs them a lot more to transport them ashore to Goose Bay after twenty-eight days and then distribute them throughout the Province. So it is more advantageous to them and, of course, they pay the two-way trip back and forth on a twenty-eight day basis. So they informed me of, you know, what they had done up to that point in time and that all those who were registered - so it outlines the importance of registering with the department because the companies then know who is interested in working in the offshore and can communicate with them and get in touch with them.

So I would just like to point out to the hon. member the importance of making sure that people on the Coast, in his district, get the registration forms that I provided to the hon. member.

MR. G. WARREN: They are all gone.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Terra Nova (T. Lush), in his opening remarks the last time he spoke, talked about these statistics again. Now we cannot fool with statistics, I mean not these statistics. The hon. member says the employment statistics are accurate. You can count the number of people that are employed. I wish they were doing that. I wish they were counting them individually because then they would be 100 per cent accurate. They are not totally accurate but they are fairly accurate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the best, as I said to the hon. member, the best statistic on employment in this Province is the

MR. DINN: employment rate, how many people can work, how many people are in the population, whether they are invalided or whether they are of age to work, from fifteen and over. If you take that and then find out how many people are actually working in that population, from fifteen and over, then you have an employment rate. And, Mr. Speaker, we have had times in this province, and I have statistics around here and they are - we have had times in this Province, I will just give the hon. member an example. Our unemployment rate at one point in time was 5.8 in this Province, which is fairly low. And the employment rate was 42.2 -

MR. R. MOORES: What year was the highest?

MR. DINN: - was 42.2, that is the lowest year that we have I believe, in the years from 1966 to '79. It started off down there. Now, in 1979 the unemployment rate is 15.5, yet the employment rate is 44.5. What we are saying is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) participation rate.

MR. DINN: - no participation rate is another statistic. The participation rate is employed plus unemployed for participation rate. And the difficulty with that statistic is that we do not really know how many people would participate, or would be recognized as participants if there were jobs available. You cannot really tell. So the most accurate figure, as I see it, is the employment rate. How many people in a population, that is not a variable. I mean how many people are fifteen and over in the Province and how many people in that population are working? What percentage of the people in that population are working? That is the most accurate statistic. No matter what statistics you throw out - I could say this year, for example, as I said to the hon. member I believe two Thursdays ago, I got up here in this House of Assembly, I was not misleading but I used the unemployment statistics from March to March, March '79 to March '80 and I said, by those statistics the government created 13,000 jobs. Because that is what the difference was. But the difficulty is

MR. DINN: with using those statistics, and this is what I am attempting to point out to the hon. member, the difficulty is that there are so many variables - how many people participated? So what I am saying to the hon. member is, even though you can take these statistics and use them for your advantage, the statistic that you cannot use is the employment thing. That is how many people in the population? How many people fifteen and over? And in that total population, whether they are sick or invalided or whether they are in school or in university, how many people in that population from fifteen and over actually found employment and worked? And that is the employment rate. And that is the figure that I like to use. Because it is, as I said to the hon. member, the most accurate figure. And from 1949 on, from 1966 on is what I have statistics for here, from '66 on I can inform the hon. member and members of the House that that employment rate is the highest it has been for the years that we have statistics. Okay. It is right now, at this point in time, 44.5. It has been as low in these statistics down to 40.2. I believe that year was 1970. The highest it has ever been, that we have records for, is 1979, for the full year when the employment rate was 45.5, and that is the highest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can use all the statistics you want. You can take statistics and hon. members, believe me when I say that when they do the unemployment thing on a provincial basis, what they do is they take two per cent of - a two per cent poll, if you will, which is not a very accurate poll, and when they did it for the whole Island, April to April it indicated 6,000. When they broke it down and did it Avalon Peninsula, Burin Peninsula, Central Newfoundland, Western and

