

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1980

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of
the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this time, inform the House that the hon. the Premier has passed along a message on behalf of the government and the people of Newfoundland, to the family of the late Right Honourable Jules Leger, expressing our sympathy and sadness on their bereavement.

As we all know, the former Governor General is a distinguished member of a distinguished family. We remember his visits here to this Province, and the warmth which he engendered in the hearts of all of us when we met him. The loss to Canada and, of course, the loss to his family is considerable indeed. I would like to inform the House that the hon. the Premier has sent a message of sympathy to the family of the late Governor General. I know that this hon. House would also like to be informed of it, and, I expect, would like to be associated with this message of sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, can I just simply say that it was very eloquently put by the House Leader and we would like to join him in expressing those sentiments.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

If I could have the attention of hon. members I am sure they would like to join me in welcoming to the gallery this afternoon Miss Michelle Clemens who is a resident of the District of St. John's Centre,

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): but also a Grade XI student at Holy Heart of Mary Regional High School. She is participating in Student Career Day and Michelle's ambition is to become a politician, after she completes her formal education, and I am sure members will want to welcome her.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I stand on a point of privilege in that I feel that the privilege of a member of this House has been breached. When I do so I do so with the understanding that any member of the House can stand on a point of privilege of this nature, in that the right of making complaint of a breach of privilege is open to any member of the House - so says, May, page 347. And I would ask the Speaker to rule as to whether - perhaps we could have a ruling as to whether a motion might be brought in on the matter. I refer specifically to the fact that a member of the House was suspended from the House without his knowledge and in his absence. I would ask the Speaker if could perhaps have a ruling, if there is indeed a breach of privilege, and if there is a prima facie case, I would make the appropriate motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether that is a prima facie breach of privilege or not. I will recall though to Your Honour, and to the members of the hon. House that when the motion was made on Friday, that I brought this point up myself at the time. Now, it was my distinct understanding at the period of time that it was accepted by the hon. member and accepted by all members of the House on all sides, that

MR. MARSHALL: unfortunately an assault had been committed and regardless of any other questions concerning same, that in itself constitutes a very grave breach of privilege but, of course whichever way Your Honour rules with respect to it is - with respect to the motion of the hon. member there opposite, of course, is within Your Honour's purview, but I rise for the purpose of pointing out again to the House that I brought this matter up on Friday and the motion to suspend the hon. member was made only after it became apparently apparent at the time, that a blow had in fact been struck.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I may, Mr. Speaker, make a submission, my own feeling is that there is no prima facie breach of privilege in the fact that an hon. member has been excluded for a period of three days. The motion was in order and the House voted on it and to the best of my knowledge voted unanimously on it so I do not think that the House's unanimous vote could be a breach of the Privilege of the House. In a sense we are master, you know, within - obviously within Parliamentary custom, we are masters of our own futures and our own procedures so I do not think it would be a breach of privilege because what in effect then would be, this whole House and all its members would be in breach of the privileges of the House.

If I may make a suggestion, my first submission would be that there is no breach of privilege in what transpired by the House's vote on Friday with respect to the exclusion of an hon. member for three days. If I may make a suggestion, since the matter obviously is complicated and important and a matter which hon. members

MR. OTTENHEIMER: wish to deal with sensibly and not emotionally or argumentatively or even in adversary manner, a suggestion that without changing Friday's decision determination of the House, that there be an agreement that the incident and any matters logically related to it do be considered at an early meeting of a Committee on Privileges and Elections. I think there is a Committee on Privileges which this House has and the matter could be referred to it. I make that merely as a suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port, is that agreed then or -

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that was the whole intent of my raising this as a point of privilege because if the Speaker so rules, then I would move a motion, as the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) has suggested, that it be referred.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the agreement is then that the matter raised by the hon. member for Port au Port (J. Hodder), the question of privilege, if you wish, would be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections at the earliest possible opportunity.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if you would like, could I make the motion now or do you give your ruling first?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have not given a ruling because it has been suggested that it would be referred anyway to the Committee. If that is agreed, then there would be no need of a motion. If the hon. member wishes to make a motion, I will have to make a ruling then whether or not there is a prima facie case.

November 24, 1980

Tape No. 2347

EL - 3

MR. HODDER:

Okay, Well, in that case, Mr.

Speaker, I move that the Standing

MR. J. HODDER: Committee on Privileges and Elections be struck and that the matter be referred to that committee.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is that agreed? You have heard the motion. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is a debatable motion and I would like to have a few words on it if Your Honour would not mind.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to deal with the matter at hand. There is a very grave matter of principle involved in this whole affair that arose on Friday inasmuch as a member of this House was convicted in his absence. I believe that is the crux of the matter not the fact that the member crossed the House, and became involved in a fracas with members on the government side. It was the fact that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) rushed into the House and raised the matter and a decision was made, following the matter being raised by the Government House Leader, in the absence of the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores). And that is the principle we are debating now, Sir. I think that is wrong and I think in doing that we established a very dangerous precedent, one that has to be looked at very carefully. And

although I will go along with having the matter referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if that is the proper way to handle it or not, because in my experience in this House with Committees of this House, especially the one on Elections and Privileges, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that Committee has existed in recent years and if, indeed, it has existed, then they have not met.

MR. S. NEARY: There are still a number of outstanding matters, Mr. Speaker, one that I raised in this hon. House. There are a number of outstanding matters that have not been dealt with by this committee. One has been outstanding since 1974, when a ruling was made by the now Minister of Justice, when the hon. gentleman was Speaker of the House, in connection with a raid on a member's office by the R.C.M.P.

MR. CARTER: Is this relevant?

MR. S. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member that the motion, I believe, before the House now is that a committee be struck and that this issue referred to by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) be referred to it for consideration. So I think we are dealing with the issue that was raised Friday.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I do not understand your ruling. Was I out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I am ruling that the hon. member is not being relevant to the motion.

MR. S. NEARY: Is now being relevant or is not being relevant?

MR. SPEAKER: Not being relevant, related to the issue.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am giving the House an example, an example that we have before us. The committee, as I understand it, has not only been struck but it never meets. The committee was struck in 1974 - I believe the members that were on that committee, some of them are not even here now. They are not even sitting members of the House now. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: that whether it is the old committee or whether it is a new committee, they have to deal with all outstanding matters before this House, And one of the outstanding matters that I am pointing out to the House that has not been dealt with was a Speaker, privately in his office, giving the RCMP permission to raid a member's office and then coming into the House, coming back into the House and saying, 'There is a prima facie case to have it referred to a Committee on Elections and privileges, that same Speaker, Mr. Speaker, and nothing was ever done about it, the matter is still on the Table of this House. Now, how long will this matter stay on the Table? And above all, Mr. Speaker, we have found the member guilty without a trial. Will that member be allowed to take his seat in this hon. House while the committee is considering whether or not his privileges have been breached? That is the most important point of all, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. NEARY: That is the most significant thing. Will the member have to remain outside the House? The former Speaker says no, he should not have to remain outside the House, and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. And I am asking Your Honour now to consider allowing the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) to take his seat in this House while he is being tried. Now, I do not know if Your Honour intends to do that or not. But if Your Honour intends to do it, I will take my seat and keep quiet. But I am trying to make a case for -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Having made that suggestion, then, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can rest assured that it is the intention to allow the hon. member to take his seat when the matter is being debated, because the question that has now been put is the question of whether or not his privileges have been breached in terms of being able to make a response upon his suspension on Friday. So I do not believe there is any intention

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): whatsoever of having the hon. member referred to not being able to take his seat until this committee reports.

The motion on Friday was to suspend an hon. member for three days. That motion will stand. Now that member then will be able to take his seat.

So if that is the question the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) puts to me, and if that is satisfactory as an answer, then I accept his suggestion that he -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the question I am putting to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: No? Okay.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The question I am putting before the House is whether or not the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) will be allowed to take his seat this afternoon immediately while the Committee on Elections and Privileges are hearing evidence, are taking evidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Well -

MR. NEARY: In -

MR. SPEAKER: I call order again.

The motion before the House at this point in time has nothing to do with the hon. member taking his seat today. The motion before the House, as I understand it, is that a committee be struck and that the issue referred to by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) be referred to that committee for consideration. But it has nothing to do with when the hon. member can or cannot retain his seat.

MR. W. ROWE: Why does the House not make an amendment to the motion. You make that suggestion.

MR. NEARY: I am making the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure, if the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is a fair-minded man, that he will amend his original motion to allow

MR. NEARY: the hon. -
MR. W. ROWE: Move an amendment to this motion.
MR. NEARY: - or move an amendment to this motion,
as my hon. colleague indicates, to allow the member for
Carbonear (Mr. Moores) to return to his seat immediately -
MR. W. ROWE: Until it is resolved.
MR. NEARY: - until the matter is

MR. NEARY: resolved to the satisfaction of this House and to Your Honour. Now, that is a fair suggestion and a fair request because under the British system of justice a man is innocent is he not? - my legal friends cantell me - a man is innocent until proven guilty. So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is just not a snow job, that this will not turn out to be like all the breaches of privileges of the past, that they will be swept under the rug, that the committee, if it is indeed appointed, will meet quickly, not procrastinate, as we have seen happen in the past. And all these other matters, Mr. Speaker, they just do not go away because we had an election, they do not go away because we are the Thirty-Fifth instead of the Thirty-Fourth General Assembly. These matters have to be dealt with and they have not been dealt with. And the Committee on Elections and Privileges in the past was just a place to toss something at and then forget about it. I do not believe that Committee met once. At least in 1974 there was this matter arose and I do not believe they met after. Of course, we had a general election in between but a general election just does not change standing Committees of the House, or precedents established in this House that have to be dealt with by the Committee on Election and Privileges. So my main argument now, or my main point, Mr. Speaker, is this: That under the British system of justice a man is innocent until proven guilty. In this particular case we did not hear the other side of the story. I was not here myself, I had left the chamber and I had gone home on personal business when the matter arose so, therefore, I am not familiar with the facts. But I think every fair-minded Newfoundlander, every fair-minded Canadian would agree that the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moore's) should be given an opportunity to tell his side of the story. The punishment and the penalty may still stand, I

MR. NEARY: do not know. There may be others who may deserve to be punished, Mr. Speaker. I read reports and I heard reports on the radio where there was a ganging-up on the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A ganging-up. It was not one on one, Mr. Speaker, it was not one on one although we had a one on one situation. I would like to point this out for the benefit of the news media and especially the Evening Telegram who did such careful research. They said the last time this happened was involving Mr. Bill Smallwood. Well, that is

MR. NEARY: not true. I was here in the House one evening when the member for -

MR. W. ROWE: St. George's.

MR. NEARY: - St. Georges came across and gave the Leader of the Opposition a belt in the side of the gob.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That is the last time it happened. And both members were suspended for one or two days, I believe it was two days.

So it was the swiftness in which this was done, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. The principle is wrong. Every man should be given an opportunity to defend himself. We are not living in Russia, we are not living in Poland, we are living in Canada, and every man should be given a chance to tell his side of the story.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the new constitution.

MR. NEARY: And I hope the new constitution that we are now -

MR. W. ROWE: The Charter of Rights.

MR. NEARY: The Charter of Rights that we are now bringing back from Westminster will give every Canadian that privilege and that right - it is not a privilege, it is a right. It is a right that every Canadian has, and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) should have that right. I am hoping that the Government House Leader, (Mr. Marshall) when he rises in his place, will have the courage and not just allow this matter to be brushed off on a committee that may or may not meet, that may or may not be set up, that may take weeks or months to establish, that may take years before they report to this House. That is no way, Mr. Speaker, to make democracy work. That is no way to administer justice in this Province.

