

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity -
Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in answer to a question regarding the number of police on patrol duty, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) indicated that I was in error and he indicated that at least twice as many patrolmen were on duty as I had suggested. Now, Mr. Speaker, my sources indicate that the minister was quite wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: It is a preamble, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE: A preamble, yes. What is wrong with it?

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the minister was misleading the House, but I am suggesting that he was ill-informed and misinformed. Therefore, would the minister now confirm, for example, that on the 4:00 to 12:00 shift on Wednesday, November 26th, there were only eight to ten patrol policemen on duty in the city of St. John's?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned yesterday, the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman were in error and I said that it was at least double the number of people responsible for policing the city than the number he referred to. And I did say at the time that, you know, I would not be more specific, that it would be quite wrong for me to say the exact number. I think hon. members understand that that would be quite wrong. So that was

MR. OTTENHEIMER: my reply and it was an accurate one.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the publicity being given to this matter in the media in the Province at the present time and the fact that people are quite concerned, and the minister did say that there were twenty-four people on duty -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: At least.

MR. F. ROWE: -at least, would the minister confirm the accuracy of this, that there were four supervising sergeants on duty at that particular time, two in the communications centre for dispatching purposes, two in each of four cars to cover the areas one to eight in the city, four men in unmarked cars in the high crime unit, which means that they were not available for normal patrol duty, two C.I.D. in the investigating unit and two in the police van, one of whom was taken up on a breathalizer test for the day and the other who was dealing with a mental patient during part of the day, and that is a total of twenty-two altogether, but only eight were in the patrol cars and two were in that van, so that is a maximum of ten policemen on patrol duty in the city on that 4:00 to 12:00 shift on Wednesday, November 26th?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that I do not intend to give the exact number policing the city at any particular date or any particular time, or a breakdown of where they were or what their specific duties are because, as I mentioned yesterday, that is information extremely

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

valuable to those who either on a full-time basis or part-time basis would like to know this breakdown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: So I am glad to see the hon. member has recovered from his illness and is back in the House, but I do not intend to give that breakdown. Now the hon. member can go along with those figures as much as he wants to -

MR. F. ROWE: Are they accurate?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - and I do not intend to give the breakdown of patrolling St. John's at any particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) must realize that those fully occupied or otherwise in the business of crime in the city would certainly have some indication of the number of policemen on duty and where they are located in this city. They are not that stunned or some of them would not be as successful as they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not help them.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Oh, listen, 'Do not help them.'

MR. F. ROWE: Do not help them. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just -

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is pretty low even for you. I think.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member has a supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and the minister should realize this, about the welfare of the citizenry of St. John's in this particular instance and I ask the questions in that vein. Is the minister still satisfied that

MR. F. ROWE: the city of St. John's has been over the last week and is being properly policed when it comes to patrol activity in this city? And because of the fact that this matter has come up in the media and on the Open Line programmes and is a widely discussed issue in this city at the present time and is causing concern in this city, would the minister be prepared to provide the House, either privately or to the spokesman for Justice on this side, with the rosters over the last couple of weeks to indicate to us whether or not there is any basis for our concern on this particular issue?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I stated yesterday and I will repeat today that I am satisfied that the city is adequately policed. I am so satisfied, and I certainly do not intend to give the hon. gentleman rosters or roosters or anything else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think this is too serious to be treated as lightly as the hon. minister is indicating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE: One particular question I would like the minister to answer, Mr. Speaker; were there, as he stated yesterday, at least twice as many, namely twenty-four policemen, on patrol duty in this city at the time that I indicated, on patrol duty, over these twenty-four people -

MR. THOMS: Street duty.

MR. F. ROWE: - street duty or were there twice the number that he was talking about, the total police force in offices and elsewhere in the city?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I informed the hon. gentleman yesterday that there were more than twice the number referred to by him performing the policing duties for the safety of the people of St. John's. The breakdown of what they were doing I said I was not in a position to give. My answer is the same as yesterday.

MR. F. ROWE: You are not answering the question.

MR. WARREN: You are still not in the position to give it?

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) and regard an invitation that the Labrador South Chamber of Commerce has sent to the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, inviting him to come into Labrador to speak and also, if necessary, aid with the developing of the road in the Labrador Straits. When I first got elected, I ended up saying in one of my speeches the feeling of alienation and frustration in my district of the way the provincial government is treating the people in the Straits area. Particularly the Minister of Finance ended up saying that I was fanning the waves of separatism. Could the Minister of Finance inform this House now that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), who is always saying that he does not get enough money from the treasury to carry out the minimum road maintenance, can the Minister of Finance inform this House whether his department is considering giving the Minister of Transportation more money instead of having the people in the Straits in frustration and anxiety going to the Premier of Quebec?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we brought down a budget somewhat earlier in this fiscal year and in bringing down the budget the Department of Transportation and Communications put in certain estimates to the budgeting process and these estimates were considered in regard to estimates coming in from all departments and a decision was made on the allocation of funds. And then the Department of Transportation and Communications decided when and in what manner those funds would be expended. If the Department of Transportation and Communications requires other funds, it has to make a case to Cabinet; if Cabinet decides upon that, well, then some appropriate measure will be undertaken. That is all I can say. All I can say is that the budget was brought down, funding was applied to the department, the department is taking care of its responsibilities to the best of its ability and, I am sure, absolutely adequately within the constraints imposed by the province's financial position. But if there is dire need in any area, not only in this department, but in any other department, government has a responsibility to look at it and I am sure we will. I am sure the minister will make whatever case is necessary.

MR. E. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: This government prides itself on its integrity and also following the advice that usually the Premier gives, and that if there is any way, for example, of getting power in Williams Harbour once the Premier said we would get it in that area, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) follows his direction. During the provincial election, the Premier promised \$200,000 for the road in L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay. Can the Minister of Finance inform this House now that he has given money

MR. HISCOCK: to the Department of Transportation budget? But where the Premier has said that \$200,000 will be allocated for this road, can the minister inform us now that this money will also be set aside in the next year's budget?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is people like you that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: -(inaudible) right in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I think the hon. member is asking questions that should more probably be directed to my colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Either that, or when the estimates for Transportation and Communications are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is very difficult to hear what is being said in the House by the Chair. I am sure other members have the same difficulty. I would appreciate it if members would restrain themselves. The hon. Minister of Finance is trying to answer a question. It is very difficult to do it with other people heckling.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Just a final remark, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS: Either the hon. member may wish to direct a question to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (C.Brett), or, I would suggest even better, that when the estimates for the Department of T and C come up at the time of the next budget, that there would be really serious debate go on in regard to the concerns that hon. members may feel about those and not concentrate on scoring little political points here and there.

I do not know is these particular points are ever debated when the estimates do come up, and I would suggest that that is the time when the questions that are now being brought out should be gone into in greater depth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this regard where the budget is now in the process of being planned, Can the Minister of Finance inform this House if the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) has made representation to the Minister of Finance for additional funds to do the work on the Straits road? Part of the frustration in that area is that Quebec now has its part of the road upgraded in that area and is also now in the process of laying pavement. Can the minister inform us -

MR. F. ROWE: Before René paves it.

MR. S. NEARY: Get René over there.

MR. HISCOCK: -yes, before René paves it, as one of our members said.

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

DR. COLLINS: I am glad the hon. member brought up that question. Yes, the preparation for the new budget is going ahead quite rapidly. We have made two particular changes this year to make things as expeditious as possible. Firstly, we are going to bring in the zero based budgeting concept for a certain number of departments and, if my memory serves me correctly, I think the Transportation and Communications Department is one of those departments involved in that.

Secondly, we have requested that the departments bring in their estimates at an earlier date so that we will be in a position to begin putting together the framework of the budget much earlier in the New Year. So I think that we will find that the budget is done a bit more expeditiously, I think that we will find that the departments have started on their preparation of their estimates a bit earlier than was the case in the past, and I think that they are already working hard on it and I am sure that the Department of Transportation and Communications is involved in that.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

November 28, 1980

Tape No. 2497

AH-1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I think my colleague wants to ask a supplementary.

MR. HISCOCK:

The Transportation Committee of the federal and provincial government -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

- had a meeting just early this week and the plans were presented to the federal counterpart -

MR. S. NEARY:

The envelope.

MR. HISCOCK:

- the envelope, that all the other three Atlantic Provinces presented in July and our Province had it ready in September and did not present it until last week, and they asked for a reply from the federal government that basically they would give a reply Friday. Can the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) tell us that this money for the roads agreement or whatever agreement in this Province will be forthcoming this Friday from the federal government that they asked for?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member is getting his information but that is completely false, it is so far out of whack it is not even funny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

This is utterly ridiculous. The federal committee met with my officials on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week. There was no discussion whatsoever on dollars, there was no discussion on railway, there was no discussion on roads, there was no discussion on the Gulf ferry. There was a general overall discussion on policies and procedures that the federal government would take over the next five years.

MR. NEARY:

Did you give them your highway programme?

MR. BRETT:

The highway programme was presented

MR. BRETT: to the federal government months and months ago. But to get back to the meeting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Do the hon. members want an answer? because I would just as soon sit down. They did not even bring all the information from Ottawa that was requested. Further meetings will be set up. But let us get back to what was discussed. As I indicated, it was a general, overall discussion of transportation in the Province and the way that they want to go in the next five years. And they have not taken into consideration our railway plans, and the bottom line of the whole thing is trade-off. Now, you know, I get sick and tired of standing up here hammering the federal government, but that is what it boils down to. They say if you want a Trans-Canada Highway, then give up your railway; if you want the Southern Labrador road done, then we will decrease the number of trips that the coastal boat is making and this sort of thing, the whole thing right from start to finish. The hon. member has not got a clue as to what he is talking about, not a clue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let us see if somebody has a clue to what they are talking about. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: As hon. members know we had a couple of unfortunate situations developed in this Province when two people, one in St. John's and one in Gander, lost their lives as a result of laboratory techniques and procedures and so forth, at least that is what was alleged to have happened. Would the hon. gentleman tell us if any steps have been taken to tighten up the procedures, to

November 28, 1980

Tape No. 2497

AH-3

MR. NEARY: improve the techniques and the
procedures in the laboratories of this Province so that
there will be no further deaths resulting from negligence
or anything else in these laboratories?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is related to these particular incidents, but there has been an ongoing review of laboratories across the Province, particularly those, you know, in cottage hospitals. Of course, the others in the other hospitals are under review also because each of the hospitals have personnel who, of course, are fully qualified and these are under constant review.

We are not totally happy, of course, with all the facilities we have in laboratories, but, as I said, there is a review ongoing and it is specifically aimed at the cottage hospitals.

One part of the programmes, of course, is a training programme and a more sophisticated training programme for the smaller hospital. We did have combinations of lab technicians and X ray technicians and they were not very well qualified in either one, and what we are doing now is giving them full qualifications, helping give them full qualifications, improving the programme with the College of Trades and Technology to give them full qualifications in one aspect and partial in the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, the lab programme is an ongoing thing and it is not related to the unfortunate incidents. I think the two that were referred to, these had no relationship with training and with equipment.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: As I understand it from the hon. gentleman's answer then, things were not very good in most of the laboratories across the Province, especially in the smaller hospitals. Could the hon. gentleman elaborate, be a little more specific on the review that is being

MR. NEARY: carried out? Was it only for laboratory technicians or did it also involve X ray technicians? And does the hon. gentleman have a report that he could bring to this House? Could the hon. gentleman tell us what sort of things he found that have made him feel, I get the impression from his answer, very uncomfortable?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the labs, as I said, it was basically and specifically to the small hospitals under government control, department control. There was nothing - we just keep these procedures going anyway. We always have this under surveillance, but there was a special effort and we co-opted certain people from the hospital boards across the Province to help us with that.