MR. J. DINN: Labrador, they came out with 8,000. That was the inaccuracy that I was pointing out to the hon. member. That kind of inaccuracy will not show up in the employment rate because what you are doing is taking the total population - how many people in the age group from fifteen and over - and then of that total population how many people actually work. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I am relatively proud to be able to say that that employment rate is going up, has gone up for the past few years and it is now higher than at any point in our history or, I should say, any point for the time that we have collected statistics. And that rate now, is 4.5, which is the highest.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Carbonear.
MR. R. MOORES: I would just like to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, in relation to highways, particularly highways in my district of Carbonear, and just as importantly, about the Conception Bay Highway over which I have to travel. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. H. Young) and the M.H.A. for Port de Grave (Mr. R. Collins) also frequent accordingly and also Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of us on either side of this House is naive enough to believe that there does not have to be, and there must be, a certain amount and a certain degree of pork barrelling. I do not believe that any politician who is at all in tune with our type of party system and in tune with the need for that party system to survive, particularly the party that is in government, would be stupid enough to think that the government does not have to protect its interests and to maintain its majority and thereby get itself re-elected. But that is not the point. That is not the entire point at all. There comes a time when pork barrelling becomes negligence and where it becomes irresponsibility and at a further point where it becomes almost criminal negligence.

Now, a perfect example of pork barrelling becoming negligence is the Conception Bay Highway, and it became negligence in 1975. Now, since 1975, it has become irresponsibility, and if it

MR. R. MOORES: continues being irresponsibly neglected over the next few years, it will become criminally negligent. People will start to die as a result of it or be caused serious injury or massive amounts of damage will be done to automobiles and pedestrians.

Now, in Carbonear in 1975, the then Moores administration went down during the election campaign in September of that year and they sank dynamite galore on the Carbonear by-pass road. Well, Mr. Speaker, they exploded so much dynamite that there was a constituent of mine who had to call the Department of Highways and ask them to reduce the noise level so her baby could get to sleep after supper - not during the working day, but after supper.

Following the election in 1975, September 16th thereof, on September 17th all dynamite explosions ceased and all work on the construction of highways stopped.

Now, in the interim period from 1975 until last year in 1979,

MR. R. MOOPES:

highway which the bypass road is supposed to replace as a major traffic flow artery, has had three major and near fatal accidents involved

on all three occasions, large transport trucks which have gone out of control by losing their brakes. And in all three cases extensive damage has occurred and in all three cases, just by a hair's breadth a loss of life was avoided.

Now, in answer to that problem, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) on request of the Carbonear Town Council and other citizenry, travelled to Carbonear - he met privately. Now, I was not invited to the meeting and with good reason, six of the Carbonear Town Council members are PCs. Not only do they support the PC Party but they actively campaigned against me in favour of the PC Party. And, of course, the minister did not know himself or was not mannerly enough or was not responsible enough to say, 'Well, boys, you know, in all fairness to our political system we should invite the MHA for the district.' But it does not matter whether I was invited or not, because I knew exactly everything that went on, every word that was said, every snide remark, every promise, every commitment that went on at that meeting, I knew about it within an hour after the meeting, verbatim

And the minister, in view of the serious instances or incidents of traffic accidents that occurred, and in view of the very serious problem that the bypass road could solve, made a commitment to the people at that meeting that the Carbonear bypass road would be finished this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, negligence does become irresponsibility and pork barrelling is different than political bias. Now, pork barrelling is for a reason, presumably a rational reason to maintain a government's majority and to get itself re-elected. But political bias is where the minister, or one or more of his colleagues, does not particularly have any liking for a member in a particular district.