MR. NEARY: So I am hoping the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will amend the motion made by the House Leader on this side, amend it in such a way that the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) will be allowed to come into the Chamber this afternoon and take his seat while this matter is before the Committee and will be allowed to sit there until the matter is resolved. That is a fair request, Sir, and one that I am sure will meet with the approval of all members on both sides of the House, all Newfoundlanders and all Canadians and all people who live in a free democracy today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am hardly going to be besmirched or attempted to be besmirched by the hon. member. The hon. member may not have been here on Friday but the hon. member, if he were here on Friday, would realize that this was not a resolution of the Government House Leader per se or any member, but the entire House itself.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is an issue which is a very real issue, and I might suggest that perhaps Your Honour might like to take a period of five or ten minutes for the purpose of affording an adjournment.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am rather concerned with this issue because it involves, really, the privileges of the House.

MR. MARSHALL: We are going to adjourn for five minutes.

November 24, 1980

Tape 2351

EC - 3

MR. HISCOCK:

Okay, then I will -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

We will recess this House for
five or ten minutes.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, referring to the matter which we were speaking about before the adjournment or recess, I want to make it perfectly clear to this House and to Your Honour that the situation as far as the government is concerned is the same today as it was on Friday. I think if Your Honour will recall on Friday we indicated that perhaps it could be considered by the House before the final matter of privilege was dealt with that the hon. member be given an opportunity to explain the position and, of course, that is exactly the same position as the government holds now. If the hon. member wishes to come to the House, and if Your Honour, in his wisdom, determines that it is appropriate for him to, in the circumstances, come in and make an explanation, the government would have no objection.

However, Your Honour, I would urge to the members of the House that the only issue to be dealt with is the question of privilege, the question of privilege that the hon. gentleman is alleged to have hit a member and that the issue will be confined solely and simply as to whether the member assaulted another member within the precincts of the House which is the reason for which he was expelled. But I want to make it crystal clear that as far as government is concerned, government's position is no different than it was on Friday with respect to that matter and it is entirely, as we say, open to Your Honour, of course, as all these matters are open to Your Honour, to make a decision accordingly. But that is the government's position.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that there are two separate questions here: One is the question of one member of the House striking another member or whatever, the other question is whether a member can be expelled from

MR. J. HODDER: the House without having his say or whatever. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that my motion that I made was to look at this matter, which I consider to be a breach of the privileges of a member of the House, and that is the one I have asked - that would be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the matter raised, I believe it is fair to say that the Chair really does not have the authority to allow the hon. member to re-enter the House because on motion by the House last Friday, the hon. member has been suspended. I submit to hon. members that the members in the House are the masters of their own operations and considerations, and I would also submit to the hon.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

members that if a request of that nature has been made, it would require unanimous consent of the House and that is the way in which I would propose to deal with it. If unanimous consent is reached, then the hon. member would be invited in for one purpose only and that would be to explain his conduct or make an explanation of the situation that transpired last Friday. There would be no debate at that point, then the hon. member would have to leave the Chamber again. It would simply be a request of the House if there is unanimous agreement. I suggest that that might be the appropriate way to proceed and if that is agreed, I would then ask if there is unanimous agreement to allow the hon. member for Carbonear (R. Moores) to take his seat to explain his position and then to leave the Chamber. Is there unanimous agreement for that request?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Hearing no objections, the hon. member for Carbonear may certainly take his seat.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the matter here is of great concern to myself and other members on this side because it is -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Are you rising on a point of order now then or -

MR. HISCOCK: I am speaking on the motion. The question of -

MR. SPEAKER: Well, if I may with respect. The motion, for the moment, is not being debated. The

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): question of whether the member may first of all address the House with his statement is the question that we are now dealing with. If the hon. member is prepared to take his seat and offer his explanation as I have just described, there has been no objection and that is what I will hear at the present time. If the hon. member is not prepared to take his seat and make that explanation, then we will continue with the debate on the motion that has been put by the hon. member for Port au Port (J.Hodder).

So if the hon. member for Carbonear(R. Moores) is available -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: - I have not concluded my comments. If the hon. member for Carbonear is available my suggestion is that one of his colleagues might wish to invite him in.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we leave the matter in abeyance and go on with other business until we find the member for Carbonear because -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is in the hall.

MR. NEARY: No, he is not in the hall.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) the gallery.

MR. NEARY: No, he is not in the gallery either. But could we leave the matter just in abeyance until -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member will be within the precincts of the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe we have already dealt with the matter whether or not the hon. member

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): for Carbonear (R. Moores) wishes to explain his position and I think, or at least it was my understanding, that that would be the next item of business to proceed with. So my ruling is if the hon. member wishes to come in, he now can come in and make his statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is up to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The gentleman may rise on a point of order and address the Chair first of all, and then I will recognize him.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - Carbonear is not within the precincts of the House at the moment but he will be in short order and so would Your Honour just leave the matter in abeyance until we can get a chance to discuss it with - he is on his way here, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider it as a request. Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): On the motion, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, it is a concern of this side of the House that basically this is the Parliament of Newfoundland and Labrador, commonly referred to as the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador. When a person, for whatever reason lowers the decorum of the House and the Speaker decides to expel that person, then fine. But when a person has committed a breach of privilege of this House and is expelled without having his case heard, the Speaker - Your Honour, you just mentioned that the rules of this House are up to the majority of the members of this House. Technically one person can turn around and bring up a privilege here about another member who is not here in the House. And take, for example, the Premier in London at this moment, that it can come before this House and the majority of the people can vote it and the Premier can be expelled from this House for three days or two days. So I am saying that the case - for the Speaker or for the Chair to turn around and say that the member can come back and then be expelled again is basically undermining the legitimacy of this Parliament and the rights of this House.

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman is realizing what he is really saying. I mean, Your Honour, has made a ruling. The last words - and I do not think the hon. gentleman intended it, but the last words of the hon. gentleman are in effect seemingly challenging the ruling of Your Honour, honour among the - I know he does not wish to do this. What the hon. gentleman is now debating is the fact of whether or not the

MR. W. MARSHALL: hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) ought to have been given an opportunity to explain his alleged conduct. That very opportunity has now been given, or is now being given, to the hon. member for Carbonear. And I would suggest that the remarks made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I know they are not intended but, number one, they are covering ground that has already been decided and, number two, they are really, in effect, questioning the ruling made by Your Honour, although, as I say, he does not intend to do that.

MR. E. HISCOCK: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: The President of Privy Council has pointed out that I am - and I totally agree with him - I had no intentions of questioning this Chair of the Parliament. But I am concerned that if this mere matter is referred to the Committee on Elections and Privileges that has not met since 1974, I think -

AN HON. MEMBER: Probably later than that too.

MR. E. HISCOCK: - probably later than that. It is hypocrisy and is a mockery of the parliamentary system that if we strike this committee and refer this matter to it and then let it die for another four or five years then it is a mockery of parliament. And I feel again that the privileges of this House are the ultimate things that we as all members should strive to maintain because it is our democracy and our constitution.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further discussion?

You have heard the question.

All those in favour.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: I would like to inform Your Honour, that I did manage to get in contact with the member for Carbonear. He is at home and he is leaving immediately to come. Now, whether or not he wants to re-enter the Chamber is entirely up to himself. We will discuss that with him when he comes. I just wanted to give Your Honour a progress report. So he should be here within a matter of ten minutes, say -

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The motion as put, Mr. Speaker, is a motion to the effect that the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay'. The motion is carried.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

Mr. Speaker (Simms): The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, during recent time much has been said about the phenomenon commonly known as "acid rain". Many meetings, seminars and conferences have been held on the subject in both Canada and the United States; much scientific research is being conducted concerning its cause and environmental effects; items very frequently appear in the media expressing a growing concern; Governments are studying the problem, both domestically and on a trans-boundary, international basis.

For a subject to be given this kind of attention, it must be of more than ordinary importance and significance - and such is, indeed, the case. In fact, acid rain is one of the most serious environmental problems facing certain parts of Canada today.

What is acid rain? Where does it come from? Where does it go? What are the dangers? Does this Province need to be concerned? Is Government doing anything about it? I feel it is incumbent upon me as minister responsible for the Newfoundland environment to provide the information I have on acid rain to the members of this hon. House and, indeed, to the Newfoundland people so that all may be aware of the scope of the problem and the steps that are being taken by Government to address it.

Rain water free from pollution is slightly acidic due to its interaction with carbon dioxide, a natural earth by-product. On a logarithmic scale from 1 to 14, designed by scientists to determine the acidity of a liquid, this pollution free or "clean" acid has what is known as a pH level of 5.6. However, in many parts of North America - especially in the North Eastern sector - rain is being measured 10 to 100 times more acidic than this. The increased acidity

MR. DAWE: The increased acidity is being caused by conversion in the atmosphere of oxides of sulphur and nitrogen into sulphuric and nitric acids. These oxides are emitted from fossil fuel burning sources such as smelters, oil and coal fired electrical utilities and internal combustion engines (of which the motor car is the chief source). These pollutants with the right kind of climatic conditions, can be transported in the atmosphere for many hundreds or even thousands of miles before finally returning to earth either by dry deposition or as washout in rain or snowfall.

Some areas, although receiving large amounts of acid precipitation, remain relatively unaffected because of the natural counterbalance of limestone deposits which neutralize the acidity. Conversely, areas devoid of limestone deposits are extremely vulnerable to any increased acidity and can rapidly show serious effects.

The most notable effects of acid rain are the eventual depletion of fish stocks in fresh water systems, where the acidity causes decreased productivity and, sooner or later, the complete loss of fish and aquatic life from the watershed. Other less immediately obvious but equally serious effects are damage to forests, agriculture, and even to buildings in the long term.

As already intimated, acid rain is really the final aspect of what is really a very large and

MR. DAWE: complex problem that begins with the emission of fossil fuel burning and industrial pollutants into the atmosphere, their chemical transformation into acids, and their eventual deposition many thousands of miles away into relatively clean areas of the country and in many cases across international boundaries onto the lands of other nations. Obviously the first corrective steps have been taken by controlling the sources of the emissions - a complex, difficult, costly but technically possible proposition.

The great bulk of this pollution is being generated in the mid and northeastern United States and in the industrialized areas of Central Canada. As much of this industry is located near the Canada-U.S. border, it becomes readily apparent that the pollutants are flowing both ways across the border much to the chagrin of both countries. What is now also becoming apparent is that a considerable quantity of air pollution is also flowing into Eastern Canada - a recent report claiming that half the acid rain falling in the Eastern provinces is coming from the United States.

Perhaps more because of Canadian initiative, Canada and the United States signed a Memorandum of Intent in August, 1980 to set in motion a bilateral process to deal more effectively with trans-boundary air pollution problems. The Memorandum provided for the establishment of five work groups to assemble technical and scientific information and to assist in preparation for the negotiation of a co-operative agreement between Canada and the U.S. on trans-boundary air pollution. In this connection, I am very pleased to announce that Mr. Brian Power, Environmental Engineer, in my department, responsible for air quality, will represent the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland on a working group that will work on Atmospheric Modelling. I am concerned about recent statements attributed to President-

MR. DAWE:

elect Reagan to the contrary,

I am hoping that there will be no relaxing of American environmental standards and I am optimistic that a U.S.-Canada agreement in due course can be concluded to the mutual betterment of both nations.