With regard to the labs, if you recall, a couple of years ago at a national level there was some report out - it came from Toronto - that there were excessive rays going into people from certain machines. And we had a lot of older xray machines across the Province, so we made a complete survey of all the X ray units of these and we found that from the point of view of safety that there was no problem.

There are a few places now - and we are continuously, Mr. Speaker, replacing X ray units, but there has been no case in this Province where there has been any danger exhibited from the reviews that we have done

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want now the hon. gentleman to be invited up to appear on television and announce that he is reviewing all the laboratory techniques and X-ray techniques. I want the hon. gentleman to - if they are going to invite him up, now that I am going to get him an interview on television because he has just announced a new programme, I hope I will get equal time, but if I do not, I would like for the hon. gentleman, if he does not tell us in the House, to tell us what they found, what did the minister's officials, his department find in these reviews? Is there a written report? Will the hon. gentleman make it public in this House or will he make it public outside the House so that when he is asked the questions that we can ask him intelligent questions and the press can ask him intelligent questions as to what he found? Were people not qualified? Was the equipment outdated? Was the equipment obsolete? Is there enough equipment? What about the procedures? And will the minister give us the answers to all these questions or table the report so that we can take a look at it and determine for ourselves whether or not the public are adequately safeguarded against anything happening that happened before in St. John's and in Gander? Would the hon. minister undertake to give us the report in the House so we can take a look at it ourselves?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any capacity to determine whether the hon. gentleman can ask intelligent questions or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, these kind of reviews are just about continuous, but there was a special effort, as I said, with regard to the X-ray units because of the national concern and national interest. The report - there has been no specific report done as yet and handed to me. The fact is that we have discussed it. It has been done around the Province and the X-ray units that we have are safe. Now we are continuously upgrading, we are continuously replacing, and one part of our Five Year Plan, of course, is an equipment bank of funding to allow hospital boards and hospitals to replace their obsolete equipment as they see fit and necessary.

With regard to the review on labs, we are looking at it from a personnel viewpoint. We know we have some inadequacies and we are working on these -

MR. S. NEARY: What are they? What are they? Tell us what they are.

MR. W. HOUSE: Well, it is not inadequacies in the sense of the word that the thing is being poorly done, but certain hospitals have to get certain testing done in other places. Now we are working on that and that is part and parcel of the hospital programme. If you have listened to our announcement on hospitals, it is mainly and basically diagnostic equipment that we are talking about and facilities we are talking about putting in these regional centres.

The one specific recommendation that came out from the lab point of view is to eliminate - and this is on the basis of discussion with lab technicians and X-ray technicians - is to eliminate the programme that we have had for training, the initial programme that was put in place perhaps ten or fifteen years ago -

MR. S. NEARY: Over here at the College of Trades and Technology?

MR. HOUSE: - yes - the combination lab and X-ray

MR. W. HOUSE: which was a one year programme. It did not train adequately so that is being eliminated and now we are only training in one of the areas but giving a general overview of another in case of an emergency.

So the programme that we have put in place -

MR. S. NEARY: In other words, you are separating the two, you are going to have X-ray technicians and lab technicians but they will not do the same work.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that has always been a separation there because you can be a lab technician or a lab technologist or an X-ray technician or technologist. But what we did have was certain people went in and did a one year training and they did training in lab and X-ray so that they could go in these smaller units and do both jobs. They are finding that this is not adequate and now we are giving programmes in one but we may give a six month programme in addition - after a person, for instance, is qualified as a fully qualified lab technician they may get a short course in X-ray technology or technician, whatever the term is, so that they can take x-rays when the regular person is off. So they will be fully qualified in one or the other.

MR. S. NEARY: Now they are not.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Ms. L. Verge). Could the minister advise the hon. House when the Happy Valley School Tax Authority was changed to the Central Labrador School Tax Authority and why was it changed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the boundary of the Happy Valley School Tax Authority was changed last year to enlarge the territory affected by that Authority. As to the

MS. L. VERGE: change of a name, I will have to take that as notice and supply the information later.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to the minister. Was there any objection to the change of the Happy Valley School Tax Authority to its new name? Were there any objections?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the name was changed or that there were any objections to any change of name.

MR. WARREN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARRENN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this is a supplementary or not but I find it most unusual that the minister makes a change in her department and she is not aware of any objections. I would like to ask the minister if her department has responded - I will tell the minister that there were objections - and has her department responded to those objections?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am not aware that anyone was upset about any change of name in the School Tax Authority.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Were the school boards in the area consulted with the change? Were the school boards consulted concerning the change or

MR. WARREN: were the school boards in favour of the change? Or have you got confirmation from the school boards saying they are in favour of the change?

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

MS. VERGE: School Board -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, our school tax authorities comprise a majority of representatives of school boards so the school tax authority serving the Lake Melville region would comprise as a majority of its membership representatives of the Labrador East Integrated School Board and the Roman Catholic School Board for Labrador. The balance of its members would be representatives of municipal governments in that area, so the school boards have a majority vote in any decisions of school tax authorities.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transportation (C.Brett). I would like the minister to advise how well organized and indeed how well equipped his department might be to handle the upcoming Winter highroad conditions, primarily main thoroughfares but especially in emergency conditions and that again, Mr. Speaker, in the rural areas as well as in the main thoroughfares?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that exact same question was asked to me two or three days ago in this Chamber, I believe by the same hon. member, and I can only give him the same answer. You know, I feel kind of foolish standing up here saying the same thing day after day. You know, I told the hon. member that probably this year we are a little bit

MR. BRETT: better equipped to do the main highways in that we have fourteen additional flyer trucks - those are the ones with the plow in the front and the salt in the back - and that will give us more clout on our main highways particularly the Trans-Canada Highway. I suppose the fact that we have fourteen new flyers in turn means that we can take some other equipment and put it on our secondary roads. But we are as well equipped as we ever were, maybe down a little bit in staff but, as I indicated the other day, and I wish I had the - if I had Hansard here I could read what I said the other day and then I would be sure of saying the same thing. I think probably we are a little bit more efficient than we have been over the years and as for emergencies, no matter what we do in emergencies, we will never, ever please the public. Because I think one of the unfortunate things about Newfoundlanders, and I think probably it includes us sitting here in the Chamber, is that too often we expect the same driving conditions in March as we have in July and that is not possible.

But we are ready, as ready as we can humanly be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, we do ask -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): There is time for one final quick supplementary. The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will get to it very quickly. The reason I am asking that question, Mr. Minister, is because I am having calls in from the district, not necessarily my own district, saying

MR. BENNETT: that the operator of equipment in a special area is in trouble with the community because he is trying to operate broken down equipment. And the community is one his back and it is no good for him to go to your department looking for better equipment, And he said, 'I am at loggerheads with the community because they are shooting me down when indeed the blame should be laid at the doorstep of the minister's department.'

MR. WARREN: Right on, Right on.

MR. BENNETT: Could you confirm - surely goodness, Mr. Minister, you must be getting some of these complaints from around the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have time for one quick answer.
The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, it always seems that if we are going to have a breakdown it will happen during a storm or during a flood or during something and I do not think anybody can do very much about that. I have confessed here on many occasions that a lot of our equipment is old and outdated and it is difficult to keep it working, but again, you know, I cannot work miracles.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Question has expired.
I am sure all hon. members would like to join with me this morning in welcoming to the galleries forty grade nine students who are visiting the House of Assembly from Mary Queen of the World school in the district of Mount Pearl and their teachers, Mr. Mike Collins and Mr. Gerry Glavine. We hope that they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDER OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1. When the House last adjourned, we were debating the amendment as proposed by the hon. the

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Leader of the Opposition and the debate had been adjourned by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

The hon. member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I watched the infamous, I suppose, television broadcast when the Premier spoke to the Province concerning what he, I suppose what we all consider the Province's sacred rights. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that my reaction when I saw that particular address to the Province was I was horrified, not because of the issues of which the Premier was speaking, but I was horrified that he would do it and I had a sense of unreality because I felt that it was not believable, that it was not true, that this cannot be so. I had a feeling that

MR. HODDER: something had come unhinged, that the Province as I knew it and the guarantees as I knew them could not have been flung aside so quickly, new Constitution or not.

Mr. Speaker, I still do not think the Premier is right, but I support this Resolution because of the feelings that arose in the Province after these two particular issues, our Labrador boundary and the denominational educational system, had been brought up. There were many people in the Province who were very, very disturbed and very afraid. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the churches were as afraid as some of the general public were, because having advice and knowing of their lawyers and knowing probably more about how the denominational system works and what is happening in the Constitution, they perhaps were better informed on the whole issue.

Mr. Speaker, since this debate has started, I have listened to the debate in this House on this amendment and I have come to the conclusion that, both inside and outside of the House, many people are not aware of the complexities of the subject under discussion. What we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, in this Resolution, is our Labrador boundary and our denominational school system, and the threat is that the control over both of those systems might be taken away from the jurisdiction of this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think everyone agrees, if they look at the new Constitution, that Section 43 guarantees that our boundaries and school system cannot be changed without the consent of this House. That is how it is written in the proposals which are now being debated in Ottawa. But what has been endangered, Mr. Speaker? Well, what has been endangered, as the Premier is saying, is that there are other sections in the new Constitution

MR. HODDER: that make it technically possible - and I stress 'technically' possible. And the Premier has said technically possible at every time he has mentioned it - that they can be changed. He says that through a national referendum process it is possible that this Legislature could lose its jurisdiction over both of those matters. The basis of his argument is that we now, that this Province now has those two sacred rights, that under the present Constitution, under the present B.N.A. Act, that we now have those two sacred rights and that they cannot be altered or changed without our expressed consent, or that is the impression that he is trying to give. But he says that under the new Constitution we can lose those sacred rights, which are, namely, our church school system and our boundary rights. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. Those rights are not protected now. The Senate and the House of Commons, through a joint address to Westminster, can, under the present system, abolish anything they wish.

MR. TULK: Right on! Right on!

MR. HODDER: Any time since 1949, this could have happened in this Province. Right now, at the present time, before the Constitution comes home, it is possible for the Government of Canada and the Senate to change anything they want. It is technically possible. I stress 'technically' possible - it has not happened.

The Premier has argued that anyone who wants to take away our sacred rights can take them. He has argued that it is possible to take them away - technically possible. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, it is technically possible

MR. J. HODDER: to do anything under any constitution that a government wants to do. It is possible for the Canadian Parliament, by joint resolution of the Government of Canada and the Senate, to, I suppose, at the present time to actually abolish this Province. They created the Province without the formal amendment to the other provinces, and it is technically possible to abolish it now. As a matter of fact -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. HODDER: Just let me continue. As a matter of fact, when the new Constitution comes home there will be a Bill of Rights, which is an amendment to the Constitution, and that shows that the federal government can amend the Constitution without the consent of the provinces. Now I know the provinces are trying to prove they cannot, I will not bet a bottle of champagne but I will bet a bottle of rum that the Province will lose that court case.

Now we should recall, Mr. Speaker, that under the present Constitution, Newfoundland became part of Canada in 1949. And the federal government in 1949, the Parliament of Canada went to Westminster and asked that the BNA Act be amended to include the Terms of Union, thereby making Newfoundland a province of Canada. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that prior to joining Canada that debates in the House of Commons show that some of the provinces were opposed to Newfoundland joining Canada. The federal government acted alone and Newfoundland became part of Canada.

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is right. If the other provinces had their way, we would not have joined Canada.

MR. J. HODDER: That is right.