Now, for my part, politically, I am glad that you did not finish the Carbonear bypass road because you ensured my re-election, and as long as the bypass road remains unfinished I will remain the MHA for the Carbonear district. But the government of this

MR. R. MOORES: Province has a responsibility to the maintenance of the welfare of the people who drive on certain roads -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: - and pedestrian who walk the streets and motorists who are going about their business in downtown Carbonear. And the same responsibility applies to all of the Conception Bay Highway. How the Minister of Public Works and Services, the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) and the member for Port de Grave (Mr. R. Collins) can sit over there as part of a government and allow this road, the Conception Bay Highway, to deteriorate to the point that it has - dear God, I would not sit with a government, I would not be so irresponsible as to sit with a government that would be that negligent. It is, Mr. Speaker, not only one of the worst roads in this Province right now but it services some 50,000 residents. In other words, the Conception Bay Highway from Brigus to Old Perlican services 50,000 people, half the population of the city of St. John's, more than half of metropolitan St. John's. Now, we do not ask for \$55 million or \$60 million arterial roads that you can go out and drive on, Mr. Speaker, at any time and you wonder if there is any traffic on them, and we do not ask for another four or seven or eight million dollar extension of the crosstown arterial,

MR. R. MOORES: and we do not ask for a half a million dollars for one intersection by the Holiday Inn on Portugal Cove Road, and we do not ask for the upgrading of the Kenmount Road to four lanes and the Topsail Road and the Prince Phillip Parkway. We are not asking for that. All we are asking for is a road that is safe and that will maintain the welfare, the physical health of the people who drive on it. And I would say in Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, you have transport trucks now, big transport trucks with eighty thousand and a hundred thousand pounds of cargo aboard going through not one school zone but three school zones where fourteen hundred children use the crosswalks and I say to the Minister that he has been given fair warning by the citizenry of Carbonear and the other interested groups at the meeting last year and I now re-iterate that warning, that some child is going to die as a result of the negligence of this government in dealing with the Carbonear bypass road and if it does, if one child dies and I guarantee you, I will stand in my place here in this House and I will point the finger where the blame and where the responsibility will lie. Because this road has not been neglected for one year but has been neglected now for five, since 1975, for four previous to that while this government was in power, and in 1966 the bypass road was envisioned as a solution to that problem.

The blame will only lie in one location and it will not lie with the Liberal member from Carbonear district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this House for eight years and I have never, never never in my eight years heard a member get on his feet and speak such pure nonsense as I have just heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT:

And the member made an excellent -

MR. THOMS:

(inaudible)

MR. C. BRETT:

- an excellent case for the completion of the Carbonear bypass, an excellent case but I wonder did the members of the House and the galleries hear what he said before that. He said, 'I am happy, I am glad that the government decided not to finish the Carbonear bypass because,' he said, ' that will re-ensure my election!

MR. MORGAN:

How shameful ! How shameful !

MR. C. BRETT:

Now that is what the hon. member just said. Did you ever hear such trash in all your life ? Now, I wish I could go out to Carbonear tomorrow and speak to all the hon. member's constituents with Hansard from the House and say, your member stood on his two feet or maybe he was on one, I do not know, and he said that he is happy - he is happy because the government decided not to finish the Carbonear bypass this year because ' that will re-ensure my re-election.' Now, that makes a lot of sense. I have never heard such pure unadulterated trash in all my life.

I always had the hon. member chalked up as being fairly intelligent and not a bad politician, for that matter, he seems to get re-elected, but -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh !

MR. C. BRETT:

- after hearing that it makes me wonder. There is nobody who has said in this House that there was pork barrelling this year. There was no pork barrelling. And there is no negligence on the part of the Department of Transportation and Communications on that road. The road, the Conception Bay Highway is not unlike the Torbay Road, the road through the Goulds and any number of roads that I can mention. I did not name them this morning but I mentioned pavement that is broken up and I said it is going to cost many millions of dollars to finish. Negligence - that is ridiculous for the hon. member to say he is going to stand up and point the finger at me. I remember it is not too long ago when certain members over there got up and pointed a finger at my hon. colleague here because some people were drowned due to an Act of God. I know who they were. Hon. members actually pointed

MR. BRETT:

on his feet if there is an accident in Carbonear, he is going to point the finger and blame me.

MR. T. LUSH:

Shame! Irresponsible.