Recent reports prepared by Canada and the United States tell us that the results of acid rain are as bad as anticipated or worse. It indicates that acid rain has killed between 2,000 and 4,000 lakes in Ontario. Large stocks of bass and trout have been destroyed. The addition of acid rain to lakes in Ontario has been shown to increase the amount of mercury found in fish. There is even some concern that acidification of Nova Scotia rivers could be affecting native Atlantic Salmon (although, as yet, this is not well documented).

What about Newfoundland? Has the incidence of acid rain had any deleterious environmental effects yet in this Province and what is being done to ensure that these are immediately identifiable? Though we may be further away from the source of air pollution than other Eastern Canadian provinces, we are in the path of generally prevailing winds and weather systems that flow from the Northeastern and Central North American industrialized areas and, in the long run, we can hardly escape from negative impacts from acid rain.

In the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, some work has already begun to determine the extent of the impact of acid precipitation. Three stations

MR. DAWE:

were established in 1977 in Gander, Stephenville and Goose Bay as part of a nationwide Environment Canada program to monitor the acidity of precipitation. Although four years is too short a time frame to establish any trends or changes in the acidity of rainfall, it does allow an assessment of how acidic the rainfall actually is across the Province. Over the four year period, the rainfall has averaged pH 4.6, which is roughly ten times more acidic than that of clean, unpolluted rain.

My department is now establishing its own precipitation monitoring network to complement the federal network. The first stations have been set up at Cape Broyle and Whitbourne. Initial results from these stations confirm the existing data from the federal stations, namely, that the acidity of rainfall throughout the Province is approximately ten times more acidic than it should be under ideal conditions. A third new station will soon be set up when a suitable location has been decided upon.

As already stated, the most immediate effect of acidic precipitation is on lakes and streams and the fish and aquatic life that they support. In general, it has been determined that as the acidity of a lake or stream approaches pH 5, the reproduction of fish diminishes, while water below pH 5 is usually devoid of all fish life - a so-called dead lake or stream.

A program of monitoring thirteen streams for water quality in Eastern Newfoundland has been in place since 1977. The acidity of these streams varied, on an average from a pH level of 5.3 to 6.1. While this is not yet critical, it is close to the levels at which

MR. DAWE: fish populations could be threatened and we must, therefore, maintain a very close surveillance.

On the other hand, a study by the Inland Waters Directorate of Environment Canada, conducted this Summer between Goose Bay and Churchill Falls in Labrador, revealed that water acidity in lakes was low with pH in general in the range of 6 to 6.5. However, the capacity of these lakes to resist acidic precipitation was extremely low. Thus, these lakes although presently holding their own, are deemed very sensitive to any future acid precipitation.

My department is fully aware of the problem of acid rain as it confronts our Province. We are a Province of relatively low industrial capacity compared to Ontario and the Northeastern United States. But we are rich in forest resources and abundant in fresh water fisheries, and Government intends that our Province will continue to benefit from these resources. My department will, therefore, be expanding its precipitation monitoring network to give more extensive coverage to both Newfoundland and Labrador. It is also proposing to commence a program to monitor streams and lakes throughout the Province for the purpose of determining if there has yet been any effect on fish populations. These, of course, are long term programs that must be carried out over relatively long periods to produce meaningful results.

Of more immediate concern to me is a United States coal-conversion program that provides

MR. R. DAWE: for conversion of electrical generation plants to coal-fired operation, with the suspicion that insufficient funding may be provided for installation of appropriate control technology on emissions. This involves another country and must be dealt with at federal levels. I have written the federal Environment Minister and, through him, urged the federal government to take a strong and aggressive stand in its negotiations with the United States on the threat this conversion programme could pose for Canada. I am also hoping that there will be no lessening of the emission standards imposed on industry in the manufacturing regions of Central Canada.

Much closer to home, I recently read that the federal government has promised \$175 million over the next four years for "environmentally acceptable conversions" of oil-fired electricity plants on the East Coast to coal. This appears to be a desirable goal from an energy point of view and I further understand that the federal government is currently drafting pollution guidelines to ensure that this project will meet the standards specified in the Clean Air Act. Talks are supposed to begin soon with the provinces on these guidelines.

I am sure the federal government must realize the sensitivity of providing funding for, and thereby encouraging, the conversion of oil-fired plants to coal operation in Canada while, at the same time, expressing concern that our American neighbours to the South are doing the very same thing. Canada must, therefore, be sure that its policies are consistent and ensure that the same environmental controls are expected from Canadian industries and power generation plants in conversion to coal operation as would be expected from those in the United States.

In this latter regard, I am concerned about one such conversion that has recently taken place in Nova Scotia at Lingan on Cape Breton Island. Though the design provided for controls, these, to the best of my knowledge, have

MR. R. DAWE: not been installed and it is my understanding that the Province has been operating the facility without them - and this, I am told, is only the initial phase of what will be a four stage project.

I do not know whether or not there was any federal funding for this project and this is of little concern to me at the moment. Of primary concern, however, is the fact that when completed, a large coal-fired generation station will be operating on Cape Breton Island, very close to Western Newfoundland, with the long term potential of adding to the long range transport of air pollutants that already appear to be increasing the acidity of the rainfall in our Province. I have, therefore, written the Nova Scotia Environment Minister asking for an up to date clarification of this situation and requesting that the whole matter be reviewed at the earliest possible date.

Nova Scotia has always demonstrated considerable concern for long range transport of air pollution and acid rain, and I am cognizant of the fact that the operation of the Lingan project has been extensively monitored. However, though adequate emission controls are admittedly expensive, I find it difficult to comprehend that the Province would proceed with a conversion to coal programme without environmental safeguards being an important part of that programme.

New information on the subject of acid rain and control processes is constantly evolving and I am sure it will be an important subject well into the future.

MR. DAWE: In fact, a senior official of my Department has just attended a seminar in Portland, Maine, that was convened to study the impact on acid rain on Atlantic salmon stocks.

I trust that my statement has served this hon. House about the problem of acid rain, and what is being done about it in this Province. In the interests of all Newfoundlanders, I intend to report to the House on a periodic basis as new developments arise or further information becomes available. In the meantime, hon. members can rest assured that a constant vigilance will be maintained by Government in this important area of concern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the minister, the member for St. Mary's - the Capes (D. Hancock) who is the shadow in this particular area, not being here today, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see that the minister has taken this particular stand as far as acid rain is concerned. Acid rain, I believe, is one of the great issues which is facing industrial nations today. I think it is probably an issue that we will hear more and more about, and it is something that has crept up on us. We, in this part of the country, feel particularly aggrieved because we are not an industrial area and we seem to be getting the fallout from other areas of the country. But it is the - and we are facing a dilemma today in that there is - we are facing the problem of a lack of

MR. HODDER: energy and with the return to coal-fired generation it is becoming a great problem because it interferes with the environment.

It was only this morning that I heard a report - I believe it came from the conference at Portland, Maine-that five salmon rivers in either - I think it was Eastern United States, or Eastern Canada and the United States, which had been identified as having been practically dead, where the salmon are no longer spawning.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there must be stringent regulations. A few years ago, we kept hearing from the polluters, I suppose the industrial polluters, that the cost of the government's regulations on pollution was driving up the cost of their product and was driving them into bankruptcy, but this is the other side of the problem and this is the most serious side of the problem.

I would like, also, as well, to congratulate the environmental officer, the environmental engineer, Brian Power on his appointment. It is always nice to see a Newfoundlander reach prominence and become involved in things of this magnitude.

I would say though, Mr. Speaker, that I brought this matter up a year ago during the sittings of the Social Policy Committee. And why I say that the minister's attitude is gratifying is because at that particular time when I brought the matter up,

MR. HODDER: I was told that we really did not have a problem, that we were monitoring it but did not have a problem, that the federal government were doing some monitoring at that particular time. But I am pleased now that the Province is involved in this as well and that we are cognizant of the magnitude of the problem. Because when I hear the minister say that the waters in our rivers are ten times more acidic than they should be under ideal conditions, I think that this is something that gets to the heart of every Newfoundlander, because we are a sports-minded environment-loving Province and it is something that I and my colleagues on this side of the House regard with a great deal of concern. So we would give the minister every aid and all the help and support from this side of the House in any endeavours that he may undertake to help overcome this particular problem.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a statement concerning government's decision to increase benefits paid to Workers' Compensation recipients.

Effective January 1, 1981, the following increases will become effective: 1) The compensable earnings level will be increased by \$3,000 from \$16,000 to \$19,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: This will mean, depending upon income, workers will be eligible to receive 75 per cent of a maximum of \$19,000 as compensable income.

It is interesting to note that in 1980 the compensable earnings level was raised from \$14,000 to \$16,000. This, coupled with a \$3,000 increase

MR. DINN: in 1981, will show that the government has increased compensable earnings by \$5,000 over a two year period, or an increase of 35 per cent.

The level of \$19,000 will place this Province at almost mid point in relation to compensable earnings ceilings for the twelve Canadian jurisdictions (including the Yukon and Northwest Territories);

- 2) an increase of 10 per cent in permanent total disability and permanent partial disability pensions awarded as a result of accidents occurring before January 1, 1980;
- 3) an increase of 10 per cent in minimum level for temporary total disability and temporary partial disability benefits;
- 4) an increase of 10 per cent in the minimum level for permanent total disability and permanent partial disability benefits;
- 5) an increase from \$650 to \$750 for burial expenses and elimination of the \$200 maximum for transportation of the body;

MR. DINN: (6) An increase from \$330.00 to \$370.00 a month for pensions to a widow or invalid widower. (7) An increase from \$75.00 to \$85.00 a month for dependent children under sixteen (16) years of age. (8) An increase from \$75.00 to \$85.00 a month for orphaned children.

Mr. Speaker the increase in pensions proposed by the board will not cause an increase in industry rates; the extra funding required will be transferred from the board's recapitalization reserve. The 10% increase is intended to help offset the increase in the cost of living.

The increase in compensable earnings level will not cause any increase in rates, however, the actual dollars required from industry will increase proportional to the increase in the maximum compensable level.

It should be noted that maximum disability benefits, either temporary or permanent, remain at 75% to the compensable earnings ceiling.

I would like to touch briefly on other important aspects of the board's activities this year.

One of the more significant accomplishments of the board this year was the agreement reached with the General Hospital Corporation to complete a twenty-two bed wing in the Health Sciences Complex at a cost of \$500,000,00. For some time the Workers' Compensation Board has been experiencing ongoing frustration with admission to hospital for claimants with back ailments, in particular those requiring neurosurgical attention. The Health Sciences Complex is the only hospital in the Province with the capability of handling people requiring neurosurgery. The Complex, however, has been unable to assign sufficient beds

MR. DINN: to accomodate the number of people on the waiting list requiring neurosurgery. The board generally has a waiting list of fifty to sixty people.

In order to resolve this problem government approved a joint proposal by the Workers' Compensation Board and the General Hospital Corporation whereby an eight bed wing will be assigned for the exclusive use of Workers' Compensation Board for neurosurgical and orthopedic care.

With eight beds available to the board on a permanent basis, the number of claimants awaiting admission will be reduced to ten resulting in savings to the board of at least one quarter of a million dollars per year. The board will therefore recover the initial capital outlay over a two year period.

In addition to the dollar cost of having claimants waiting for admission, there is an additional problem of rehabilitating claimants to return to the work force after long waiting periods for medical attention. The social upheaval both to the individual claimant and their families resulting from long waiting periods must be the prime consideration.

In order to expedite claims the board in March of this year acquired the services of a full-time medical officer.

MR. DINN: The medical department of the board is now staffed for the first time by a full-time medical officer as well as two part-time medical officers and secretarial staff.