MR. J. HODDER: So, Mr. Speaker, it is possible to change Canada by a decision of the House of Commons without the consent of the provinces and it was amply demonstrated in 1949. So when the Premier says that we are losing something, he is wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the present Constitution? Can the Government of Canada change the constitutional alone? Can it be changed like that? Let us look at what will happen when the new Constitution is patriated. It will require the consent of the Province of Newfoundland, even if we took the worst view, that is the technical view, to change the boundaries of the Province. The Premier says that, if you really look at the Constitution, that section 47 overrides everything else. But that is the deadlock breaker, section 47, and in order for the other provinces to go along with our boundaries, to changing Newfoundland's boundaries, they put their own boundaries in jeopardy. It is technically possible, Mr. Speaker, but it is far harder under the new Constitution, far, far, harder to change the boundaries of this Province than it was under the BNA Act as it now exists.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Our sacred rights are far more sacred under the new proposal than they are today.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on.

MR. J. HODDER: But members must ask themselves, and citizens of this Province must ask themselves is there a likelihood of the citizens of any one province in Canada voting in a referendum to give up sovereignty of our borders, thereby setting a precedent which under the Constitution endangers their own borders, setting a very, very dangerous precedent? What I am saying here is that Constitutions are words, they have to be able to be changed. What

MR. J. HODDER: the Premier has done, he has traced through the Constitution and the very fact - if you look at anything, Mr. Speaker, if you look at it hard enough and you try to make an excuse and try to find a way, there is no constitution that is foolproof for anything. What I am saying is that Newfoundland has, under the new constitutional package, the same guarantees over its borders as every other Province in Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: And greater guarantees than we have now.

MR. J. HODDER: And that under the old constitutional package, the federal government can change any boundary by going to Britain, as they now are. They have not done it, but, as the Premier says, it is technically possible. It has not happened. There are actually more guarantees after patriation of the Constitution than there are now with respect to our border.

Now just to refer back to 1949, as I said, it was common knowledge that Quebec,

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, was opposed to us joining Canada because the Terms of Union which we were then negotiating with Canada guaranteed Newfoundland's sovereignty over Labrador. Now even then, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada agreed to us entering Confederation with our boundaries intact even though Quebec, that terrible province as she is sometimes painted, was against us. They had an issue, they did not want us to have the Labrador border, but even then the Government of Canada unilaterally allowed us to enter Canada with our boundaries intact. And that was a federal government, Mr. Speaker, that was headed by a Quebecer, with the support of Quebecers; he was a French-Canadian, Louis St. Laurent, and he allowed us to enter Canada in spite of the fact that a number of provinces, not only Quebec but including Quebec, were against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HODDER: So, Mr. Speaker, if they wanted Labrador, that was the time to get it.

DR. J. COLLINS: That is wrong.

MR. HODDER: It is not wrong, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is not wrong. Is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying that it was wrong, that when we entered Confederation that it was wrong, that we were opposed? Is he saying that there was not a French-Canadian Prime Minister? Is he saying that I am wrong when we entered with our boundaries intact? Is he saying that we are wrong that the House of Commons with a joint resolution from the Senate of Canada signed the Terms of Union and amended the BNA Act by the Terms of Union? Is the Minister of Finance saying that is wrong? Because that is what I said.

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has gotten him straightened out now.

MR. LUSH: No, he is saying it is wrong that we joined.

MR. HODDER: Oh, he said it was wrong that we joined, that is what it was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: We should not have joined in the first place.

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has got him straightened out now.

MR. HODDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if they wanted Labrador, if they wanted to change, if that terrible country, Canada, as hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes paint it, wanted our boundaries, wanted Labrador, that was the time to get it, Mr. Speaker, But they did not do it and they will not do it, and after the Constitution is patriated they never will be able to do it even if they wanted to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: Well said.

MR. HODDER: Let us just turn for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the educational system. Several provinces have a substantial involvement in the church/school system, particularly Quebec. Now it is clear that Newfoundland, as a Province, has jurisdiction over education, as does every other province, and the denominational churches in Newfoundland have protection under the Terms of Union not just from encroachment by the federal government, but also from encroachment by the provincial government because we have one extra guarantee; that in Newfoundland the provincial government under the Terms of Union cannot encroach on the denominational school either, It is clearly under the BNA Act, under the Terms of Union, a provincial responsibility, The whole system under which we work here has been laid out and when the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) passes her funds, she passes them to the Denominational Education Committee. So we have one little twist, we have one extra guarantee; we are guaranteed from the Province - we have the guarantee of every other province in Canada, the same one that they have, but in our case the extra guarantee is that the provincial

MR. HODDER: government will provide funds to support the denominational education system. But it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that while for all practical purposes, Newfoundland is in exactly the same position constitutionally in respect to those matters, that not one province in Canada, not one premier, not one legislature, not one word has been said or any concern expressed regarding their borders or their rights over education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it becomes clear, if you follow the constitutional discussions, that even at the present time the federal government is striving to clarify the procedure so that,

MR. HODDER: you know, the - it is not over yet and instead of confrontation, Mr. Speaker, you know, there are groups from this Province who have gone to Ottawa and been well received. And there is progress being made concerning the negotiations or concerning what is going on with the patriation of the Constitution and there are words which will be included and there are words which will be excluded and there are ways, Mr. Speaker, to get your way as a Province in this nation without screaming, shouting and having a stand-off position to such an extent that there is no longer any conversation going on between Newfoundland and Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, from what I have been saying, some members may wonder why I would even be part of a group that would bring in a resolution of this type if we feel quite secure that it is there. Well, the question is, Mr. Speaker, or the point is that we brought this resolution in because the fears of the Province, the fears of Newfoundlanders, the fears of the ordinary person who does not normally read much about constitutions or does not study much history or whatever, the normal fears have been fanned, Mr. Speaker, the fires of sectarianism have been fanned by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say this, and then I am going to take my seat. Mr. Speaker, what the Premier did that night on television, on CBC, - I do not know if he was on the other station or not what he did that night will never be forgotten; it will never be forgotten by the churches, it will never be forgotten by the people of this Province and it will come back to haunt, because it is the worst example since I have been politically aware of a government in a fight with Ottawa over a number of issues under which they

MR. HODDER: cannot reach agreement, mostly Mr. Speaker, because they have put a wall up, and where there is no conversation there can be no progress. But in that fight they put their hand in and they plucked at something that was sacred to every Newfoundlander, something that -

MR. BARRY: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am about to conclude my speech, I wish to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have his chance to speak when the - well, the hon. Minister - I am only responding exactly, the hon. Minister spoke here the other day and I asked him four times would he permit a question and the hon. Minister would not permit a question. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province, you do not toy with people, you cannot pluck at what is - whether it is an individual or a province, you cannot pluck and toy with what is most sacred to them without a reaction.

And I believe that, Mr. Speaker, this particular move by this government showed more than anything else what the government is made of. This is not a new administration, a clean administration: This is one of the worst administrations, Mr. Speaker, and an administration that would stoop to any level, any level to better their political ends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, with that I conclude.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. the Minister of Development, I would like to welcome to the Galleries twelve students from Mellwood High School in

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Deer Lake along with their teacher, Mr. Jim Feltham, from the district of Humber Valley. We hope that they too will enjoy their visit to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman opposite should be so fortunate to have somebody so capable to help him with his speeches, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise just for a few moments, and I realize that most of what needs to be said about the constitutional debate probably already has been said, but I cannot let

MR. WINDSOR: these students from my district who were here this morning, I am very happy to have them and I thank Your Honour and my colleagues for extending such a welcome. I cannot let them go away from here, having heard some of the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, and go with false impressions of security as it relates to the constitution because that is far from the truth, there is no question about that in my mind, and I think most hon. gentlemen in the House will agree. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, of supporting repatriation of the constitution. Nobody, I think, disagrees with that. What we are disagreeing with is the method in which it is being repatriated and the unilateral action that is being taken by the federal government in amending the constitution without the consent of the provinces of Canada the result of which, hon. gentlemen know, six provinces are now taking court action - or three provinces with the support of three others - are taking court action to oppose the move stating that this is an illegal move on behalf of the Government of Canada.

I say there is no security, Mr. Speaker. Primarily we can talk all day about the various sections of the proposed amended constitution, but from my point of view none of these are of any importance as long as the amending formula is allowed to stand as it stands at the moment. Because under that amending formula nothing is sacred, anything can be changed - including the amending formula. Section 41, 42 and 43 refer to the methods by which any provision of a constitution can be changed, and they can be changed without Newfoundland's consent - not without Ontario or Quebec's consent because they are given a veto because they now have twenty-five per cent of the population of Canada - and Section 41 states that it would require the consent of any province that before

MR. WINDSOR: proclamation of this act has twenty-five per cent of the population' - and that means only Ontario and Quebec, and they will always have a veto. It does not matter whether their population decreases. If there is a great out-migration of people from Ontario so they sometime down the road have only five per cent of the population of Canada, they would still have a veto because of the wording of this constitutional amendment that any province that before proclamation has twenty-five per cent of the population. So they will always have a veto regardless of the percentage of population of Canada that lives within that province. So that holds for Ontario and Quebec. In the Atlantic Provinces, two out of four provinces must support an amendment and together must have fifty per cent of the population of the Atlantic Provinces. So that means that the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick could very well say no to an amendment that Newfoundland proposed and we could not have it put through. Or, alternatively, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick might agree and Newfoundland might object, but that would matter not. And that includes an amendment to our boundary, it includes the insecurity of the Labrador boundary. A question could arise and Newfoundland could be overruled by two other Atlantic provinces who would vote in favour of it with the support of both Ontario and Quebec and two, again, of the Western provinces. The same sort of formula applies in the four Western provinces as they do for the four Atlantic provinces. So basically no provinces other than Quebec and Ontario have a direct veto on their own. So we say that that is not equitable, Mr. Speaker, and all we are saying is that all should be treated equally in Canada, that all provinces should be equal partners in this Canadian federation and that we should not be discriminated against.

MR. WINDSOR: Hon. gentlemen talked about borders and education, and there has been a great debate in the public eye about the denominational education system. As a result of that a number of people have said, "Well, is that the correct system? Is it the proper system we are operating under or maybe we should look at the public school system?" That is not the issue at all, Mr. Speaker. It is not the fact that we have a denominational education system or we do not: The issue at stake here is that we have the right to decide that it cannot be decided for us by people in Central Canada or by the courts. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador must retain that right to decide the system under which their children will be educated, not the system itself.

MS. VERGE: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: I have support, at least, from the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). So that was the issue at stake, Mr. Speaker, and it is very clear that our border can be challenged and the amending formula allows for it to happen. Not only that, but Section 47 of the act provides that the amending formula itself may be amended by the same formula, again without Newfoundland's consent. So there was nothing—even the

MR. WINDSOR: amending formula; nothing is sacred, nothing is secure under this proposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many have said that the ten provinces will never agree. Well, the ten provinces did agree, Mr. Speaker, in Vancouver, in what has been known as the Vancouver Consensus. And basically, what the Vancouver Consensus said was that the Constitution should be amended with the consent of two thirds of the provinces of Canada. So seven out of ten provinces of Canada voting in favour, and having together a majority of 50 per cent of the voters who voted in favour of the Resolution, then the amendment could stand, the Constitution could be amended.

It is fairly reasonable, Mr. Speaker, and that provides for most provisions of the Constitution - and I say most, because there are certain basic rights that all provinces agree should not be changed, provisions for those rights in a constitution should not be taken away without the consent of the provinces concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: And those are basic rights, Mr. Speaker. Let me list them for you: The powers of the Legislature to make laws. Should the Legislature's power to make laws be taken away? Should the rights and privileges granted to the Legislature be taken away without our consent? Should the assets or properties of a province be taken away without our consent, or should the natural resources of a province be taken away without our consent? Those are basic rights.

The Vancouver Consensus stated that those rights must be protected. And the assets or property of a province, Mr. Speaker, include very clearly one's boundary; and the natural resources obviously protect

MR. WINDSOR: the great wealth that this Province is endowed with.