MR. BRETT:

And I thought he was an intelligent young man, how ridiculous! Our maintenance forces are working continually on that road. The Carbonear bypass is an important road, but so are the roads on Fogo Island important. And so are the roads in Terra Nova important. And so are the roads in St. Mary's-The Capes important. And I wonder how these gentlemen would feel if they saw \$20 million this year listed for the recapping of that highway with not one cent for them? I wonder how they would feel? I have admitted these roads must be recapped. But there is no more danger there now than there ever was. We made changes last year in Carbonear, the officials of the department made changes to divert the traffic, to take it away from the populated areas. And we are not negligent. We are continually working on it.

I do not know - I think that is about all I have had to say I believe. I was going to point out - I was going to do it this morning and I thought I would do it again but really I think it is a waste of the time of the House because everybody has this that I tabled and everybody knows that the money is evenly distributed across the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

I will yield to my friend for a second.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member yields? The hon.

member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I will not be long, with all

due respect -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Be quiet.

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1967

NM - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

He wants to be named. Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES:

Not only, Mr. Speaker, in reply -

MR. STIRLING:

They told you you could speak again, did they?

MR. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Minister of
Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) -

MR. STIRLING:

They told you you were allowed to speak again, did they?

MR. SPEAKER :

Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Not only am I politically happy that he
has not finished the road in Carbonear, and the operative word is political,
which I repeat now, not only am I happy but I will take you on next week
at the meeting that has been called by the Mayor of Carbonear, with the
Mayor of Bay Roberts, the Mayor of Harbour Grace, Spaniard's Bay, Port de
Grave and a few others.

MR. NEARY:

Victoria?

MR. MOORES:

I will take you on face to face at the
meeting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come on gentleman.

MR. MOORES:

And I will tell you the same thing. I will
tell them the same thing, now, that politically I am happy that you did not
finish the Carbonear bypass road, that as a Minister of the Crown, and a member
of this government you have been irresponsible and negligent in the way that
you have dealt with the people of Carbonear. You have misled the Town Council,
and you have backed down, you have flip-flopped on a commitment to them. And
when you say that you -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I ask the hon. member to

withdraw the term -

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

In a moment.

I ask the hon. member to withdraw the terminology misled. It has been ruled unparliamentary. The terminology has been ruled unparliamentary so I just ask him to withdraw that term.

MR. MOORES:

Yes. Okay. Yes. I was not aware

though, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

The point of order was somewhat in connection with the statements now being made in regards to being misled, but also, Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out yesterday, you do not refer to members of the House by 'you' or any other term, you refer to them by the district which they represent in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is a valid point of order.

And hon. members are all aware of that. I am sorry I missed that particular part.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be a valid point of order but somewhat specious in terms of the way that we use English language. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has some -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no debate on the point of order. I have already ruled on the point of order.

MR. MOORES:

No, I am not debating the point of order, It is a valid one, somewhat questionable if the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) could speak better English. But that is all right. I will forgive him this time.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I can just -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Without the hon. member for Carbonear losing any time from his speech can we suspend the clock for one second for me to just make one little announcement that the government will be

May 30, 1980

Tape No. 1967

NM - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: tomorrow flying the flags at half mast
on all provincial buildings -

MR. NEARY: No, they will not. No. There is no way.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Will the hon. member for Carbonear yield?

MR. S. NEARY: No. No. No.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I just wanted to make an announcement
on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Out of respect for the -

MR. L. THOMS: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - for the eleven people who-

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for Carbonear prepared
to yield to the Premier to make this announcement?

MR. NEARY: No, he is not prepared to yield.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that it
would require leave for that type of thing.

MR. NEARY: Yes. It is a Ministerial Statement,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand leave is not granted.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: No respect -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! If
I just may clarify who is speaking and who is not. The hon. member for
Carbonear I believe was speaking

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): and he took his seat when the Premier asked permission for something.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order?

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and request for clarification.

Am I of the understanding that the Premier requested to ask leave of the House to make a statement with regard to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: Is my colleague talking to me or somebody else?