This addition to the medical department has allowed for faster, more efficient service to claimants.

As part of its programme to regionalize its services, the Board completed staffing of offices in Corner Brook and Grand Falls. These offices will provide full Compensation Board services to their respective regions. The offices are staffed by claims investigators, payroll auditors and rehabilitation counsellors.

The Board has organized and is totally funding a major study for the long term effects of dust conditions in Baie Verte. The study, which is headed by Dr. Harry Edstrom of Memorial University, will cost in the vicinity of \$600,000 and will take approximately ten months to complete.

During the past year the Workers' Compensation Board has acquired its own computer system. Working in co-operation with the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, the system will provide for more efficient administration of all the board's activities.

Mr. Speaker, what I consider to be one of the most progressive pieces of legislation ever passed by this hon. House was proclaimed this year, with the implementation of Workers' Compensation for fishermen.

Every fisherman holding a valid fishing licence is included in this universal coverage, giving fishermen equal coverage with other trades in this Province, protection which the fishermen and their families so well deserve.

MR. DINN: The regulations covering our fishermen were developed in consultation with the fish companies, Fishermen's Union and the Compensation Board.

On November 14th. I announced the appointment of Dr. W.J. May as Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Review Committee. The chairman and four commissioners have been asked to do a thorough assessment of the Workers' Compensation Act in this Province and report to government. The recommendations of the committee will be studied carefully by government, and I would hope to have applicable legislation ready for presentation to the House by the Fall of 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, any kind of legislation, any kind of effort by the government to improve the social, economic and physical well-being of our people will find no lack of support on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: This is the kind of legislation that we like to see coming from the government. This is the kind of legislation indeed that they should be making. Many of the things mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, are long overdue. But that, of course, does not take away from the significance of what we have in front of us here today.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, it took a long time and a lot of effort by a lot of people, a lot of workers in this Province, and particularly members on this side of the House, to convince the government of the necessity of the kinds of initiatives that we heard the minister announce here today.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to at last see the government recognize the kind of financial frustration that a worker experiences when, through accident or

MR. LUSH: injury, that he has to - or she has to cease from their regular employment and live on a substantially reduced salary. It is certainly gratifying to see that now we have the scales changed so that workers so affected will get more compensation. Of course we can say it is not enough, workers can say it is not enough, the question has to be asked, you know, what is enough today when we are faced with rampant inflation? But suffice it to say that it is recognition, it is recognition of the kinds of problems, the kinds of financial problems, the kinds of financial frustrations that these workers have to go through when they are forced to have to do without their regular salary and live on compensation.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased with that and we hope we can see the day when we move from the midpoint in this respect, from the middle, among our Canadian jurisdictions, closer to the top.

MR. T. LUSH: I only wish that we were at the midpoint in other areas. In unemployment, for example, I wish we were at the midpoint there. So it is gratifying to see us moving to the midpoint at least in certain areas. We are pleased too that there is some initiative taken with respect to getting the General Hospital Corporation to complete a twenty-two bed wing of the Health Sciences Complex for workers with back ailments. This again was a major concern of workers throughout the Province, particularly in mining areas, in Buchans. I can recall that complaint coming from there several times. So again it is gratifying to see that this initiative has finally been taken and, hopefully, that people with these problems will shortly find that they can get treatment for these problems.

So, Mr. Speaker, this certainly is good news and, of course, we will have to wait until these facilities are put in place just to see how effective they will be and whether, indeed, they will solve the problem as satisfactorily as we would like to see.

With respect, of course, to the compensation for fishermen, again this is something that members on this side of the House fought for vigorously and, again, I am glad to see that the government have acquiesced to the needs and the demands of the fishermen and have finally come through with this workers' compensation for fishermen. Mr. Speaker, these are good measures and we are pleased to give them our full support.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) is now in his seat. I would advise the hon. member that permission has been granted by the House to allow you to make a statement concerning the incident which occurred on Friday, at which time agreement was also reached that you would then have to leave the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Mr. Speaker, I should start by saying thank you to all members of this hon. House for permitting me the opportunity of giving these brief few words.

On Friday morning past, Mr. Speaker, I was not in this House when a motion was placed before this House to have me expelled from it because I was driving a colleague of mine, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to the airport to catch a plane back to his district for the weekend. My absence from this House, having been explained as merely routine and not deliberate, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I now speak by permission, by the leave of this House rather than by right as a member representing the district of Carbonear. The House has not undone what it did to me and Friday morning. My opinion is that my privileges as an elected member of this House have been apparently irreversibly infringed upon and unless the House is prepared to undo the damage that it has done and to give me back those privileges which were rightly or wrongly denied me, then I have no detailed answer as to the events that transpired that led to my removal from this House. The House has taken its action to give this matter over to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and at that time I will give a detailed answer to it. On the other hand, if this House wishes to give me back my privileges, give back the privileges to me and to the people of Carbonear whom I represent, then I would be only too willing to

MR. R. MOORES:

give a detailed answer. Until then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw from this House and will gladly serve a suspension which I believe has been wrongfully placed upon me and has denied my constituents the right of representation in this House.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I thank the hon. member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements by ministers.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). He was not here when the Premier tabled the bill on the Upper Churchill. One of the main concerns that he expressed when he tabled the bill was the effect on the financial community and the bondholders, and he indicated to the House that he had dispatched the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) to New York to allay any fears. I wonder if the Minister of Finance is now in a position to report to the House on his meetings with the bondholders and the financial people?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. members of the House had available to them this particular publication, this particular document, which is really a memorandum prepared by the Department of Finance in association with others, including Newfoundland Hydro, and the purpose of the memorandum was to lay out not only the details of the Act which the hon. Premier indicated would be debated in this House but also to lay out the reason why government felt that it had to go this route and felt that this was the best route to pursue at this particular time

DR. J. COLLINS: in regard to achieving our rights for the Upper Churchill electrical generation source.

We were quite aware that there might be misgivings about this, in financial circles in particular. We felt that once the situation was clearly laid out, that our case was not misunderstood in any way, that those misgivings could be allayed and that was the reason for the delegation going to New York. We saw, in New York, the two main credit rating agencies, Standard and Poor, and Moody's, and discussed in detail with individuals in those two agencies who are particularly involved with credit rating in Canada, including the credit rating given to this Province. In addition to that we saw the top officers in certain insurance companies who hold the majority of the shares in CFLCo, that is, Prudential Life Insurance Company, Metropolitan and Equity Life.

I can tell this hon. House and specifically the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. L. Stirling), that our memorandum was received coolly. Our explanation, I think, was quite understood by those we saw. We saw no evidence of undue surprise or shock or dismay - anything of that order. It was indicated to us, of course, that this was a move that they had not immediately expected although it was not, if I may put it this way - it may sound a little Irish to put it this way, I suppose - it was not, in their view, an unexpected move. What I mean by that is that this was not an option that they had not considered, it was available to the Province, but that they had not actually, immediately, been expecting it. However, they also indicated that they would clearly like to hear the other side of the question, i.e., the side that might be put forward by Hydro Quebec, before coming to any definitive statement or any definitive decision in their own minds on things. But I feel I can quite clearly say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we came away in each instance, in every interview we had, we

DR. COLLINS:

came away very encouraged that our position was understood, that it was understood by those individuals that we were taking responsible action. We gave them the assurance that if any further information was needed in the future, either as a result of their consideration of this memo or as a result of any information they got from other sources, that not only would we be available to go back there and have further discussions with them, but we would entertain visitations from them or we would supply them with any documentation that they felt was necessary.

So as a result of the visit there, we felt that we are not in any risk at this point in time of any undue action to be taken by the financial people in New York, and we feel that our case is clearly understood and we have no indication that there was any dismay or shock or anything in that order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: You anticipate me, Mr. Speaker. I do have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Have we now, in fact - one of the assurances made by the Premier in the documentation you refer to, one of the assurances was that the bondholders or anybody involved with CFLCo would be compensated. - have we now made financial arrangements with these same people to arrange the financing that will be necessary in order to pay off those bondholders?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear

DR. COLLINS: the actual statement given by the hon. the Premier, obviously, but I feel sure that he included in it the point that when this act is passed, or if this act is passed by the House, and we anticipate it will be, but when this act is passed it will not be proclaimed immediately, it will be referred, in the first instance, to the Court of Appeal in Newfoundland and following that it likely will be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, or if it is not referred there to make absolutely clear that we have jurisdiction to pass such an act, that the Government of Newfoundland, the government of this Province, would see that it is referred there. Now it is anticipated that that will take a period of time, not a short period of time, I am not certain how long it will be but not a short period of time, an appreciable period of time, and that during that period the act will not be in force

We told the people in New York that during that ample period of time we will put in place the funds, we will arrange to have the funds available to pay off any bondholders who will seek cash payment for the bonds they hold.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I take it from what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has just said that in actual fact this financing has not yet been arranged and that it certainly has not been arranged with the existing bondholders. Now, the impression I had was that the existing bondholders

MR. STIRLING: were involved in a re-financing. Are you saying that financing has not been arranged at this stage?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, there would be no need to have financing arranged at this stage. The act has not even begun to be debated by this House. It certainly has not been debated by this House. It certainly has not been adjudicated by the various courts that I mentioned and it is quite a bit down the road before all that process is gone through. The bondholders and the financial managers and so on, did not concentrate on that aspect of things with us. They understand that borrowings are done usually when the need is imminent, when the need is in clear view and the need for the amount of money that will be required to retire these bonds is not imminent at this time but none raised any particular concern that the Province could not achieve this end.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Just to be absolutely clear, I had the impression that part of the homework that was done on this whole thing was that this had been squared with the bondholders, that the bondholders had been assured that the financing was available and that they did not have to be concerned about any loss. Now, are you not concerned that Quebec Hydro, based on the statement you made today, Quebec Hydro will be able to go down to - because this government has a record going back to the

MR. STIRLING: , last time, in '73 - '74, when
in actual fact financing did become a problem, a major
problem - are you not afraid that Quebec Hydro will be
able to take the position that in actual fact, except for

MR. STIRLING: bringing in a piece of paper in the Legislature, you have not actually got any commitments from the financing people in place to be able to assure those bondholders? Are you not concerned that Quebec Hydro will be able to use that against you?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to raise the funds that we might need for this purpose from Quebec Hydro, we are going to raise the funds we might need from the financial markets in the United States. We visited certain of those people involved in such markets, in particular the credit rating agencies, and, as I pointed out, there was no dismay, there was no shock, there was no difficulty with our case raised by these individuals. And I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition would expect us to have the numbers of - it will go into hundreds of millions of dollars - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would not expect us to have hundreds of millions of dollars, at this point in time, lying around in some fashion or form waiting for something that will be required perhaps up to two years down the road.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Did the Minister of Finance raise with these same bondholders whether or not, in fact, they would be prepared to exchange the existing bonds and participate in the new financing? Was that discussed with these same bondholders?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in our memorandum, and I believe it would have also been in the hon. the Premier's statement, that option is open to the bondholders. We felt that we wanted to give them the total reassurance

DR. COLLINS: that they could convert their bonds into cash if they so desired. And that, of course, would be the maximum reassurance. But we indicated to them that the option would be open to them to realize on their bond holdings in some other way. Whether that be in terms of rolling over those bonds into other bonds, that clearly is something for them to decide. The message we wanted to get across to them was that they would be able to surrender their bonds for their cash value, that is the cash value plus any premiums or any accrued interest that was owing on them.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. The minister never ceases to amaze me with statements that he makes outside the House that seem to baffle me as well as a lot of other Newfoundlanders. The one that I am referring to now that the hon. gentleman made was in connection with the nationalization of the Churchill Falls Corporation. The hon. gentleman - at least I got the impression from what he said in his public statement that the government had to nationalize Churchill Falls Corporation in order to repeal, to cancel out the water rights to Churchill Falls Corporation. Now, did the hon. gentleman make that statement? And if he did, can he justify it to this House?