All other matters, Mr. Speaker, could be amended under that proposal by a vote of seven out of ten of the provinces and 50 per cent of the population of Canada. That was agreed, Mr. Speaker, by all ten provinces, and I find it very difficult to believe that a proposal that is judged by the ten components of the whole as being fair and equitable and in the best interests of Canada should be adjudged by the combining body, the Government of Canada, not to be in the best interest. As I have said many times before, Mr. Speaker, it is as if ten vice-presidents of a company said, 'This is the right way to go,' and the president said no. And I find it very difficult to believe that the president could be so correct and the ten vice-presidents wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are objecting to is unilateral action by the federal government of repatriating the Constitution as amended - not of repatriating it, we support that, but of amending it unilaterally and asking the House of Commons of Great Britain to amend it because the House of Commons in Canada cannot do it on their own. And those who have questioned whether or not such an amendment requires the consent of all the Canadian provinces, well, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that eleven amendments which have been made over the years have required and have received the consent of the provinces concerned, and that sets a precedent which I would suspect and I would suggest would be considered as binding in law as if it were so written. Perhaps this has been quoted before, but there is a newspaper article in The Chronicle Herald of Wednesday, October 22nd, quoting a Dr. William Lederman, Professor of Constitutional Law and

MR. WINDSOR: former Dean of Law at Queen's University, a very well-respected constitutional expert. He says, "The practice of consulting the provinces on major constitutional changes has developed to the point where consent of the provinces is necessary, as well as that of the federal Parliament, before it is constitutionally proper to send an address to London." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a very knowledgeable, very highly respected constitutional expert who states that this procedure has been followed for so long that it now has indeed the strength of law.

He makes one very astute observation, in my opinion, a very important one as it relates to the changing of a constitution at this particular time recognizing that an amended constitution should have an amending formula which would provide for future amendments as agreed by all provinces and by the federal government.

He says, "It is essential to follow the unanimity principle one last time to make fundamental changes in the Canadian Constitution." Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WINDSOR: I think there is a great deal of wisdom in that statement, because what he is saying is that to bring home the constitution and to amend it so that all provinces agree should be done by the formula of all provinces agreeing one last time, and putting in place an amending formula that will provide for future amendments, should be agreed upon unanimously. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Vancouver consensus was very close to that. And for hon. gentlemen to suggest that provinces can never agree and will not compromise again is inaccurate as testified again by the Vancouver Consensus, since when those constitutional meetings started, there were twelve items on the agenda and it was agreed at the beginning of the constitutional conference that all twelve items would be dealt with and that it would be an entire, complete package. The Vancouver Consensus, Mr. Speaker, deals with only three or four of those issues and the dropping of the others was in itself a concession by various provinces who had strong feelings on one or two or three particular aspects of the items that were being discussed. And all provinces, Mr. Speaker, made concessions to come to this amending formula, or this Vancouver Consensus, in order to make some progress and to bring the constitution home and have it amended. Mr. Speaker, we thought that was fairly reasonable. All we are asking is equitable treatment, fair treatment, equal rights with other provinces of Canada, equal rights under the constitution. The hon. gentleman who just spoke before me talked about Newfoundland entering Canada and the fact that the other provinces were not consulted. Mr. Speaker, the other provinces did not have to be consulted because Section 146 of the British North America Act as written in 1867, provided that Her Majesty the Queen on address by the

Mr. WINDSOR: House of Commons and the Senate of Canada could provide for Newfoundland to join Canada and it did not require obviously, therefore, the consent of other provinces because that provision was already in the British North America Act and it is slightly different than what we are talking about today. So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I close. I would thank you for the opportunity of having addressed this very important issue and I trust my friends from Mary Queen of the World school have gained some insight into this important issue.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly on these issues as most Canadians and Newfoundlanders and members of this House also feel, on the resolution and the amendment. I would like to talk on the amendment in particular, with regard to the sacred rights. I did not have the opportunity to watch the Premier on television in his half hour address to the Province outlining its case. Basically, it was from the point of view of emotion. I would like to not call it politics of emotion, but basically say that we are operating in this Province for the first time - it has been operated in other areas of the world, we are operating in this Province now with the politics of fear. It is the politics of fear that we are using.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: It is the negativism, it is the emotion, it is somehow or another that Canada is going to come down like the wolf and pounce on poor little Newfoundland and Labrador and take all, everything we have and basically we will.

MR. HISCOCK: wake up and find out that we are out in the cold without our houses, without our schools, without our hospitals, without our roads, without anything, that Ottawa and other mainland provinces are basically concerned with raping Newfoundland. Nothing has been said about how they have helped in the past, nothing has been said that they still continue to pay the majority of our budget, all that is being said, basically, is negative. And I would like to go on record as saying that these two issues of education, and the boundary are two issues that were brought up to this Province to get the emotions of our people

MR. HISCOCK:

riled up and ended up saying that look, Ottawa, the Federal Government, the Liberal Government in Ottawa is going to be taking these rights away from you.

I think it was pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that in my district the Labrador South Chamber of Commerce through its frustrations and through its anxieties and how they have been treated by this government for the past several years, now feel that the only recourse open to them to get attention and to bring attention to this Province is inviting the Premier of Quebec, Mr. René Levesque to come in and address their meeting as well as to come up with some money to help do the roads there because Quebec is doing that.

Down in my district and also in Wabush, or in Menihek district, there is no question whatsoever with the residents living in Labrador that Labrador belongs to them and to this Province. There is no question in the minds of the people in Blanc Sablon, Old Forte and Lourdes to Blanc Sablon and Fermont and Mount Wright that that is Quebec and on the other side it is Labrador and Labrador belongs to Newfoundland, So there is no question with the boundary. I really have to say and I think that this government, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) basically said, I was fanning the flames of separatism when I pointed out the reality of what was happening down in Labrador. I take great pride in saying that I have not had any contact with this Chamber of Commerce for the past month and a half and I have done this deliberately from the point of view that I knew what they were going to be doing and I did not want myself associated in any way

MR. HISCOCK: to have the government side come back and say look, you are priming them and you are behind this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: So, the Chamber of Commerce itself and the people in that area are doing it on their own initiative and I, for one, basically do not support thier avenue. But how do you get attention, how do you get attention from this government? Basically, the government is going on emotional issues and fear issues and other issues of going outside and taking an outside enemy, whether this is Nova Scotia with the Northern Cod, whether this is Ottawa with regard to the offshore or mobility rights, or the offshore, with the Federal Government with regards to the Constitution, it is always an outside enemy and always an enemy that we want to focus on and forget about the plight of our health in this Province. Forget about unemployment, forget about health, forget about transportation. All these issues are used as diversionary tactics.

And I have said it in this House Mr. Speaker, and I will say it again, these diversionary tactics are used for only one reason and that is, basically, to get the points of view and interests of our people away from the day to day operations of this Province. This government is almost bankrupt. If we were bankrupt back in '72, with the debt then, the debt now has quadrupled and this government basically realizes that if they cannot get the oil and the money coming in from Hibernia fast enough, which will not come in until 1985, then they have to have another election in '83. And the only way they can have that election and win that election is build up their popularity and support and they are doing that by overall emotional issues.

MR. HISCOCK: And I hope - unfortunately I have to say, hopefully, hopefully, Mr. Speaker this Province of ours and the people will not take twenty-one years to realize that one government was in for twenty-one years, that it will realize that if we are going to run a Province we have to run a Province in this nation of ours rationally, and basically carry out the rules and the regulations made by this Province, not on emotion.

I am concerned about the boundary of Labrador, representing it, but as I said the enemy is not Ottawa that is going to change it. There would be no question whatsoever in the Province, or in that part of our Province, that if Ottawa ever wanted to change the boundary without the consent of those people in that part of our Province, Mr. Peckford, our Premier, or any other member on the government side would not be the first ones to rally and go to Ottawa, as maybe the constitutional express is going now, it would be the residents in Labrador itself. So I point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, the enemy is not Ottawa, the enemy is within, the enemy is our own Provincial Government.

Our own people in that area of the Province are looking at other ways of fulfilling their aspirations and getting points across. The people in Labrador realize what the Federal Government has done for them and what it is still doing for them. When I asked a question of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with regards to roads, the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) came back to me and said, 'DREE, DREE'. Everything done in Labrador is DREE.

MR. HISCOCK: The high unemployment in Goose Bay; 'Get a Canadian base in Labrador City and Churchill Falls, get the federal government to build the highway between Churchill Falls and Wabush, get the federal government to do the Trans-Labrador Highway, get the federal government to do the airstrips, get the federal government to improve the coastal service'. The federal government is everything. So down in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it that the rights and various facilities in that area of our Province and country have been done in most cases by the federal government. And if the federal government in any way, technically or whatever, wants to question the boundary of our Labrador down there, as good as the Party has been to the people down there and as good as the people have been to the Party, there would be no question about an immediate uprising of the people in that area.

So I think really, Mr. Speaker, the question of the boundary is being brought up not for the consumption of Labradorians. There is no question whatsoever in Labrador that Labrador is theirs and it is the province's. It is for the consumption of St. John's. It is for the consumption of the urban areas where the Conservatives have their seats. It is rattling another cage.

'Look, the Liberals in Ottawa, the government, are going to be taking Labrador away from us'. And I have to say that this Province and this government, for the most part, look at Labrador just like Quebec looks at it, and that is one of exploitation, one of great resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And if this government and this Province continues to look upon Labrador as bringing down

MR. HISCOCK: the Churchill Falls power into Grand Falls and not allowing any of that power to stop on the coast, instead having diesel generators, paying the highest rate for electricity in this Province, and if the Province continues to do this and continues to neglect the roads, the schools, the Trans-Labrador Highway, high unemployment in Goose Bay, the second generation in Labrador - Wabush area, then I am sad to say that this Province, not only the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, will have to wake up to the reality of what is happening in Labrador. So I say, Mr. Speaker, the enemy is not Ottawa with regard to the boundary, the enemy itself is within our own Province.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on to is the one of education, another great emotional issue. I never thought, being a younger member of this House and of this Province, that I would ever see the head of sectarianism rise as it did about 100 years ago when they would have the battles between the Orangemen and the Catholics in Harbour Grace or Carbonear or in other areas of the Province. We thought this issue was dead, we thought this issue was long dead and buried, and also what the resolution of this government has pointed out with regard to the sacred rights, was gone forever. But no, Mr. Speaker, it was brought up from the point of view of getting our people and thinking that the churches were going to latch on to it. Sure, the churches are concerned. So are we concerned. Various church delegations and the DEC's met in Ottawa to have meetings with the federal government officials and we will know more about that in time as the talks progress.

But with regard to education, during 1970 and 1974, in the DREE expenditure educational

MR. HISCOCK: facilities, special areas agreement, over \$38 million was spent by the federal government on educational facilities in this Province. Education is entirely a provincial responsibility. The elementary school on MacDonald Drive - 75 per cent a grant and 25 per cent a loan, totalling over \$1 million (inaudible) \$300,000. Land acquisition for MacDonald Drive Elementary School - 100 per cent of that was a loan to the provincial government, \$124,000. The Junior High School on MacDonald Drive - 75 per cent of that was a grant, 25 per cent was a loan, over \$2.5 million. St. John's West high school, Beaconsfield - 75 per cent was a grant, 25 per cent was a loan, \$2,768,000. Mount Pearl, the students that were here today - I am sad to say they are not here now and I am also sad to say that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is not here. Because if there is any area in this Province that owes anything to the federal government with regard to education, it is Mount Pearl itself. Mount Pearl Junior High School - 75 per cent a grant, \$3.5 million given to the town

MR. E. HISCOCK:

of Mount Pearl. The Mount Pearl Junior High School equipment, 50 per cent by the federal government, 50 per cent for loan \$290,000; Mount Pearl Junior High School land acquisition 100 per cent loan, -

DR. COLLINS:

Did not all the provinces get (inaudible)?