Mr. Speaker, I want a clarification.

The Premier came into the House asking leave of the House to make a statement which he considered to be of some importance to the House and there is no leave from the Opposition. Is that a clarification point?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, if it is a point of order - and I suggest it really is not a point of order, the case is that the Premier asked permission to make a statement and that would require agreement by the House. Agreement was not granted and that is the way it stands.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say to the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. Mary's -

The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 30, 1980

Tape 1968

EC - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. Mary's -

The Capes has the floor.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Mr. Premier, you have my

permission to fly the flag at half-mast.

MR. S. NEARY:

The new flag?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The member for

St. Mary's - The Capes is speaking.

MR. S. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member

for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

If it is not the new flag the hon.

gentleman is talking about flying for the first time then we would

hear argument. Maybe we will give -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

If I could have the attention of hon. members. I understand that that matter has already been resolved. The Premier asked leave. I understood leave was not granted.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, leave is not being requested at this point in time - it already had been and was not agreed to.

The hon. the member for St. Mary's -

The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) without our approval.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

No, with our approval, Mr. Speaker, because I would think it was misinterpreted. You have my permission to fly the flag at half-mast.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I hate to keep calling members' attention to the rules of this House, but the hon. the member

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

for St. Mary's - The Capes has

the floor and I believe it is difficult to hear what he has to say.

The hon. the member for St. Mary's -

The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to make the point that the Premier has my permission to fly the flag at half-mast.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that I would like to make in order here. I would like to point out first that I am not a greedy man and the people of St. Mary's - The Capes are not greedy people by any means, Mr. Speaker. I do not expect, and the people of St. Mary's - The Capes do not expect to get the 105 miles of dirt road paved this year or next year or the year after, but, Mr. Speaker, we had a good start in the past and I just wonder now if we are playing politics with this matter. I would like to think not, Mr. Speaker, but with the remarks made by the hon. the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. H. Young) this morning - who, by the way, is a minister of Cabinet - it is hard to believe otherwise.

When my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) pointed out the fact that 84 per cent of funds went to the P.C. districts and 16 per cent to Liberal districts, there was a member on the opposite side saying, 'They got too much, Mr. Speaker. There was too much given to them.' Now, if this is not playing politics, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is. And he is a member of Cabinet and expresses the views of Cabinet and has some input in the Cabinet, or I would like to think he does, Mr. Speaker. It is not a very good way for any Cabinet minister to act.

As I say, I have 105 miles of dirt roads, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to get it done this year or next year, I realize that, but this year was a bad start. There is not one mention of St. Mary's - The Capes, any roads, especially sections of roads that children have to travel over, and that is what concerns me most, I guess, the school children. When you talk to parents in the area, they have to

MR. D. HANCOCK: get their kids out for school 6:30 A.M., give them a half decent breakfast like you or I would sit down and have and put them aboard a bus that has to travel twenty-five miles over some of the worst roads around this Province, Mr. Speaker. That road coming out of North Harbour is in a deplorable condition. It is ridiculous in this day and age that children should not only have to travel over twenty-five miles of dirt road to get to school, but the condition of that road as it exists today, Mr. Speaker. And when you cannot feed a child and put her aboard a bus - she has to take a lunch and have her breakfast in school, Mr. Speaker, that is a bit ridiculous, in my opinion, and I would like to see something done about it.

Another thing, on the way to school from North Harbour, you have to pass over the Rocky Harbour bridge. It was built in the early 1940s and I am sure the minister is aware of the condition of that bridge. The railing on the bridge is done up with - they came out and patched it up. The bridge is so old all the concrete fell off and they patched the bridge up with two by fours. I drove over it as early as yesterday and I know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. The minister says that that bridge is in good condition. The structure of the bridge, I cannot say, because I am not an architect. I did not design the bridge and I do not know how long the bridge is safe for. To look at that bridge, Sir, it appears ready to collapse any minute at all, and I would like to have some assurance from some inspectors or from the minister that that bridge will not collapse. I would like to see an investigation carried out to see that that bridge is sound and safe. I do not think it is, Mr. Speaker. The end toward Placentia now is about ready to cave away from where the bridge ends and the dirt road section starts.