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

MR. L. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker, I never made that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, then, I would gather from the hon. gentleman it was not necessary to nationalize the Churchill Falls Corporation to do what the government is going to do now? It was not necessary to nationalize

MR. S. NEARY: the Churchill Falls Corporation.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Do you want an answer to that question?

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, I want an answer.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the nationalization, as the hon. member calls it, of CFLCo., I presume he refers to the purchase by the Government of Newfoundland of the two-thirds shares then owned by BRINCO in CFLCo. This was a historic milestone, Mr. Speaker, for the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. BARRY: By doing that, Mr. Speaker, we removed what the previous administration had permitted to be a barrier between this Province and the Province of Quebec in attempting to negotiate a better deal with the Upper Churchill contract. Up to then it had been necessary to go through a private corporation, a corporation controlled by a multi-national and a foreign controlled multi-national, Mr. Speaker. We permitted the Province of Newfoundland to get nose to nose, face to face, chin to chin with the Government of Quebec

MR. L. BARRY:

and, Mr. Speaker, this was the only responsible thing to do. Because until we did that, we could never have determined that it would be necessary to take the step that we are taking here today, we could never establish, Mr. Speaker, that some accomodation would not be necessary with the Government of Quebec.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is questioning whether the \$160 million spent for the shares of CFLCo was a bad investment, I would ask him to do his sums and figure out what the total value of that electricity flowing to the Province of Newfoundland is every year. And every year, Mr. Speaker, the value of that electricity is close to four times the price paid for the Churchill Falls shares. In addition, Mr. Speaker, to getting the shares in CFLCo, the Government of Newfoundland re-purchased the water rights for the Lower Churchill River, the Gull Island site, the Muskrat Falls site and other rivers in Labrador, water rights, Mr. Speaker, that are the equivalent of another Upper Churchill. There are in access of 4,000 megawatts from these other rivers, Mr. Speaker, and that was included in the \$160 million; a portion of that was allocated to the purchase of the water rights then remaining in other rivers in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member questions the validity of that, when you look at the numbers of millions of barrels of oil equivalent available from those rivers with oil at forty dollars a barrel, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the better deals that this government made. Unfortunately, it had to be a buying back of something given by an administration that the hon. member had supported and that is the sad part about it. That is the sad part about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY:

But, Mr. Speaker, specifically this government could have - yes, could have in 1972 -

MR. S. NEARY:

Do what they are doing now.

MR. L. BARRY:

In 1972, Mr. Speaker, this government could have brought in the legislation that is being brought in before the House in this session -

MR. S. NEARY:

Without nationalization.

MR. L. BARRY:

- but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if it had been done in 1972, it would have been viewed upon as an irresponsible Act whereas today, after seven to eight years of bona fide hard work being put into an attempt to negotiate a settlement with the Government of Quebec, whereas today when we can show the financial community not just of Canada but of the world that we are being ripped off to the tune of \$550 million to \$600 million a year, Today, Mr. Speaker, we can take this action and it is not viewed as irresponsible, it is viewed as-people are saying it is definitely justified in view of that. Even, Mr. Speaker, a former Premier who belongs to the hon. member's party, the same political persuasion, that man himself is saying that such a lopsided deal as this is now today warrants the action that this government is taking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, now that is what I meant when I said earlier about the hon. minister making statements that baffle people. Now he is admitting that it was not necessary to nationalize Churchill Falls in order to bring in -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) did not say that.

MR. S. NEARY:

Well, that is what the hon. gentleman said. Now, what I want to know is how much did that gigantic blunder cost the taxpayers of this Province? Could the minister give us some idea of how much the nationalization of Churchill Falls, which was unnecessary, how much it cost, what interest we are paying on that per annum and are we collecting enough revenue to pay the interest and the principle?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I start off again by contradicting the hon. member when he says it was not necessary. It was absolutely necessary and essential.

MR. S. NEARY: For what? Why was it necessary?

MR. L. BARRY: (a) To put the government in a position to deal directly with the Government of Quebec so we could establish totally, totally -

MR. S. NEARY: Nonsense.

MR. L. BARRY: - what the position of that government was and so that we would be able to satisfy not just the people of this Province but the people of Canada and of the financial world that the Government of Quebec was not prepared to do a deal that would be fairer than the deal entered into by the party opposite when it formed the government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, give me the information, how much?

MR. L. BARRY: Again, my recollection - I think the hon. member knows and it can be checked - I believe, that the amount paid for the shares was \$160 million which again included, Mr. Speaker, the water rights with respect to the rest of Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it should not be forgotten that we would not, by this legislation, be able to acquire the water rights in the other rivers of Labrador and on the Lower Churchill River. We could have acquired the water rights to the Upper Churchill by this legislation but if for no other reason, that previous decision can be justified, again unfortunately, that we had to do it to buy back something that had been given away. But it was justified -

MR. S. NEARY: We did not buy back anything, we bought back nothing.

MR. L. BARRY: - Mr. Speaker, just in acquiring the water rights.

MR. S. NEARY: We could have repealed that in this House. What this House does it can undo.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there would have been no reason for repealing the grant of water rights with respect to other rivers in Labrador -

MR. S. NEARY: How much? Give me the figures, how much?

MR. L. BARRY: - there would have been no reason, Mr. Speaker, because then we would be taking something from a shareholder or from a company and the shareholders would have had to be compensated.

MR. S. NEARY: I see, They do not have to be compensated now.

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, here we have provided compensation in our legislation for the shareholders for any reduction in the value of their shares but the amount paid will revert back two-thirds to the Province because we are two-thirds shareholders of CFLCo. Now, I do not know what you are asking, how much -

MR. S. NEARY: How much has it cost us to date for that nationalization?

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to - whatever the interest rate has been, I suppose, if you want to look upon it - there are two ways economists tend to look upon these things, Mr. Speaker, they either treat them as fixed costs or they attempt to artificially escalate them, based on the interest rates that have accrued from year to year and what you figure you could have invested your money on since 1972. So, Mr. Speaker, we could spend, I guess, a lot of time debating how we arrive at a final figure. The amount was \$160 million back in the early '70s which included not just the shares of CFLCo, it included the water rights, which had been given away, to all of Labrador. Shame!

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, undertake to get me the figures? Would the hon. gentleman get me these figures or get them for the House?

MR. L. BARRY: Which figures?

MR. S. NEARY: I would like to, first of all, find out, the original loan that was borrowed to nationalize Churchill Falls Corporation, how much it has cost the taxpayers since then? How much is involved in interest and principle since the government nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation to date? Would the hon. gentleman get me these figures?

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. S. NEARY: Wait now, hold on -

MR. L. BARRY: Are you finished?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe it is fair to say that this can continue all day and I am sure other members might want to ask questions. If the hon. member would like to put his question then the minister could answer it; that would be the appropriate way.

MR. S. NEARY: My only question to the minister is, if he agrees to get me these figures and I would like to have the figures, would the hon. gentleman tell us now what the government intends to do with the 4,500 megawatts, I think it is, of the Upper Churchill power? If this deal goes through, if the legislation is passed in the House and the court rules that the House has the jurisdiction, what will the government do with the power on the Upper Churchill? Do they have customers for it? Will it just sit there? How will the government generate revenue to borrow money on that power if it is not being generated?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will get the hon. member

MR. L. BARRY: the exact amount that was paid out for the CFLCo shares. The hon. member is going to have to do other calculations himself, it depends upon what interest rates -

MR. S. NEARY: No, I want the Finance Department to do it for me.

MR. L. BARRY: You want the Finance Department to do what? I mean, you have got to - it depends on what assumptions you make in terms of -

MR. S. NEARY: I want to know the exact amount involved -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I am afraid I must interrupt again. The hon. member has asked a question, the hon. minister perhaps should give an answer.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will get the hon. member the exact amount paid out for the shares and, I mean, he can -

MR. S. NEARY: No, no, I want the total cost.

MR. L. BARRY: Interest rates are public information, do we have to do his homework for him?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: I want the total cost of nationalizing Churchill Falls.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the hon. member please to refrain. I will allow the hon. minister an opportunity to answer the question that he put to him otherwise we will never hear the answer.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there has not been a question asked in this House that has not been answered fully, totally and completely by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: Full, and open disclosure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: But Mr. Speaker, there comes a point in time when hon. members then ask you to do their homework for them in trying to work out - interest rates are public information. You can do your own figures, arrive at your own conclusions.

MR. MORGAN: He cannot do that. He is not capable of doing that.

MR. BARRY: Obtain them and if you can add you can do your figures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the second- what was the second part of that question? What are we going to do with the electric power? Mr. Speaker, our main objective is to meet Newfoundland's energy needs and to do that we need, immediately within the next year or so, to see the - well, we need by 1984-85, 800 megawatts. To get that 800 megawatts from Muskrat Falls - well, we will only get 600 from that site, but we could then recall the 175 we are still entitled to recall from the Upper Churchill. The generation at Muskrat itself would cost in the area of \$1.6 billion, \$1.6 billion. We would then, have to pay for the transmission line, the Strait of Belle Isle crossing. That will have to be paid for in any event if we bring the power down from the Upper Churchill.

But consider, Mr. Speaker, the \$1.6 billion that it would cost us to generate 600 megawatts at Muskrat Falls, and compare what at worst we would have to do which would be to pay off, say, the \$600,000,000 to the bondholders for the Upper Churchill contract, and you can see, Mr. Speaker, that even if the remaining 4,425 megawatts flowed to the sea and we just took 800 megawatts

MR. BARRY: from the Upper Churchill, we would be close to a billion dollars in by getting our 800 megawatts from the Upper Churchill project.

MR. NEARY: You have no customer there.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, let me finish. However, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared, if the Province of Quebec should wish to re-negotiate a purchase, we are prepared to sell them some power but we are not doing this emotionally, in a punitive fashion -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - we are doing this, Mr. Speaker, to look out for Newfoundland's energy needs. We also, however, Mr. Speaker, if the Province of Quebec should decide it did not want to re-negotiate, we have kept active and full contact with aluminum companies, aluminum companies who would be interested in purchasing power in this Province, particularly four mil power, Four mil power, Mr. Speaker! We have also, Mr. Speaker, the expectation that the Federal Government will enable this Province as of right to have energy transmitted from Labrador to the Maritime Provinces, to the United States or wherever the markets might be, our constitutional right, to have energy transmitted across Canada in the same way that oil and gas are transmitted across Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, they will be lining up at our doors, lining up at our doors to get access to that four mil power and we will have no problem reselling it in the event that our neighbour, Quebec, decides it does not want to enter into friendly negotiations to repurchase any part of that power.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) your logic.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! I think it is fair to say that the answers have been somewhat lengthy, but it is also fair to say that the questions, perhaps,

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) led to lengthy answers, and members may want to consider that in formulating their questions. The next time it might be more appropriate to put some of them on the Order Paper. In any event, I understand from indications from members on my right that there are others who wish to ask questions. There are a couple of minutes left. Anybody remaining? The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) whose department has taken over the responsibility for the Department of Consumer Affairs. In August of 1980, the petroleum product prices in Newfoundland and Labrador tabled its report, and in this report it pointed out the large discrepancy in prices paid for oil and gas in this Province, and that consumers down on the coast of Labrador are the ones who are paying higher prices than any other consumers in this Province. One of the recommendations from this report was that a further report would be done to find out why these prices are - why the people on the Labrador coast have to pay more for oil and gas and other products on the coast. Could the minister inform me if this study is now in the process of being done and when can we expect a report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, as the hon. member knows, with reports is that they frequently come back and recommend further studies, further reports and obviously these things can continue on forever. The hon. member will probably recall that a few weeks ago, I believe it was, the Premier stated that there would be some form of enquiry into varying costs for food products in different parts of the Province. The nature or structure, if one wishes, of that enquiry has not, you know, been determined or decided upon. But among the possibilities, certainly, would be an enquiry which would embrace both aspects, that of differentials in petroleum costs and food. Obviously it could not be an unending list because the process would go on forever. But in terms of - I mean, those are two very essential areas to residents of Labrador and Newfoundland, the Island part of the Province, everywhere. So it is certainly conceivable, and it may well be logical and a good idea, to combine those into an enquiry. And that has not been finally decided but it is certainly a possibility. And that is why no final decision has been made until we are in a position to see whether it would be practical and sensible to combine those two aspects into one enquiry including communities in Labrador but not limited, perhaps, to communities in Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Are there any Reports by Standing and Special Committees?