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Not on education! Not on education! And the minister can definitely say, and I can go on record here as saying that this province is the only one that has a special case and a special agreement. And not only that, that was done away with at the initiation of our provincial government here which said, 'We cannot afford these DREE schools that the federal government is giving us. We cannot afford to maintain them. So, therefore, we are getting out of it because we are not going to be tied to paying the fuel costs, paying x number of other things'. St. John's West Elementary School, 50 per cent grant, 50 per cent loan, \$2,758,000; the junior high school in Corner Brook, 50 per cent grant and 50 per cent loan, \$3 million; the junior high school in Corner Brook land acquisition 100 per cent loan; the Seal Cove Vocational School extension 50 per cent loan and grant for \$652,000. The other part came from, which is an equal amount, from the federal Department of Employment and Immigration; Memorial University Engineering building 25 per cent grant, \$2 million; Beaconsfield High School 75 per cent grant, 25 per cent loan, \$2,600,000; the vocational school extension Gander, 50 per cent loan and 50 per cent grant for \$394,000; St. Paul's High School, Gander 50 per cent loan and 50 per cent grant, \$2.5 million; St. Lawrence High School 50 per cent loan 50 per cent grant \$300,000; Creston South High School 75 per cent grant and 25 per cent loan \$1,300,000; Marys-town High School 75 per cent grant 25 per cent loan for \$1.5 million; the vocational school extension in Burin

MR. E. HISCOCK: 50 per cent, 50 per cent grant, \$616,000; the elementary school in Grand Bank 75 per cent grant, 25 per cent loan for \$1.2 million; the high school in Stephenville - the hon. member for Stephenville's district (Mr. Stagg) - 75 per cent grant, 25 per cent loan for \$1.9 million; the regional high school in Stephenville land acquisition etc., 50 per cent grant, 50 per cent loan for \$4.5 million; the elementary school in Stephenville Crossing 50 per cent loan, 50 per cent grant for \$3.5 million; the elementary school in Hawkes Bay 50 per cent loan, 50 per cent grant for \$600,000; the regional high school in Port Saunders 50 per cent grant, 50 per cent loan for \$1.5 million; the elementary school in Happy Valley 75 per cent grant, 25 per cent loan for \$1.8 million; the vocational school in Happy Valley 25 per cent loan, 75 per cent grant for \$2,016,000.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, - the total is \$38,484,122.21 - I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and this hon. House does this sound like a government, the government of Canada is interested in taking away educational rights in this Province? They are not concerned with taking away educational rights. They would have continued helping this Province in the educational field if the Education Department and the government did not turn around and say to them, 'We cannot afford to upkeep these schools.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: I also will give the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), or the former Minister of Education credit that it may not have always been the Education Department itself but many of the school boards themselves complained that they could not upkeep these schools. And the school boards complained from the point of view that they could not maintain the schools because the provincial government was not giving them their grants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right, right!

MR. E. HISCOCK: So whether it is a roundabout way or whatever, it was that they could not maintain these schools.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, they were designed and they were designed from a national standard. So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say with regard to the educational issues and with regard to the boundaries issues, these are two emotional issues, and if our people, who got so upset at the beginning-when you find out that basically you come home to your home and it is broken into and it is ransacked or whatever, the immediate thing is to get upset. But if you look around, basically you find out that it might have been done by a storm, it might have been done by an explosion or it might have been done by whatever, once one investigates the situation. We have turned around and perpetrated a fraud our people and basically said, 'Look, the educational issue and the emotional issues of the boundary, give them to our people and they will latch on to them and our popularity will go up even more.'

MR. E. HISCOCK: I would like to ask this hon. House why, when they brought in the resolution themselves, why was it saying that they only wanted shared jurisdiction over fisheries, provincial ownership of offshore oil and gas and free transmission of electrical energy across a neighbouring province? Why was it that only those three issues - we have heard, by bringing in this amendment, that we did not include all five. I would like to ask the hon. House why were these two sacred rights when a provincial broadcast on public paid television went out by the Premier, why were those two things not included? Did he feel he had covered them enough in that issue, the half an hour address, that he did not have to address these, that by the Premier stating this that we no longer had to protect these rights, that as soon as the Premier spoke on them everything was okay, that the Premier had spoken? I would like the answer to these questions about these two sacred rights.

And, Mr. Speaker, for myself in supporting this amendment to the resolution, I support the amendment to this resolution because these are the two basic sacred rights that all people in this Province agree on and all parties of all political persuasions and all religions. With regard to the share of our fisheries' jurisdiction, our unions in this Province do not agree with it and there are various other fishermen and committees who do not agree with it. With regards to free transmission of electrical energy, I really have to ask this House another question. Since being elected I have heard time and time again the letter that the hon. Mr. Joe Clark - the former Prime Minister of Canada sent a letter giving us control of ownership of the offshore.

AN HON. MEMBER: A great man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. HISCOCK: And all this letter is basically saying - it was a letter and the Province has held it up as a legal document. Here is the Prime Minister of Canada now, Mr. -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) a letter from the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premier of Newfoundland; and you dismiss it like that?

MR. E. HISCOCK: I did not dismiss it like this, I said it is held up as a document. And I totally agree with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) from the point of view that it is from the Prime Minister. But I ask this House if we are not playing politics when we receive a similar letter from Prime Minister Trudeau with regard to transmission lines through Quebec saying, 'We will give you the transmission through Quebec when the contract comes' - why is that letter not held in the same esteem and the same equality? Why is it that? From one political persuasion - so I say to this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that we are playing politics, we can take the word of one of the former Prime Ministers but the present Prime Minister, we cannot take his because he is of a different political persuasion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that when it comes to this issue, and more and more as I sit in this House do I realize the game of politics and how much we play politics. I suppose it is only natural in itself, but I find also a little bit of hypocrisy that when this Opposition brings in a resolution on sacred rights that the Premier took a half an hour to explain on television that the government rejects it saying, 'No, we reject it because those other three issues are in'.

MR. NEARY: It does not go far enough.

MR. HISCOCK: Exactly. So I am saying, those three that are here, why are those two not included in it? Why? Is it because the Premier spoke on it that they do not need to be there. We feel -

MR. BARRY: You are saying that is enough.

MR. E. HISCOCK: - we are not saying that this is enough, we are saying that there is a unanimous agreement in this House on the two sacred rights, within this Province with shares fisheries jurisdiction, there is not unanimous agreement. Also, I will say to this Province, and this is my own personal opinion, that with regard to bringing back the Constitution that if we had to agree 100 per cent for the full ten provinces we would never get it because our Premier himself has said, 'If we cannot get these three resolutions we want - these three in this resolution - if we do not get these, we are not supporting the repatriation of the Constitution. PEI can turn around and come up with three more, Nova Scotia with three more, Alberta with three more.

MR. L. BARRY: You are saying this is enough. You will approve it if this is done.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the resolutions that are brought here, that if it comes down to having a total 100 per cent agreement of this House, whether it is three here, whether it is two from this end, or whether it is five from Alberta, we will never get unanimous agreement. We have been trying, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) said, since 1965, and we have also been trying under the administration of Mr. Trudeau for the past eleven or twelve years. And I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, thank God for this Province and for the country as a whole, that we have a Liberal majority government in Ottawa and that we are also being supported by the NDP Party in Ottawa; that these re-

MR. E. HISCOCK: solutions are not going to England, they are not being decided in England, these are being decided, debated, amended by a joint Constitution Committee of the Parliament of Canada and the Senate of Canada, these will come back into the House of Parliament in Ottawa, they will be voted on by a majority of government

MR. HISCOCK: as well as supported by the NDP party. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I feel that going to Westminster, from the point of view of being rubber stamped, that these changes are taking place here and these changes are taking place here because, number one, we do not have a Liberal government in the provinces, they are all conservative or NDP and Social Credit, and it is purely politics -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - that this government, particularly the national government and the Progressive Conservative parties are taking, they are latching onto this issue like a mad dog taking a cat and swinging it back and forth and basically saying, 'Let us give it for all we got'. And I say too, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: A mad dog with the rabies.

MR. HISCOCK: - that with the resolutions that are before us with the charter of rights, I said before and I will say it again, why is it that this hon. House and this Province does not have its own charter of rights? Why is it? And I also say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the amending formula, I am not particularly pleased with the amending formula but it is an amending formula that is before the resolutions of both the committees and that it will be agreed on when it comes back if the provinces can agree. So the challenges go back to the provinces with one hundred per cent of the provinces agreeing and if the provinces cannot agree then, then the type of resolution that is brought out. But if this country and the ten provinces say, "Look, we want one hundred per cent agreement before we change anything. We want all this agreement." Then I would say to them when it does come back, show your spirit of co-operation and come up with the amending formula that you want, not what the federal government wants in

MR. HISCOCK: Canada but what the provinces want. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I say to this hon. House, that two years extension, three years extension, that they cannot come up with an agreement. We have parties within Canada of the same stripe going against each other. You have one government saying it should be this and you have another government in Alberta saying that and another government in Ontario saying whatever. So, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the resolution, this country of ours that had three confirmed of federalism through the federal party and also Quebec by saying they wanted to stay in Canada and renewed federalism. Renewed federalism is okay our province is saying, as long as you do it our way. If you do not do it our way then that is it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: But we are not playing ball. And I am also a little bit concerned from the point of view of international protocol and international customs. When Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran got elected he broke all international rules, regulations and whatever. And, basically, what has happened here is that the Premier of this Province has also broken a lot. I am not comparing him in anyway I am just saying how the state and how the international laws breakdown when you have anarchy. Our Premier made himself available to the press on the referendum night and said it was a great vote of confidence for Canada, etc., etc. But when it comes to accomodating some of these wishes, no, forget about it, you know we have to have this, we have to have that. And, also, with regard to going over to the UK now and wanting to meet with this group and this group and whatever and that, a federal state deals with a federal state and I find it a political embarrassment that we have the Premier of Newfoundland going over to England. To speak,

MR. HISCOCK: no problem, but to bring up the issues and to go on in his style that he is bringing on, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is out of the realm of international protocol and state protocol.

MR. HOUSE: You are agreeing with Levesque going to France and talking.

MR. HISCOCK: I do not agree with Mr. Levesque going to France. I do not agree with Quebec having joint jurisdictions and going through federal agreements with Africa or anything. We are a federal state and when we are going to have negotiations we have them. I do not agree with Levesque going here or Peckford going there or anybody. We have negotiations of a federal state and we have it.