MR. HANCOCK: Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that disturbs me is the fact that it is not only bad enough to have to drive -

Mr. Speaker could I have some order please?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member is having difficulty speaking.

MR. MORGAN: It is coming from your colleagues over there.

MR. HANCOCK: I do not care who it is, Mr. Speaker, I just want them to shut up. Mr. Speaker, we have a large section of dirt road that we have to haul fish over daily as Trepassey is one of the largest fish plants around this Island. There are two on the cape shore and if they have to transport fish, if they have to come in to go up to Witless Bay, they have to come over fifty or sixty miles of dirt road to get to the plant. I do not see why not, Mr. Speaker, - I know it is an expense for calcium treatment to be put through the communities as such but I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot get the pavement, why we cannot get some calcium treatment onto those roads to keep the dust down, especially in areas where fish is being transported. We have a job out there- Mr. Speaker, I had to fight like heck last week to try to get some of the communities done where councils were. Councils are not in a position around this Province, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, to come up with money enough to meet the demands as required of them in the communities much less go outside the community and look for money or try to get money to put calcium in their communities where dirt roads exist. I would like for the minister, council or no council, to do the sections of the dirt roads which people live on. There are some areas in my district now, Mr. Speaker, that are left out and I do not know if the minister is aware of them or not but his deputy is because I have been talking to him on it. The roads out in that district now, Mr. Speaker- the minister says he is trying to get at them, the crusher business, but

MR. HANCOCK: my God, if transportation is going to look after the highway systems around this Province who is more responsible than the Department of Transportation and Communications to put crushers or make sure that we have fill to go on those roads? There is no crusher in the area and at the department to which I was talking, there are three foremen in the district and they are disturbed that they cannot get anything to go on the roads. You have to go in and you have to dig out a mud pile on the side of the road and haul mud out and stick it on the road. Most members who travelled over the road going down to my place last Wednesday night saw the potholes. The member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) says that he would like to see the conditions of the road improved but if we had pavement with potholes all through the district you would not get any complaints but what we have there with pavement - they have not got any asphalt plant set up as yet around the Province and you have to fill them up with mud, Mr. Speaker. Is that not right?

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. members can testify to that on the other side of the House.

MR. HANCOCK: Every pothole on the Salmonier Line now, Mr. Speaker, is filled up with mud and here we are half way through - the tourists coming into this Province, it must be a great laugh or a great kick in the butt to them, Mr. Speaker, to see those holes in pavement filled up with mud. These are a few of the changes that I would like to see made, Mr. Speaker. And the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) should be concerned too not only because it is in my district but it would benefit his district greatly, I am sure. Because if the tourists coming off the ferry in Argentia had a chance to drive around that loop road where we have some of the main tourist attractions in this Province, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the minister that anybody who has been through the district - that bird sanctuary on the Cape Shore, I do not know how you could invite tourists to go out and have a look at that. It is only about

MR. HANCOCK: fifteen minutes run or twenty minutes run off the Argentia ferry if they did not have to haul their trailers or campers over twenty miles or fifteen miles of dirt road. That could be one of the main tourist attractions around this Province, Mr. Speaker and you can come on through and take in the lighthouse in St. Marys and come on down the Cape Shore and I am sure you have your scenic views up there as well. But there will be nothing ever accomplished and Placentia will benefit very little if that road is not done because people get off the ferry now and they do not even see Placentia because they are just interested in getting to St. John's because they want to come in and see Cabot Tower or whatever, some of the sights that we have in here. But we also have sights out around the Province, Mr. Speaker, that are not being used simply because of the fact that people do not want to go over a dirt road to get to them and I would beg the minister, Mr. Speaker, to have a look, and the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe), to have a look at the conditions out there as they exist today and see what we can do about them.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, why we pay taxes in our district at all. A lot of fishermen and they are in the high tax bracket, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how they can consistently pay taxes to the provincial government. I, as a business man, do not see what in the heck I get in return for my dollar, Mr. Speaker, when you are spending twenty or thirty thousand dollars a year in taxes and you get nothing back.