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, as directed by Section 19 (4) of the Act To Provide For The Administration Of Certain Facilities Constructed For The Canada Summer Games, I now lay before the House of Assembly the financial statement report for the year ended March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Any further reports?

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I am sorry. Notices of Motion?

The hon. Minister of Justice

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, no

MR. SPEAKER: No.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Repeal Of The Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation Limited (Lease) Act, 1961 And The Lease And Amendments Thereto Executed Under That Act And The Reversion To The Province Of The Rights And Liberties Leased Or Granted To The Lessee Under The Lease," carried. (Bill No. 85).

On motion, Bill No. 85 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1, at the adjournment of the House on Friday we were debating the amendment as proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and I believe the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) had about eighteen minutes remaining. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I read the papers over the weekend to see if I could find out where I had left off speaking so that I could give continuity to the remarks which I was making, of course, and found out that the most quoted part of my speech was my resignation and lo and behold the news media almost had a job for me in the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, speaking to that I just would like to say that I think my response would be similiar to the one that Mark Twain gave when he was visiting London and was told that the newspapers in the United States had given reports about his death; and he wired the editors of the newspapers

MR. LUSH: concerned and told them that the reports concerning his death were grossly exaggerated I would say the same thing, Mr. Speaker, about reports regarding my resignation. I have one job, Mr. Speaker, and that is the job that is present that was given me by the people of the district of Terra Nova. I have no other jobs offers. I do not know if the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) does intend giving me some job of authority. If she does I may have to consider taking it because then hon. members on both sides of the House could be assured of at least one department in this Province being run efficiently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And I may have to think about some major position

MR. T. LUSH:

like that. But, Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that I am still the member for Terra Nova. That is the only job I have and when I decide to make any other decision one, the Leader of the Opposition will be the first to know and, secondly, the people of the district of Terra Nova. And, so, Mr. Speaker, we will put that to rest for awhile and carry on with my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I thought that it was a waste of time to be discussing the present resolution before the House of Commons, to patriate the Canadian constitution, I thought it was a waste of time along the lines and in the direction that the Premier had caused this debate to go. That is not to say that discussing the constitution per se, or the resolution to patriate the constitution is a waste of time, what is a waste of time is to discuss it in the style and along the contents that the Premier has established. Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to ask what gave rise - what were the circumstances that gave rise to this particular amendment that the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, has put before members of this honourable House? Mr. Speaker, the circumstances were these: The Premier in his television debate of October 20th, I think, his television appearance of October 20th, attempted to tell the people of this Province about the proposed resolution to patriate the Canadian constitution. The Premier told the people that he was extremely concerned about what could happen if this constitution, if the constitution were patriated under the Federal Government proposal. He was concerned about sacred rights. The Premier identified those sacred rights, the Premier clearly accentuated these sacred rights, the Premier clearly emphasized these sacred rights, and, Mr. Speaker, he named three sacred rights, three sacred rights. One, of course, was the fact that if this proposed resolution went through our system of education was threatened, number one. Sacred right number one. Sacred right number two was that the Labrador boundary

MR. T. LUSH: was in danger of being wiped out. Sacred right number three was a rather peculiar one, Mr. Speaker, it is a rather peculiar one. Sacred right number three had to do with our natural resources, had to do with our natural resources but listen to the way, listen to the way it was worded, listen to the contents surrounding this particular right. 'A third sacred right' says the Premier, 'has to do with our natural resources those that are undisputed provincial resources now. Trees, minerals above the salt water, Up to now these could not be taken from us without our consent. Under these proposals it is possible for them to be taken from us without our consent, Under these proposals it is possible for them to be taken away without our consent. Not only is it possible for our iron ore in Labrador to be taken from us by a border change, but also by a national referendum if the Federal Government so desires'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a significant reference. Our natural resources. Now, what the Premier is saying, he is only concerned about those natural resources in Labrador? Why did the Premier mention specifically the resources in Labrador? Why did the Premier mention only education and the Labrador boundary? I would take it from this that we are still only talking about two sacred rights, because the third incorporates the Labrador boundary and, of course, if the Labrador boundary is taken care of so are the natural resources in Labrador.

MR. T. LUSH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the question must be asked why the Premier referred only to these two areas, to these two politically and historically sensitive rights. Why did the Premier only refer to these two rights? Why only these two out of the Terms of Union? I finished by asking hon. members did they know the significance of the Premier's resolution when he talked about guarding, securing and enshrining the rights, our sacred rights in the Terms of Union? There were fifty of them, Mr. Speaker, fifty of them. Now, why did the Premier only identify term two and term seventeen having to do with our denominational system of education and the Labrador boundary? Why were these two the only two that were emphasized? Why did the Premier not talk about, for example the right that allowed us to carry on making margarine? You know, that was a special right, to allow us to make margarine. Why did the Premier not talk about that one? Why did the Premier not talk about the right that allows us to use our trademark for manufacturing things? Why did the Premier not use that? Why did the Premier not talk about our financial structure, the financial arrangements with Ottawa? Why did he not talk about that? Why did the Premier not talk about the tax structure? Why did the Premier not talk about the rights guaranteeing workers UIC benefits?

No, Mr. Speaker, none of these were mentioned, it was the two sacred rights of the denominational education and the Labrador boundary. Why, Mr. Speaker, why? Well, the Premier generated a lot of excitement and a lot of concern and a lot of fear in the Newfoundland people. Naturally, the Newfoundland people were concerned about our system of education, they were concerned about the Labrador boundary.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House were concerned too. We were concerned and that is why we brought in the amendment that we did, we want to ensure that these two sacred rights cannot be changed without the consent of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, why? I find it baffling why, after that great speech by the Premier pointing out his concerns in these two areas, why, when the Opposition brings in an amendment that specifies, that accentuates, that identifies in unmistakable terms these two areas, why the Premier rejects this particular amendment. Mr. Speaker, certainly the people of Newfoundland have to question the sincerity of the Premier, They have to question, number one, why he raised it in the first place and, number two, why he is not voting for that amendment in this particular session right now. It is a strange set of circumstances, Mr. Speaker. It is an anomaly, this is what it is, of the highest order, to find the Premier out around the Province of Newfoundland and on the Mainland going around, Mr. Speaker, in a verbal battle, in a confrontation with Ottawa and almost in a fury telling the people of Canada that our sacred rights are going to be taken away. and we here in this House bring in a measure that is going to protect these two sacred rights and the Premier rejects it outright. Rejects it outright, Mr. Speaker! I do not know the Premier can justify this to the people of this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, after having done that, after having aroused the fears of Newfoundlanders, after having appealed, Mr. Speaker, to our base banal and insipid instincts, the Premier sets up a process where he is going to solicit the support of Newfoundlanders. He says, Mr. Speaker, 'Tomorrow I will inform the leaders of both political parties that the Newfoundland Government cannot accept the

MR. T. LUSH: present proposals of the Trudeau Government. I will invite the various leaders of the Province to be briefed by the government. These will include church leaders, the Federation of Labour, the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the Rural Development Councils and the leaders of many provincial organizations.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, such an insidious and invidious propaganda campaign has never been witnessed in this Province, what has gone on since that particular speech -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: - trying to solicit the support of Rural Development Associations, government-funded associations, municipalities.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I find it a real joke to pick up the paper, to pick up the paper every day and find the press reports from some PC organization supporting the Premier, supporting the Premier. Mr. Speaker, what a lot of unmitigated twaddle; The PC Association supporting the Premier, the PC Association from Bonavista North, the PC Association from Twillingate. Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it has all been orchestrated. We are going to hear from all fifty-two of them, and this is going to be taken by the people of Newfoundland as great support for the Premier. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the kind of technique, if that is the kind of tactic that this hon. member has got to dip to to get support from the people of this Province on an emotional and sensitive issue like that, it will never be done! It will never be done!

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: I would not doubt, Mr. Speaker, but there has been some arm-twisting with the - what do we call the Federation?-the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities. I think they tried to pass a resolution in their annual convention and they could not get it through, but now there is a letter coming out from the President asking for his support. He is saying that he shares the same concerns as the Premier and, again, we are getting a little - we are getting gradually announcements from the various municipalities that they are supporting the Premier. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of insidious and invidious propoganda campaign that is going on. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, should have, should have, certainly, provided a channel for discussion of this constitutional debate, certainly, but, Mr. Speaker, the channel should have been set up to inform and enlighten our people, not to indoctrinate them, not to brainwash them, but, Mr. Speaker, channels of

MR. LUSH: communication throughout the Province so that people could be informed what this constitutional debate is all about. I would venture to say there are hon. members opposite as well as there are hon. members here on this side that do not understand the complexities of what we are into. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is going around the Province prattling and sabre rattling, trying to indoctrinate and trying to brainwash the people to accept his own political, partisan views -

MR. NEARY: Right. Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - of what this constitution is all about. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a part of that insidious and invidious propoganda campaign is a brochure that was sent out. Do I have a copy of it? Mr. Speaker, everybody should be familiar with it, everybody got a copy, this blue brochure. Where is it? Where is it? I wanted it, Mr. Speaker, and I want it but I cannot find it. Well, Mr. Speaker, somebody came and took it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, this blue - here we have it - here is the one, Mr. Speaker - unmistakable, Mr. Speaker, in what it tells the people of this Province. The Constitution Act 1980 - no more guarantees, Mr. Speaker, no more guarantees, and here are the Terms of Union hatched, gone, wiped out, one fell swoop, Mr. Speaker. What a piece of deception! Who wrote it, Mr. Speaker, and who designed it? It looks like the work of an ignoramus, an ignoramus ignorant of the facts, an ignoramus trying to deceive because, Mr. Speaker, this is what it does. This is what it does. It is the biggest piece of deception, Mr. Speaker, that I have ever seen - no more guarantees. What does it say, Mr. Speaker? It talks about what the Federal Government is doing, the constitutional change, it

MR. LUSH: talks about what they are trying to do, trying to patriate the constitution. Now it goes on to say, "Does this really mean our boundaries can be changed?" - yes. "What about our educational system?" - yes. "What about our offshore oil and gas jobs?" Now, Mr. Speaker, a deliberate attempt to mix up, to mix in our sacred rights with political issues, a deliberate attempt, Mr. Speaker, to try and play on people's ignorance that offshore oil and gas, that shared jurisdiction of the fishery, that the transmission of the hydro power across Quebec, that these too, are meant to be sacred rights. That is the intent, Mr. Speaker, that is the intent. Now, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to separate these two issues. We wanted to separate the sacred rights from the political issues. Now with respect to the political issues we have, in each of these named by the Premier from time to time, given our support. We have given our support on fisheries policies. There was a motion put before the House last Spring that we supported. Now on the shared jurisdiction we are waiting for the government to tell us what they mean by shared jurisdiction. We have not been given their

MR. LUSH: interpretation of what they mean by it. Let them tell us. We have given our support on the ownership of the offshore oil. We have given our support on the transmission of hydro across the other provinces. We have given that permission. But, Mr. Speaker, let us clean up this, let us first of all allay the fears of the people of Newfoundland, let us put them aside and say all of us together believe in enshrining our sacred rights, enshrining these two sacred rights continually enunciated and articulated and accentuated by the Premier of this Province, namely, demoninational education and the Labrador boundary.