Mr. Peckford said while he was in England, "Let us fight our own battles in Canada." I suggest that it would have been better for the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador to go before the constitutional committee like Mr. McLean the premier of PEI did, instead of going on over and grandstanding before the world in the UK.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: I do not mind him making a fool of himself but he is making a fool of us.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, I would say again to this Province, and hopefully the Province will wake up, that

MR. E. HISCOCK: what we are having, we are having a political affair, we are having a camouflage of emotion and that many of the issues that are being presented are going unnoticed and we are getting on to issues before the House now, other resolutions, and we are basically - I am not saying we are wasting the time of this hon. House or the people of this Province, but I am saying that the day to day bread and butter issues of the roads, of the schools, of health, of the strike at the Trade School, these are the issues, Mr. Speaker. I also realize that we have to rise above this and this is why we are elected, for what we do. But I would say Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. E. HISCOCK: - we cannot continue. If this Province is going to run efficiently we cannot continue to ignore the day to day operations of this Province and get into fighting enemies and fighting overall broader issues. They are fine if we can maintain the same system as we are going by fighting these broader issues. But when we ask questions in this hon. House of ministers who are not knowing the answers and have to take it as notice and go back to their departments, then I would say Mr. Speaker, too much time in Cabinet is spent on the broader issues of the constitution, of taking on Nova Scotia, of how we are going to continue to get re-elected so that when Hibernia comes in, we are in there for fifteen or twenty years. We cannot just continue to fool our people in this Province and have another election and once we are in, then we can turn around and pave this with gold, and we can do this, we can do that. And I am afraid to say, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned,

MR. E. HISCOCK: whether it is accepted for anything in this House, or whatever by the hon. government, that I am afraid that the tactics they are taking, they are taking from the point of view that we have to get re-elected so that the oil will come, and once we get the oil to come then we will deal with the day to day issues of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, we do not have to always agree with the federal government, we do not have to agree with our own political parties, we do not have to agree with other Provinces in this nation. But when it comes to issues of running our country and running this Province then, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is about time we got of the politics affair and get into greater co-operation. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and this hon. House for the time. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I am waiting for somebody on the other side Mr. Speaker, Nobody going to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I am fairly brief in this debate. I would want to say, Mr. Speaker, that, you know, for the past thirty years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order please! The hon.member
for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if there is a keynote
if there is one word that is key to this debate and key to
the feelings of the people of this Province today, it is
confusion. The people of this Province are utterly and
totally confused, Mr. Speaker. For thirty years we have
been a member of confederation, we have been a Province
of Canada, and over that thirty years there has been built
up a sense of trust, a sense of satisfaction, a sense of
fulfilment, pride of been part of the Canadian fabric.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: And even the most dedicated opponents
to confederation, Mr. Speaker, concedes that now and have
been conceding it from day one. And today, up until a few
months ago, there was no possibility of finding anyone in
this Province who would have questioned our position in
confederation, or have questioned our pride in being.
But, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Premier's action, as
a result of that much talked about half hour on T.V., there
is a state of confusion in this Province,
and the confusion was started when, in the first ministers
conference, all of Newfoundland watched our Premier sidling
up to Premier Levesqué. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Newfoundland
people today had to point out public enemy number 1
to our ambitions as a province, it would have to be Quebec.
It would have to Premier Levesqué. The one province, the
one province that has publicly had designs on the Labrador
boundary - the Premier brought the Labrador boundary into it -
well, the one province, Mr. Speaker, which publicly indicated
to this country that they wanted to grab off a piece of
Labrador, that they would have changed the Labrador -

November 28, 1980

Tape No. 2515

RA - 4

MR. G. FLIGHT: tried to change the Labrador
boundary - I recall the Premier a few years ago com-
plaining,

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, because Quebec had issued a map ignoring the boundary of Labrador. The one province, Mr. Speaker, that wanted to break this country up, wanted to pull out of Confederation, Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland could not believe it when Premier Peckford said for all the country to hear, 'If I have to make a decision, if I have to support a position, I will support Premier Levesqué before I will support the Prime Minister of Canada.'

MR. WARREN:

And that is what they call a good Premier.

MR. FLIGHT:

And there is where the confusion started, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the district that I represent, Central Newfoundland, there is real confusion for the simple reason, the only thing that is happening that has any effect on improving the people's way of life, is federally funded projects. You know, they have the NIP programmes and the RRAP programmes and Canada Works programmes. Everyone knows it is federal, and they say to themselves, 'Well, what is this?' This provincial government led by Premier Peckford has done nothing,

MR. FLIGHT: nothing at all that would give us any reason to appreciate the fact that he is Premier. The only things we see going on around us are the things that we know are federally funded programmes. We have some reason to appreciate Ottawa. Thank God there are federally funded programmes over which this Province does not have jurisdiction or we would be lost totally, economically. Now, that is the feeling in my part of the Province.

So the confusion is there, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that the Premier wants to bash Ottawa? Why is it that he wants to take an approach, an irreversible approach, Mr. Speaker? There are people in this Province saying that if this man gets his way it is an irreversible road. You go down the road, Mr. Speaker, until you have to face that final question; will we stay in or will we get out?

Mr. Speaker, let me say something else. Unless our faith in Canada and this country is not well taken, unless we have been kidding ourselves, what the Premier told us that night on T.V.; that number one, our denominational education would be taken away, that number two, the Labrador boundary would be changed and Quebec would gobble up some of Labrador, that all of our economic rights, every economic right, offshore, hydro, everything that the Canadian people - because in the event of a referendum it will have to be the Canadian people - if suddenly the Canadian people want to deny us all these rights, then for me, Mr. Speaker, that Particular night, I sat there for a second and said, 'Well, I agree with him. And if that is true, let us stop talking about foolish constitutional amendments and let the Premier bring in a resolution, and if he can prove this is right, let us look at getting out of it altogether". So these rights will not

MR. FLIGHT: be jeopardized because if they are jeopardized, if they do not move now to deny us those rights, they may move fifteen years from now to deny us those rights. So if the Premier really believes all the things that he said will happen, then let him stand up and tell the people of Newfoundland that we have no trust left, that it will be dangerous for us to stay part of this country, that a referendum will deny us everything that we hold dear. And I will guarantee you he will get more support, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to talk about that possibility than he will talking about the foolish constitutional amendments and arguments that are passing over people's heads.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are confused, they are wondering whether or not we should continue on, whether we should not look at our place in Confederation and, Mr. Speaker, that confusion has been started by Premier Peckford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the Premier's speech that night and thought about it, I spent the next few days travelling in Central Newfoundland and I talked to a lot of people about how they felt about the Premier's speech. Mr. Speaker, most people do not understand all the ramifications of the offshore debate, most people do not understand the ramifications of the hydro, of the legislation we have brought in, they do not know about the trustees and the clauses that are there and the various cost sharing possibilities, they do not understand most of the things referred to in the Premier's resolution, but I will guarantee you the one issue they understand, and the Premier well knew they understood it, and his advisors well knew they understood it, and that was their denominational rights

MR. FLIGHT: and the Labrador boundary. Those were the two issues, Mr. Speaker, that they understand, and they understand and they fear that these rights will be changed. They could not believe that the Premier was saying this was going to happen.

I came into this city, Mr. Speaker, to our first caucus, and I am betraying no caucus secret, and I suggested that I would be supporting it because I assumed that when that resolution came in, the resolution would revolve around the denominational rights and the Labrador boundary. Because that is all he talked about. He played on the fears of people, on the emotions of people, and he got people uptight. And everyone I saw, Mr. Speaker, did not want to talk about the offshore, they did not want to talk about hydro, they did not want to talk about the fisheries, they wanted to talk about protecting our denominational rights and the Labrador boundary. And I could not believe, Mr. Speaker, when that resolution came in, that there was no reference at all to the one issue that the Premier had frightened everybody in Newfoundland to death on.

I came in, Mr. Speaker, thinking that I would be supporting the resolution. Any resolution brought into this House that openly indicated that our denominational rights and the Labrador boundary would be protected against any referendum, forever enshrined, I could support. There was nothing in that resolution, Mr. Speaker, that addressed itself to the fears that the Premier raised. And there was some suggestion that this resolution might be political. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought that we had come up with an amendment that would have taken it out of the political realm. I thought that that resolution would have been acceptable to the government. I believed, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT: that the government was concerned about our denominational rights, and they were concerned about Labrador. I was not prepared to believe that they were being hypocritical and playing the issue for

MR. G. FLIGHT: the political mileage that was in it, I could not believe that. And, Mr. Speaker, the member from Lewisport (Mr. White) indicated that who knows what would have happened in this debate, who knows what would happen to this resolution? Had our amendment been approved in this House, had the government supported that resolution, then they would have proven to me, certainly, that it was not necessarily a political maneuver that they were sincere in wanting to make sure that our rights were enshrined. But Mr. Speaker, when the indication came that they were not prepared to support that resolution, it suddenly became very apparent to me and, Mr. Speaker, it is slowly becoming very apparent to the people of this Province, that the Premier, that particular night reached an all time low, Mr. Speaker, an all time low in playing on the emotions and the fears of the people of this Province for political gain and nothing else. Nothing you see published today by the Premier's office Mr. Speaker, refers to denominational rights or the Labrador boundaries, he does not need to any more, he has the people of this Province in a state of confusion, in a state of concern Mr. Speaker. And I will tell you that I would like to know, I would like to know what the people out there are thinking. When the word goes out that this House and this government are not prepared to support the amendment that enshrines, that guarantees their denominational rights and the Labrador boundary, I wonder what their opinion will be? Will it be, Mr. Speaker, what was Peckford talking about? He came on, he got the churches upset, the schools upset, and he got the people upset where it hurts most, on their emotions, on their fears, on their demands to keep the denominational system. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, I am afraid that the govern-

MR. G. FLIGHT: ment may get a shock as a result of what the Premier of this Province has perpetrated on the people of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) a few minutes ago talked about how we go once more, how we go once more and try to get a unanimous agreement. Let me ask the Minister of Development, or the Minister of Mines and Energy this - he is wanting to ask questions all the time - the Minister of Mines and Energy can see the situation where Quebec would agree to the free access of power out of Labrador over Quebec. Now, as long as Quebec was not - I have to believe, if I believe anything about the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy, I have to believe that they would accept nothing, nothing, no constitutional amendments or a constitution that would continue to deprive this Province of free access of our power across Quebec.

MR. L. BARRY: (Inaudible) constitution.

MR. FLIGHT: Can the minister ever conceive of a constitution that will guarantee free access. That Quebec will agree - the minister knows he will not.

MR. L. BARRY: In response to that question Mr. Speaker, the federal government already has the constitutional authority under the present constitution.

MR. LUSH: That was a rhetorical question.

MR. BARRY: Oh, it is rhetorical? Oh, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a minute on the preferential treatment.

MR. G. FLIGHT: the mobility clause.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a minute on the mobility clause. It seems to me that Newfoundland - it seems to me that since we joined Confederation there has indeed been local preference -

MR. HODDER: Nearly every province has it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Every province in this country has given Newfoundlanders preference to jobs. There has been a preference policy.

MR. L. BARRY: If I send you over an article, a copy of a speech from Mr. McEachen, could you just read it out to the House?

MR. G. FLIGHT: I will send you over a statement made by Mr. Elmer McKay telling you what he thinks of your Premier's (inaudible)

MR. L. BARRY: From Mr. McEachen, to show where Mr. McEachen is going to send the jobs in the offshore.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest - this Province, Mr. Speaker, - the demanding of mobility rights, the refusal of accepting mobility rights, demanding -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Are you finished back and forth now? Mr. Speaker, the province's refusal to accept mobility rights in the constitution - they are demanding preferential treatment for workers from Newfoundland - has got to be the biggest admission by any government that their educational programmes in this Province have failed dismally. We have known, Mr. Speaker, we have known that we will be going into an offshore development, or an offshore related economy for eight years. Day after day in this House of Assembly for this past five years, I have heard members on this side stand up and question the Minister of Education as to whether programmes were being put in place that will one day prepare

MR. G. FLIGHT: our young Newfoundlanders for jobs in the offshore. Nothing happened, Mr. Speaker. Today our young Newfoundlanders are not prepared and if every there was a blow to the pride of people - Mr. Speaker, how would you like to have your son work on an oil rig and his co-workers say to him, 'The only reason you are here - you would not be here on your own - is because your government insisted we put you here, not because you have the abilities.' How about that feeling, Mr. Speaker, that young Newfoundlanders may well be subjected to as a result of preferential treatment? Why did not the government, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the Cabinet recognize the need to change our vocational system, to change our educational system to prepare our young Newfoundlanders for the jobs so they took them by right, by ability.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders can go anywhere in this country and if an employer in Toronto or Alberta or Manitoba has got a chance, he will hire a Newfoundlander over most other people and the reason is because we have established a reputation as hard workers, responsible people and those traits, Mr. Speaker, will be recognized by the offshore companies coming in here or anybody else coming in wanting to hire people. Those traits are established forever. There is only one problem, Mr. Speaker, and only one need for our preferential treatment clause, is that we recognize and the government recognizes that they failed to prepare our young Newfoundlanders to take on the jobs that will be available. To cover up that mistake and that shortcoming, they have decided to say, 'We will not permit people to know that we have not allowed our young Newfoundlanders to be prepared, we will have a preferential treatment clause and they will go to work anyway.'