AN HON. MEMBER: Roads.

MR. HANCOCK: Roads the member says. You are obviously aware of what I have out there, we get no return, Mr. Speaker. If I had my way I would never pay another cent of provincial tax to this Province if I could get away with it. And I do now know but I can get away with it, Mr. Speaker, looking at the statistics and seeing the SSA that was not collected around this Province over a number of years and that should be collected, Mr. Speaker, and put into the Department of Transportation and other departments. If one can get away with it why cannot I get away with it? I do not know what the figures are, Mr. Speaker, but I know from fact

MR. HANCOCK:

that there is a lot of outstanding money owed to this Province through the collection of SSA, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Ten million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT:

The main thing I would like to see now,

Mr. Speaker - we are not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT:

If we are not going to get any pavement this year, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Minister of Transportation would seriously consider having a crusher come to the area so we could have something sensible, some fill to put on the top of the road so we could make the roads fit to drive over. That is about all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why people present petitions in the House. I would like to know, actually, what happens to the petitions and delegations that come in here. Mr. Speaker, to circulate a petition around any district in this Province is not an easy task. I have had a few drawn up and you have to almost take them door to door and say, "Look, are you in favour of this or not?". And they bring them in here and I would like to know what happens to them after we lay them on the Table of this House, Mr. Speaker. Are they brought up in caucus? Do we get any representation in caucus from the input that the people in the districts had with regard to those petitions or are they just torn up and thrown in the wastepaper basket, Mr. Speaker? These are some of the things I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, there is not very much time left but I will just very quickly try to answer some of these questions. The hon. member said that the people from St. Mary's-The Capes do not get any return on their taxes. Well, I wish that Trinity North could get the return on their taxes for roads, the same return as St. Mary's-The Capes have gotten. Because in the last seven or eight years there has

MR. BRETT:

been something like \$17 million spent in St. Mary's-The Capes on reconstruction and pavement, \$17 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

And I doubt if there is any member in this House on either side can brag or indicate that there has been that much money spent in their district in the last seven or eight years. Without a doubt it is the most. So I would indicate that that is an excellent return on their taxes.

Very briefly with respect to potholes being filled up with mud, that is not exactly true but almost. In the Winter, in the Spring and Fall we use the cold patch which I have often referred to as chewing gum because it is not much better. You put it down and it only lasts a couple of days but it is all that you can use when the temperature is low. However, in the Summer when hot patching is available, then we use that and that, if it is not available now will be available in the very near future, and we will be using that on such places as the Conception Bay Highway for example. The crushing, I can only repeat what I repeated here in the House, it is not economically feasible for us to stay in the crushing business and we are going to get out of it. It is better for us to call tenders and purchase it.

The hon. member mentioned something about a bridge, I do not want him to take this as a commitment but I seem to recall that a couple of days ago some member of the staff, one of the engineers indicated that they may have to do some work on that bridge this year. The calcium chloride, we are spending four hundred and some odd thousand dollars this year. We will only lay it in the built-up areas and not in the areas between the communities. There is no way that we can ever get into doing council roads. I am not suggesting that somebody else should not but the Department of Transportation and Communications does not have any responsibility for council roads and, therefore, we will not be, at least we certainly will not be paying for calcium chloride that might go on these roads. We will assist if we can in spreading or something of that nature but we certainly cannot buy it.

MR. BRETT:

There were other points but I believe it is one o'clock so I guess I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn. I might inform members of the House that on Monday we - there are forty-five minutes I believe left in this concurrence debate, Mr. Speaker and following that we will be getting into the Budget Debate. I think the lead-off speaker who adjourned the debate last time was the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday at three of the clock.