WARREN: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is running out and I would like to carry on but I would just like in conclusion -

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. LUSH: - I would just like in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to summarize the great emotional ending by the Premier. I am not sure that Tennyson would have appreciated the context in which it was used. I am not sure he would. It says, "Though much is taken must abides". Well, Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Premier I did not know what was left only the P.C. Party. That is all I thought was left. That is all I thought was left. And though, Mr. Speaker, it says, "We are not now what we once were", well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are now what we once were and that we are much more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that on ⁷this amendment we have the chance to show the kind of productive Newfoundlanders that we are. I believe that we can demonstrate here in a spirit of determination and co-operation that we all believe in Newfoundland and that we believe in these

MR. LUSH: two sacred rights. Mr. Speaker, I think the more appropriate ending for the Premier to that poem was, 'Tis not too late to make a new beginning . Here lies the port and the vessel puffs her sails', Mr. Speaker, it is ready for us to find new worlds not to be engaging in emotional discussions, not to be raising the fears of the people of this Province but getting together, Mr. Speaker, getting together as the strong-willed Newfoundlanders we are, and the courageous Newfoundlanders that we are, to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard all the debate that has gone on. I hope I do not cover points that my colleagues on this side of the House have already covered and points raised in this amendment that have been totally demolished already as I am sure some of them have. But, if so I apologize for so doing but I would like to get my demolition in also if I may. Now we are talking about an amendment to the resolution and I would like to just go through the amendments one by one to see if one can agree with it.

The first part says that the Parliament of Canada is now considering a resolution concerning the Constitution of Canada. I think we can all agree with that. I think that this amendment is correct in that regard and I commend the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) for getting in that sentence. That is a correct sentence. He can rest assured that we will support the point that the Parliament of Canada is considering the resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: Normally they do not understand.

DR. COLLINS: It is a penetrating observation. I think that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is to be commended for keeping a close eye on the papers, for understanding the

DR. COLLINS: issues that are being presented to the Canadian people and taking such a true and absolute meaning out of what is going on in this country. I think he is to be congratulated.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, the second paragraph says, "AND WHEREAS concerns have been expressed that under the terms of the resolution", and so on and so forth. Now, I would just like to look at that 'concerns'. We have certainly said on this side that we are concerned about this resolution that is before the House of Commons in Ottawa. But are we alone in saying that we are concerned? I do not think we are, Mr. Speaker. I do not even think that non-political groups have expressed their concern, not only non-political groups, certain other political groups have also expressed concern. And I seem to remember that certain Liberal members, certain members of the Liberal Party and members of the Liberal Party that are sitting in Ottawa have expressed concern and doubt and wonderment about the implications of this resolution before the House of Commons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that in looking at that whole paragraph there, why is that paragraph in there? Surely that must mean, if hon. members opposite - and I congratulate them for this too and I commend them for it - surely the reason why that is in there is there is some doubt in their minds about this resolution. Surely they would not have put in that paragraph if they had no concern about it, if it was self-evident that the resolution in the House of Commons was quite straightforward, not going to cause any difficulty to this Province. The fact that they feel they have to put

DR. COLLINS:

a paragraph in there to bring this point out, shows that they know there is some uncertainty about it, that they are uncertain about the effect of the resolution before the House of Commons, otherwise it would be foolish to have that paragraph in there. You do not put something in unless you want to resolve it. So there is doubt about what this resolution in the House of Commons will do to this Province and I commend the hon. members opposite for agreeing to that fact by having this paragraph in there. Now, if we go to the third paragraph it says that "whereas the Government of Canada has stated their policy that such a result is neither intended or desired by them." Now, there is a certain amount of doubt in the Opposition's mind as I mentioned but I think that we can now say there is confusion in their minds also. They are confusing the issue here. They are saying it is all right for the Federal Government to bring in a resolution as long as somewhere in the back of their minds they do not intend to do anything about it. Bring in any sort of resolution and they have all sorts of implications outlined, but remember, they are not intending to bring it in. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where the Opposition are totally and utterly confused or if they are not confused, at least they are merely following a party line. The point is not whether they intend or not, the point is that as our Terms of Union are presently part of the Canadian Constitution - when we entered into confederation our Terms of Union became part of the BNA Act and hence part of the Canadian Constitution. As things presently stand, those Terms of Union cannot be changed, cannot be changed in one comma, semicolon, jot or a tittle as my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) likes to say, they cannot be changed one

DR. COLLINS:

iota without our consent.

They are inviolate, they are sacrosanct unless we ourselves say to the Federal Government, 'You want a change, or we want a change, we both agree, therefore, we will change'. Now, under the resolution as before the House of Commons that is out the window. By the way that the constitution can be changed we have no further that guarantee. At one time-as it is now it is not possible to change our Terms of Union without our agreement. If this thing goes through it is possible to change our Terms of Union without our agreement. That is the point, intention does not matter one iota. Now, just let me perhaps point that out. Supposing our negotiators at the time of the union, at the time when we were negotiating union, went to Ottawa and they hammered out terms and they got down and everything looked pretty good, and then at the last moment someone from the other side, someone from Canada as it was then, and we were not part of it, someone said "Oh, look, we have a good agreement here, we are quite happy with it, but I would like you to remember one thing now, I would like you to remember that we can change this unilaterally, we have a mechanism where what we have evolved here can be changed over night but do not be afraid, we are not going to do it, that is okay". Now, do you think that our negotiators would ever enter into Terms of Union on that basis? I mean, if they did they would not only be crazy and cracked but they would be in danger of being lynched when they got home. When they were sent up there, they were told 'Put in Terms of Union that will be indelibly written, that they will never be changed without our consent. Do not say that you have put something in place, it is great, and they agree with it but they can change it at any time they want to and we cannot say anything about it, but nevertheless they do not intend to do it! So the point here is that there is some radical

DR. COLLINS : change which can be brought in. In other words, as things are now our Terms of Union cannot be changed without our consent. If this thing goes through, they can be changed without our consent and that is one of the major objections this government has with the Federal proposal and something that apparently our friends opposite really do not understand.

MR. MARSHALL: Or do not care about.

DR. COLLINS: Or do not care about. Now, Mr. Speaker, just let us go to the first part of the resolution itself. It says " BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED ~~that~~ this House requires and requests that the Parliament of Canada take such steps as is necessary to amend the resolution to ensure that the Constitution of Canada contains provisions adequate to ensure territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador and the denominational education system" and so on. Now, it just says on the side - I am sure the hon. member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) did not mean to say, when he was talking about these, that by putting those in the proposal put forward in our objections to the constitution

DR. J. COLLINS:

that the Premier was appealing to a base, and insipid instinct in our people. I do not think that when we are talking about our territorial boundaries, or when we are talking about the form of education that we as a provincial people decide at this point in time we want, that these are base and insipid. I think that the territorial boundaries, an attitude towards that is not base and insipid. I do not think he meant it that way but that is the way it came out. Now, in any case, Mr. Speaker, the point should be made here that it really is not an argument to say that we should not have comments in there about the integrity of the boundary, about denominational education, we should not have those in there, we should have something in there about margarine. That is what the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) suggested, that we should say that we object to the proposals put forward by the federal government on the basis that this might change the right for us to have our own type of margarine. Now that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: Now you cannot seriously entertain that. The point is that it is difficult to bring out to the average person what constitutional change means. Really the constitution is rather obscure and is rather difficult for the average person to understand. And I think we have evidence across the floor here that even when you are really into it you still can be very confused and misled by it. And what the Premier was doing in citing these two examples was to bring it out four square, to bring it to the front of peoples' minds because they can readily identify with our borders, they can readily identify with the particular

DR. J. COLLINS: form of education that we as a Province at this point in time feel we should have. And this is, I think, something that had to be done, something that was a service to the people of this Province for the Premier to bring things in a down-to-earth fashion before their minds so they could concentrate on what constitutional change means. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are asked to vote down the original resolution because the Opposition members opposite say that if these two things are taken care of that will remedy all the objections that this Province has to the federal government proposal. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Those are very important to us, those two items I mentioned, but that was by no means the only reason why we as a government are against the federal action. I might just mention some of the other ones. When this Province and the other provinces sat through a long, hard, hot Summer negotiating over the constitutional changes that should be brought in, it was decided by both sides that a packet, a packet of changes would be looked at. And it was decided by both sides that the packet would go in as a whole. There would not be little bits of it and so on and so forth that would be changed, that the whole packet would be part of the changing process. Now, what happened, Mr. Speaker? What we found was that when the final meeting was held between the first ministers and this packet was put forward, we found that indeed we had almost reached unanimous agreement on the contents of that packet. Perhaps of the twelve or thirteen items six to eight were completely agreed on, a number of other were almost agreed on and on only one or two was there still some work to be done. It was held by most observers that this constitutional meeting up to that point in time was the most successful ever held, we almost had the packet in place. And the agreement was that we would

DR. J. COLLINS: not go ahead with constitutional change until the packet was agreed on or until it was decided that a particular item could not be agreed on and everyone agreed that that should be dropped out of the packet. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the last minute, naturally, we all saw this on TV, was that the federal government decided that no, they were going to throw the packet out the window. That was a totally unilateral decision. It was a shocking decision to make and it completely threw the conference into disarray and, of course, it ended up in failure. Now, that is something we are concerned about. We are concerned that the packet of changes should be reinstated and that packet of changes should be agreed upon, if at all possible, before there is an approach to the British Parliament.

Now, the second thing that we are concerned about in terms of the way the federal government has gone about this change, we have to go back to the referendum that was held in the Province of Quebec. In the Province of Quebec, the proposal was put to them that

DR. J. COLLINS:

they should separate, that they should go the Sovereignty Association route but in actual fact that just meant separating from Canada.

There were people who went to Quebec, including our own Premier as well as other premiers and also federal ministers, who said to the Quebec people, 'We understand you have frustrations, we understand you have difficulties, we understand you have problems the way Confederation is now. You do not have to separate to remedy those problems, stick with it, those changes can be taken care of. If you stay in Confederation a new constitutional conference will be mounted and the frustrations you feel will be taken care of.' And it was readily understood, especially by the Task Force on Unity that went around the country - a federal Task Force - that the same point was being put forward by almost all provinces, practically every province had wanted some change. They had certain frustrations and certain difficulties with the present set-up and that is not to be wondered at because a constitution is not something you write in stone and just leave it there, a constitution is something that you have to change as time goes on, as circumstances change and you have to change it in the proper manner.

Now, what do we find in the type of constitutional change being put forward by the federal government? The changes proposed have nothing whatever to do with the vast majority of the frustrations felt by the provinces. It is being put forward essentially as a so-called 'people's packet' which has always been, if may I use the phrase, 'the federal government's baby'. This has nothing to do with the frustrations the provinces are feeling and has nothing to do with the promise given to the people of Quebec that the changes they desired would be taken care of in the new constitutional amendment.