MR. G. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, somebody said a few days ago, 'I am not sure that I would want to live in a country where my right to work or travel and live where I wanted to work and travel and live was in anyway restricted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: This Province, Mr. Speaker, this government would have some problem on their hands today if Alberta decided, or Manitoba decided to decide, 'Well, if that is the way Newfoundland feels we will put our people to work, we will ship out the Newfoundlanders in Alberta who have come here this past two years. Mr. Speaker, 166 men were laid off in Buchans a year and a half ago. The bulk of those people are now working in Lind Lake, Alberta, Ontario. What about if those provinces had preferential treatment clauses? Where would they be working today, Mr. Speaker? This government was unable to find them a job, this government was incapable of doing anything in Buchans for ten years that would have guaranteed their ability to stay there. They had to go away and they had to go to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Supposing they had faced, Mr. Speaker, a preferential treatment

MR. FLIGHT: clause in Ontario. What is the present rate of unemployment in Ontario, Mr. Speaker? How many plants have shut down, Mr. Speaker? How many native born Ontarians are walking around in Toronto today while Newfoundlanders hold down good secure jobs? Is that what you want to change? You do not agree with that concept?

Mr. Speaker, I tell you now, I am as loyal a Newfoundlander as is in this House, but I am telling you now, if I were a member of the Alberta Legislature or the Quebec Legislature or the Ontario Legislature and I saw this kind of a policy coming out of Newfoundland, I would stand in my place in one of those Legislatures and propose legislation that would stop Newfoundlanders from going to work in that province.

MR. ROBERTS: If we are going to be Canadians, let us move within Canada.

MR. FLIGHT: If we are going to be Canadians, let us move within Canada, that is right.

Mr. Speaker, I would probably go further and say, 'Look, I have a constituency' - my constituency in Toronto. If I stood in the Legislature in Ontario, and, say, I have 15,000 men not working, all my constituents, I would demand their right to work and I would be calling in the companies and saying, 'How many Newfoundlanders do you have on your payroll?'

MR. LUSH: Get them out of here.

MR. FLIGHT: Get them out and let us start putting my people in.

MR. COLLINS: Alberta understands but the federal government does not.

MR. LUSH: They only want it one way, you know.

MR. FLIGHT: They only want it one way, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, talk about confusion!

MR. R. MOORES: What a statement for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to make!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: We talk about confusion in this Province. We have the sickening - you know, Mr. Speaker, and it is almost not worth talking about - but we have the sickening performance of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) two or three weeks ago saying on public radio and T.V., 'I cannot reshoulder the roads, I cannot patch the roads, I cannot maintain a decent road system in this Province because Ottawa will not sign the agreements, will not give us the money we need to do it. And the reason they will not give us the money to do it is because they want to trade off our offshore rights.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that was somebody with some stature saying that, the people of Newfoundland might believe it. We have the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) saying, 'I cannot implement any forest management programmes, I cannot do anything about the mess in our forests because Ottawa will not sign the agreements, and the reason they will not give us the money is because we will not give a little on the offshore.' How green, Mr. Speaker, does the ministry think the people of Newfoundland are?

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is another area of confusion in Newfoundland outside of this city. The government cannot maintain a basic, decent health facility in this Province. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) has to put on a dispensing fee, \$2.50, in order to get drugs dispensed in a cottage hospital to senior citizens. Municipalities are going broke, cannot maintain basic services, and the reason they cannot - and they may accept that - is because this Province cannot give them the money

MR. FLIGHT: to do the job. Well, if ever there was a reason for confusion, Mr. Speaker, we turned on the T.V. one day two months ago and here is the Premier saying, 'We are going to give one of the richer Crown corporations in Canada, C.N., \$20 million to build a synchrolift in St. John's.'

MR. R. MOORES: Now!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, how does the minister, when he goes back to Deer Lake and he goes back to Howley -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - how do any of the members go, when they go outside of this city, and rationalize that? - reconcile that although we cannot provide the basic services and facilities, the rights that people expect, we are going to now give \$20 million to C.N. to build a synchrolift?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me add to that and say this, I have no problem with this Province, this government. If the research shows the synchrolift is necessary, if the research shows that the funds are not available anywhere else, then I have no problem with this Province giving the \$20 million. But here is where I have the problem, Mr. Speaker, once that decision is made that we are going to fund the synchrolift for \$20 million, then by what right do we deprive \$5 million to build the Buchans - South West Brook road? That road is just as important to the people of that district as the synchrolift is to the people of St. John's. The industrial park in Windsor, Mr. Speaker, is just as important to the people who live in Windsor, if not more so, than the synchrolift is to St. John's.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is great confusion in this Province today. There is becoming more and more, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FLIGHT: a feeling that this whole constitutional debate, brought on by the Premier, is a smoke screen, nothing less than a smoke screen to cover up this government's inability to deal with the Province. Nothing has happened in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in eight years, nothing has happened to improve the way of life of the people of this Province, nothing. It did not happen under Premier Moores. It is not happening under Premier Peckford. Yet we have these blockbusters, we have these blockbuster press conferences called, the Labrador issue, the constitution issue, the offshore issue. Keep people talking, keep their minds averted away from the fact that -

MR. ROBERTS: Attempt to divert them.

MR. FLIGHT: Divert them away from the fact that we are going down the drain, that this government is not able. And, Mr. Speaker, I might say and I said it before, that there is some feeling - there was a feeling for the Premier of Newfoundland, the young fighting Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker. He was going to protect Newfoundland. But there is getting to be a great feeling outside of this, certain circles, that the Premier of Newfoundland is not necessarily his own man anymore.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Not necessarily his own man. But the policies we see coming - and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) might well listen to this - that the policies we see coming are the policies of the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins), the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), the people, Mr. Speaker, who kept Newfoundland in a state of -

MR. LUSH: The Marshall plan.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, the Marshall plan for Newfoundland. -who kept this Province in a state of almost starvation. Now, Mr. Speaker, our young fighting Newfoundlander, the Premier, is now in their hands and the policies we see flowing out from him are the kind of policies that we were used to before 1949

MR. FLIGHT: when half this Province starved to death and St. John's prospered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, so he may lose some of his credibility, he may well lose some of his credibility, and, as a matter of fact he is, take it from me, he is losing a lot of his credibility, your great leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to wind up this speech by simply saying that this Province, the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have had perpetrated on them the lowest and most hypocritical form of - there is no source of politics lower or more hypocritical than the kind of politics that have been practiced by the Premier of this Province and supported by his followers on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker. The hypocrisy is clear and it is blatant. There is a resolution here, an amendment asking to have enshrined for all time the basic rights of Newfoundlanders; our rights to teach our children under the denominational system, the right to guarantee the Labrador boundary. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion, a resolution, an amendment that asks to have that done. Now how, Mr. Speaker, in view of the Premier's performance, how can anyone conceive a more hypocritical position than thirty-four members of this Legislature will stand and oppose, Mr. Speaker, the right to have our denominational system and the Labrador boundary enshrined. How low can you go, Mr. Speaker? How hypocritical can you get? And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it may be in the near future, it may be a long ways from now, but the party and the government who did this, who played on the emotions of the people of this Province to the extent you have, will one day pay the price. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Are you ready for the question? The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much. I would just like to take a few minutes to speak very briefly on the amendment presented to the House by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). Anybody who wishes to go for a coffee may do so. We will be ready for the question about ten to one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thank you.

MR. MOORES: Right. Mr. Speaker, the amendment as proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is perhaps, I believe, one of the best pieces of political strategy -

MR. STIRLING: Do not give away our secrets.

MR. MOORES: - that I have seen brought into this House. And the reason for it is because the Premier of this Province, had the Leader of the Opposition not

MR. R. MOORES: introduced it, the Premier of this Province would have gotten away with one of the biggest bluffs that has ever been perpetrated in this little Province of ours. I cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province, allegedly an educated man, would get on television for a half an hour -

MR. T. LUSH: That is what you would call asininity.

MR. R. MOORES: - and expound the virtues of the denominational education system in this Province and inform Newfoundlanders of the impending threat that our Labrador - Quebec boundary was going to be changed or taken away from us altogether.

MR. NEARY: The Canadian wolf.

MR. R. MOORES: Well, well, well. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is not that the Premier is doing what he is doing, or has done what he has done, the problem is that he is getting away with it. The problem is that the people of this Province are being duped into believing that what the man says is right. And that comes directly from what my colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was just alluding to, the confusion, the deliberate confusion that has been injected into the public air waves, through the media and that is being either disregarded by the people as a whole or is being left undigested, undigested in a proper sense. Now there is nobody to blame in this Province for that but the media. If we had any kind of substantive intellect in our journalism in this Province, investigative reporting of some substance, they would be able to prepare all of this politicking, all of this trash and rubbish that is going on

MR. R. MOORES: in press conferences on a daily basis, they would be able to take it to turn it into an objective report and present it to the people properly as is their responsibility. The responsibility of a free press does not mean that it is free to be negligent, or free to be irresponsible, but it is free to provide proper information, properly presented to the people in any electorate, in any society -

MR. S. NEARY: The eyes and ears of this House.

MR. R. MOORES: -and they have not done that.

And sometimes it is inopportune for a politician to get up in the people's House and belabour the shortcomings of the press, the media. But I for one, I for one have no reason to suck in with those in the press gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: But there are those, there are those, particularly on the government side of the House, who find it most appropriate to do just that at the expense of the people of this Province, I might add. And this constitutional issue has become one of the biggest fiascos, the biggest piece of deceit presented to the people of this Province that I have ever seen. And I get back to my initial point that I believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) used good strategy when he presented this amendment, good strategy, to emphasize that the two points which the Premier came on television to talk to the people of this Province about, was the denominational education system and the territorial integrity of our Province; two points, very clear, very concise about them. And he said they were oh so important to the future of this Province, particularly as it relates to our future within Canada. Now, what have we heard of since? Since the half hour on television what have we heard of? Well, we have heard

MR. R. MOORES: nothing. We have heard nothing from the Premier at all about those two basic issues and here is the reason for it: On the territorial integrity problem the people of Labrador almost castrated him, politically speaking. When he got the feedback from Labradorians and he realized what a stupid, idiotic issue that he had created, that he had fabricated and that it was backfiring and that he was losing support, public support,

MR. R. MOORES: in Labrador, he said, "I had better keep quiet about it". Now, on the denominational education thing, after realizing that he had turned up a hotbed of disaster, that he should never have touched with a hundred foot pole in this Province, something that for 155 years politicians have steered clear of, because if they did not they sure as hell found out why, and after fabricating, after creating something that was not even there and realizing that he was not making any political points on it, he backed off again, but not before he had done almost irrevocable damage to the social fabric of this Province. Because the history of religion in this Province says that the denominational education arose as a result of compromise on the part of all religions because they had been worrying and fighting and confronting each other for decades. And they sat down like sensible people and they compromised and they said, "That is all right we will all have our separate religion and our separate school system". And from that compromise arose what most people would consider a quite workable educational system in this Province. It would not have worked otherwise.