So that is the second thing we object

DR. J. COLLINS: to the way the federal government is doing it and not just these two that are mentioned in this amendment.

The third thing we object to and we object to this very, very strongly; again the point was made during the referendum campaign that we wanted to preserve Canada, we did not want to destroy Canada as we know it by a large province leaving Canada which would throw the whole Canadian Confederation into some sort of disarray and we would not know what came out of the end of it, we wanted to preserve Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, does this proposal by the federal government preserve Canada? And I think you have to look at Canada and just see what it is before you say whether it does preserve Canada or not. Canada, amongst other things, is that we make changes like this in how the federal government and the provincial government relate together. Canada is a place where these changes are arrived at by consensus. They are not arrived at unilaterally, they are not arrived at by some sort of confrontational or by some arrogant way, they are arrived at by consensus and indeed it is part of the way we change our constitution that there will not be changes made to the constitution that affect these relationships unless they are agreed by all concerned.

Now, this proposal changes all of that. We will not end up with the same Canada that we started with if we bring in the proposal and the manner of constitutional change put forward by the federal government. It will be a country but it will not be a Canada as we know it. Secondly, the Canada that we know is one where all provinces are equal in jurisdictional authority. In other words, it does not matter whether Newfoundland is bigger or smaller than another province, it does not matter whether PEI is bigger or smaller in territory than other provinces, as a province one is equal to the other. Now, under this type of constitutional change, we are going to

DR. J. COLLINS: end up with three types of provinces: We are going to have the two large central provinces which have a total veto over any future change that will be in the Constitution. That is because they have a certain population size at the present time or will have had it at some point in time. Then you will have another tier of provinces because of the part of the country they are in and also, to some extent because of their population size, who will also be part of the constitutional amending process. They will not have a veto but they will have a very vital part because by their combination with other provinces in their area they can, in combination with those other provinces, stop a change going through. A change would have to go through with them there in association with another province. That is the second type of province we will have. Then we will have the third type of province and unfortunately Newfoundland will fall into this category, that you can have changes in the constitution further down the road whether we are in it or not. It is totally

DR. J. COLLINS:

irrelevant whether Newfoundland agrees with that particular change, whether it does not agree with that particular change, whether it affects Newfoundland, whether it does not affect Newfoundland it is totally and utterly irrelevant. So we will end up with a Canada where there are three types of provinces, not the Canada we knew, not the Canada that was said during the referendum we were going to preserve.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are three reasons why we cannot agree with this federal government's package. As I mentioned, it is not a package they are putting in, it is only something that they are particularly concerned about. It does not take care of the provincial frustrations which - and that was promised during the referendum debate, and it does not preserve the Canada that we know. It sets up some new type of entity where there are three type of provinces or three tiers of provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I then can go on to the second last provision in this. It says that, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that subject to such an amendment being made, this House supports and endorses the proposal to patriate the Constitution of Canada! Mr. Speaker, we cannot support that for the reason 'endorses the proposal to patriate! The proposal referred to here is the federal proposal. We can agree to patriation of the constitution, not the proposal that is on the paper in Ottawa. That is a proposal for change that we cannot change, that we cannot accept. The last part of the amendment states, AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Speaker of this House be directed to convey this resolution to the co-Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons now considering the said resolution and to the Speakers of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada!

DR. J. COLLINS: And for the reasons I have laid out we cannot agree with that part there because it does not satisfy what is required to preserve a Canada the way it has operated in the past and the way that the people in Canada wish Canada to operate. The only part, indeed, that we can agree with in this amendment is the first part which says, WHEREAS the Parliament of Canada is now considering a resolution concerning the Constitution of Canada.' We can agree with that but nothing else.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, give notice that I will vote against this amendment and I hope that all members of this House will do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution put forward by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling).

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that members on the other side of this House have the gaul and intestinal fortitude to stand in their places and get up and vote against this resolution. Mr. Speaker, if we can reflect back to when the Premier of the Province went on Province-wide T.V. and put fears in pretty well all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and said, 'Look, we have to make sure of our denominational education and also the Labrador boundary'. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe one of his first paid advertisements by the people of this Province says that, number one, was 'For our boundary to be changed without our consent and, number two, was for our education system to be changed without our consent.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this was paid for by the people of this Province. Now the government members are not even going to come up and say, 'Yes, we want to make sure it is enshrined in our rights.' They are saying, 'We are going to vote against it'.

MR. NEARY: Unbelievable!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable! I do not know how the members are sleeping at night time. I am sure they must have nightmares and every other thing, you know, they cannot sleep.

MR. TULK: They are nightmares!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think that once in awhile all members of this hon. House should put politics to one side. If we are going to cause the average Newfoundlander to be concerned about our educational system and about our Labrador boundary, then why do we not all join together and vote for this resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot go any further without making a comment with respect to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who did give us ten or eleven or twelve -

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirteen.

MR. G. WARREN: Thirteen was it?-thirteen characteristics of being a Liberal.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I know one characteristic that is becoming to a P.C. that is worth noting.

MR. TULK: Sums it all up.

MR. WARREN: And it sums up the P.C.s at least in this hon. House. A P.C. is worth a fortune.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. WARREN: Some of them as we look across have silver in their hair. Others have gold in their teeth. And by the look of the expressions on some of their faces they have stones in their kidneys. And finally all of them have gas in the stomach.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they spew it out all the time.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: They are sick.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are sick, yes.

MR. WARREN: - the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) rose in the last sitting of the House and -

MR. ROBERTS: Rose is the way to describe it.

MR. WARREN: - and said, 'Ten years ago-he was a Canadian'. "I am a Canadian, a fighting Canadian and a fighting Newfoundlander." I agree, I am the same way. He said, "Ten years ago I was working on the mainland, working across Canada and I came home, and got a job." He was not turned away because he had worked in Ontario or Quebec or somewhere else. He was given a job because he came home and he qualified for a job. And as far as I am concerned about job preference, if you qualify for the job the job is for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to speak after the Minister of Finance (DR. Collins). Every other time I spoke in the House of Assembly, the Minister of Finance followed me. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance based his half hour on concern, on his concern. As a member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I am

MR. WARREN: concerned also. I am concerned as well as the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins). We are all concerned. And this is why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), the member for Bonavista North, has brought in this most important resolution, to make sure that the people across this Province and in Labrador will say, "At least, boy, the Liberals are fighting for us. At least the Liberals want to make sure that our rights are in the constitution. They are the ones who are bringing into the House of Assembly -

MR. LUSH: At least they are sincere. They are sincere.

MR. WARREN: They are sincere. They are not going on televisions and saying, "Oh my worry about this and worry about that." They are going to take action. They have taken action in this House of Assembly. Now, the Minister of Finance has said that they are concerned. I would like to quote from the Labrador report of several months ago, Red Bay Road, a hazard, still no government action".

MR. TULK: Concern.

MR. WARREN: That is concern! That is what you call concern! The other evening the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hisock) asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) about the seventeen washouts along the Red Bay Road. What was the answer?

MR. CARTER: How many washouts over there?

MR. WARREN: How many washouts over here? Well, almost as many as on that side, Almost! I assure the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that after his speech the other evening he is a complete washout.

MR. B. TULK: There is neither washout over here as big as the member for St. John's North.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will talk about another concern: The Premier of our Province was going to put the flag on the Labrador boundary. That was a concern.

MR. B. TULK: What happened?

MR. WARREN: But, Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador West, the people of Menihek said, "Listen, Premier, you are doing something wrong. Do not come in here and put that flag there". And at that time the new leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Stirling) said, "I am concerned about Labrador". He said, "I will show my concern, I will go in and talk to the people in there", which the Premier did not even have the intestinal fortitude to do, at that time. So what happened? The pressure got so great that the Premier did not place the flag on the Labrador boundary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, another concern - it is too bad the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is not in his seat now - here is another concern: About several months ago I brought the concern to the Department of Environment that / PCB's were in the sites at Hopedale and Cartwright. Now, I will show you how much concern -

AN HON. MEMBER: We moved it.

MR. WARREN: I will show you how much concern - yes, you moved it, right, you moved it from a population of 400 people into a town with a population of 8,000. That is your concern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Follow up?

MR. WARREN:

Sure, you can follow me.

MR. TULK:

He thought, Yes, he thought -

MR. WARREN:

So it was moved from one location to another location and concern has been expressed by a town council and by other groups in the area.

Mr. Speaker, another concern was the implementation of a drug prescription program for the nursing stations along the Labrador coast. That was a concern until it was addressed to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and then it was withdrawn. So these are concerns.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, I know, Mr. Speaker, where the concerns are. The Premier and his beloved wife went shopping one day. They found the prices from St. John's to Green Bay different. Now, 'okay, boys, let us have a Royal Commission and that is the concern!

MR. TULK:

And they put the prices up in Green Bay.

MR. WARREN:

So, what happens? Apparently everything is pretty low key now, we are not hearing too much about this pricing survey. Furthermore, it was over a year ago that my hon. member from Eagle River (Hiscock) brought up a question to Consumer Affairs about the prices along the Labrador coast. If there is going to be an investigation into prices in this Province, it should be done right from Nain right down to Cape St. Mary's, not just in Green Bay or St. John's, wherever the Premier finds it convenient to go shopping.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution - I would like to read it again. I am sure that the government members cannot live without supporting this. It is impossible! BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House requires and requests that the Parliament of Canada take

MR. WARREN: such steps as necessary to amend the said resolution to ensure" - that is a big word, Mr. Speaker. That is a big word. In fact, the Premier has not used that word yet in talking about the constitution - ensure, 'ensure that the Constitution of Canada contains provisions adequate to ensure that the territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador and the denominational system of education cannot be altered without the authorization of a resolution of this House.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what do the government members want us to do? What do you want us to do?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if that comment was aimed at me, well, probably the member would like to get up and say it loud so everybody can hear it. I would kindly take my seat for him to say it louder. He has not got the intestinal fortitude. So, Mr. Speaker, those are the kinds of snobby remarks you hear from the member from St. John's North (Mr. Carter). I think he is much better in the savoury farm than he is in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking the government to support a serious resolution, to support the denominational education of this Province and to make sure that our Labrador boundary will not be altered.

Mr. Speaker, in the main resolution it says, "AND WHEREAS the proposed resolution does not address the area of shared fisheries jurisdiction". If this government can do as good with the fisheries in the future as they did in the past, we would support them. If you could do some good in the future as in the past, But you have not done anything, you have not done anything or very little. So, I mean, what is shared fisheries jurisdiction? How much do you want to do? Do you want all of it or part of it or 20 per cent of it? I understand

MR. WARREN:

there is shared fisheries

jurisdiction now.

Mr. Speaker, provincial ownership of offshore oil and gas; I did not hear anyone on this side disagree with that, not one person, and I for one stand and say that I support the provincial ownership of offshore oil and gas.

MR. G. WARREN: But, however,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

But, however, shared fisheries jurisdiction is another matter. It has not been proven by this government that they can handle the affairs of the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: They cannot handle anything.

MR. B. TULK: They have messed it up.

MR. G. WARREN: Your own Premier, your own Premier one time said that Romeo LeBlanc was the best Fishery Minister around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, seeing it is close to the hour of 6:00 o'clock I will -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The member wishes to adjourn the debate?

Is it agreed to call it 6:00

o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 o'clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 25, 1980, at 3:00 p.m.