Now, what merit is there in the Premier saying that the denominational education system was in jeopardy? Well, for thirty years we have had a denomination in this Province, the Penecostal Assemblies, who have existed in a legal sense by the grace of this House. They have no rights, specifically, under Term 29, the Terms of Union of this Province, but yet they have existed without any threat -

AN HON. MEMBER: Not under term 29.

MR. MOORES: No, I am sorry, that was an error. The Terms of Union I meant. They have never been threatened by this House. In fact, they have received more protection from this House because they have no legal protection under the Terms of Union. So where is the threat, where is the real threat to the denominational education system in this Province? In

MR. MOORES: the mind of the Premier who irresponsibly and without any regard to 200 or 300 years of history in this Province, without any regard to it, have it up to the people of Newfoundland and had the gall and the shamelessness to come on television and speak to the people of the Province about it. Now after realizing his mistake he never mentions it again, never said a word about it. Now the constitutional issue has become economic.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right. That is right.

MR. MOORES: Now it is a threat to Newfoundland's economy. And what are the three things that he sees as a threat to Newfoundland's economic future? Shared fisheries jurisdiction, and the fishermen of this Province do not want the Province of Newfoundland in on the fisheries jurisdiction in this Province.

MR. LUSH: They would do without the department altogether if they could, the provincial department.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) the fishermen, The fishermen -

MR. MOORES: They do not want them in there.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MOORES: The fishermen of this Province are frightened to death of the possibility, the mere possibility that this Province could get its hands on some of the jurisdiction of our fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Under the present minister. Under the present minister anyway.

MR. MOORES: And this provincial ownership of offshore oil and gas, we spent over a month in this House in the last sitting discussing this, over a month we spent when my hon. colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Jamieson) was the leader and who gave one of the finest speeches I have ever heard in this House on the issue and where we stand as a party

MR. R. MOORES: and where this Province should stand. Over a month, there are pages and chapters of Hansard covering it. And you would have thought that the Premier of this Province would have gotten some kind of sense out of that debate to see that this issue cannot be simplified. It is a very complex one that Newfoundland as well as Ottawa have no claim to, no ownership of, that we have two parties here involved, one and the other saying they own something which neither of them really owns legally, and the way to settle it is through the courts in this country and then we will get our rights if we have any,

MR. R. MOORES: a simple, straight forward, simple and straight forward solution to a very complex problem, too complex to be tossed childishly around by the Premier of this Province. And then there is the free transmission of electrical energy across neighbouring provinces. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you had been here, and you were, in the House the other day when this matter was being discussed, and the new bill that is going to expropriate the NFLCo water rates, well, if you had been here to see what kind of a sad testament that this Premier has, the understanding that he has of this, and how he is trying to again bluff the people of this Province. And I say to the Government House Leader that is all it is, a bluff in the greatest sense of the word. As it now stands, in the Province of Quebec there is a transmission line owned fully by the Province of Quebec and the Premier of this Province wants to, one, either use that transmission line or, two, put a new one there. If he uses the existing one owned fully by the Province of Quebec, then the National Energy Board of this country has absolutely no jurisdiction over it any more than they have over the Confederation Building in St. John's. And if he wants to build a new transmission line, a new transmission line then there must be agreement from the National Energy Board and some discussion rather than confrontation. And I do not believe that the Province of Quebec, in my own way of thinking, is going to allow the Province of Newfoundland or the Government of Canada or any other agency to go over its province with a transmission line that will destroy thousands and thousands of square miles of territory of its province, change and tear up thousands and thousands of acres of its land while there is an existing transmission line there. And therein lies the problem.

MR. FLIGHT: Why should they?

MR. R. MOORES: If the Province of Newfoundland cannot, and its Premier particularly, cannot change its attitude of confrontation, then I see the Lower Churchill and the Upper Churchill as an insoluble problem. You can expropriate what you like, you can use this House or misuse it and its legislative proceedings how you like, but unless you change your attitude my friends, that this is a co-operative federalism and that Newfoundland is an equal partner in it, unless you change your attitude and come to that thinking then you might as well kiss any kind of agreement from Quebec or Rene Levesque - and I do not know what this is about Levesque, because Claude Ryan, when he becomes premier, it is not a question now of if, it is a question of when, is going to be no more sympathetic towards Newfoundland and its confrontational attitude than Rene Levesque is. So there are the crippling issues that are going to affect the economic future of this Province. And the reason why they are going to affect the future of this Province negatively, is not because of the extraneous factors, not because of Quebec or Ottawa, or the National Energy Board, or Romeo LeBlanc or anything else, it is because of the attitude of this government. And nothing has ever been won by confrontation. This is in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Cap in hand.

MR. HISCOCK: It is not cap in hand at all.

MR. R. MOORES: This is in no way - it is physically different than a war in that the war is being fought in a mental sense, strategy, tact, and that type of thing, verbal combativeness and so on. But it is no different in its end result than a war, a military combat, nobody loses, nobody wins, we just end up being worse off as a whole. Society

MR. R. MOORES: as a whole, whether it is a national or international society, everybody loses. And the Premier of this Province, I would say he has already lost, I would say this Province

MR. R. MOORES:

has already lost if for no other reason than because he brought up this almost scandalous facade of denominational education. That ugly head has reared itself again. And some of us liberal thinkers and broadminded people in the education system, gone through university, have tried so hard to diminish those feelings, to put them under the rug and say, "Well, look, we are better men because of it". And the Premier of this Province in that one thing alone has done more damage to the social fabric of this Province and the intellectual thinking of its people, I would say, than almost any other issue. And it was unnecessary. That is the tragedy in all this, ladies and gentlemen, it was unnecessary. I mean, he did not have to go to the people for another two or three years and there were 100 other issues that he could have gone to the people with an election, 100 other. Why religion? Because the man never had any better sense. That is what it comes right down to.

MR. LUSH:

Or go the margarine butter that we all love so well.

MR. MOORES:

He never had any better sense. And I believe that that is true of most other confrontations that he has entered into. He does not have any better sense not to confront. The man has never been involved to any great extent. He came out of a high school teaching career into the office of the Premier almost overnight. And then going to take on the whole country, or the whole world. He is off now to England, to London to see the Queen.

MR. LUSH:

He will get thrown in the shower again.

MR. MOORES:

He is off to London to see the Queen and he goes over talking to businessmen and bankers in London about how these bankers and businessmen can influence the British

MR. R. MOORES: Parliament into seeing this constitutional affair our way. And these are the same businessmen and bankers to whom this Province indirectly, through the Come By Chance fiasco owes \$200 million, \$200 million that the Export Development Corporation, which is the British Government, the same Premier representing the same Province goes off to England to meet businessmen and bankers to ask for their influence and he stills owes them \$200 million.

MR. HODDER: Make no wonder they all came to the meeting.

MR. MOORES: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: To try to collect.

MR. MOORES: I would like to see what his answer was when one of those Limeys came up and asked him, "What about our \$200 million?", what his answer was.

Mr. Speaker, actually what should be done with this debate, both the amendment and the main resolution, what should have been done with it is it should have been put in a trash can, never brought into this House at all. It is not an issue with the people of this Province, not an issue at all with the people of this Province. They want jobs, they want job security, they want an improved standard of living, they want better educational and health facilities. They do not want constitutional discussion and debate and neither should this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit taken aback, surprised. I have not been in the House since last - well, I guess since the first day it opened. I thought this was the great constitutional debate but apparently it is not as great as I thought it was going to be. I thought that everybody on the government side of the House would wish to stand and to

MR. THOMS: defend Newfoundland's sacred and other rights. But I guess that is not to be the case. I must say I am a bit surprised. I certainly thought that everybody on the government side of the House would wish to stand and speak in this debate and, hopefully, support the resolution that has been brought in by my colleague and friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). Speaking of my own district, from what I can understand, as far as the constitution is concerned, I would gladly, Mr. Speaker, support the amendment or resolution or whatever.

MR. L. THOMS: The people of Lamaline have been deprived this coming year of the machinery to plow the roads. They have been told that if they want their roads plowed, then they have to buy their own machinery. Well, the town of Lamaline cannot afford to buy or hire the necessary machinery to plow the road. I would gladly, Mr. Speaker, undertake to vote for the resolution if I could get an undertaking from the government of this Province, from the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) to supply the town of Lamaline with a snowplow for this coming year. I would only be too happy to support them. And that, Mr. Speaker, is basically what I think of the resolution that has been brought into this House by the government of this Province.

MR. HOUSE: You are speaking on the amendment.

MR. L. THOMS: At least, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking. That is more than I can say for the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I guess during the leadership campaign for the Liberal Party, there was one thing that a couple of people in this Province accused me of being and that was that I was too much of a federalist. I asked them a simple question and I ask all members of this House in this Province, how you can be too much of a federalist? I do not know how I can be too much of a federalist, I do not know how I can be too much of a Canadian, I do not know how. I do not know how. I do not know how I can be too much of a Newfoundlander, I do not know how I can be. I ask a simple question, tell me how a person can be too much of a Newfoundlander? Tell me how a person can be too much of a Canadian? I stand in this House and I will let the people of Grand Bank decide whether I am too much of a federalist, whether I am too much of a Canadian, whether I am too much of

MR. L. THOMS: a Newfoundlander. I will let them decide. I will have no problems in my own mind, in my own conscience of voting for this amendment although, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment is probably unnecessary, totally unnecessary, as a matter of fact, except from a strategic thing that is happening in the House because I do believe that Dr. Eugene Forsey, himself an eminent Grand Banker, and a Newfoundlander, and an eminent Canadian was right, absolutely 100 per cent right when he stated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: When he stated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I think the eminent Newfoundlander, I do not care what he is, let him be a Conservative, NDP, Liberal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, it matters.

MR. THOMS: It does not matter, it is irrelevant. I will have something to say about living in Newfoundland, I will have something to say about living in other provinces and working in other provinces. But, Mr. Speaker, I think Dr. Eugene Forsey was absolutely right when he said that a person would have to be dreaming in technicolor to think that the sacred rights of education and the Labrador boundary or any boundary, could be changed without the consent of the Province involved. So really what are we doing? What are we doing with an amendment to a resolution such as this? What happened? The Premier of this Province decided to go on television for half an hour to make this great pronouncement. What was he trying to do? He may have succeeded. The very fact that we are discussing this in the House of Assembly may say that he has succeeded. He tried to strike fear in the hearts of every Newfoundlander. He came on to say that the denominational system of education could be changed

MR. THOMS: and the Labrador boundary could be changed without the consent of the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this were so, and by some wild stretch of the imagination that anybody outside this Province, anyone from Halifax to Vancouver, ever dared attempt to change the system of education, or the boundary of this Province, I would be one of the first ones on the firing line. The Premier of this Province will not stand alone, Mr. Speaker, he will not stand alone in that case, we will all stand with him.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to happen. I have read the constitutional proposals. I suppose if you could dream in technicolour - I have difficulty dreaming in technicolour myself. I do not dream that much, as a matter of fact, but I have difficulty in seeing how the Government of this nation, or the people of this nation could change or alter the sacred rights, the denominational system of education, the system of education that I came up under, that maybe many of us came up under. I fail to see anywhere where this could be done without the consent of the Province. I just fail to see it. Maybe I am stunned, you know, maybe I am a stunned lawyer, but I fail to see it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I came to this conclusion before I heard anybody else say it, that I think that under the present constitutional changes it would be more difficult, almost an impossibility to change the denominational system of education or the boundary. But the government of the day in this Province, even if they were right, that there was a technical possibility that the changes could be made, when the Premier went on television this was not what interested him. The only thing that interested the Premier of this Province was to be able to go on television

MR. THOMS: and pick the two issues that he knew would raise the emotionalism of the Newfoundlander. I cannot think of two issues that would do that moreso than the denominational system of education and the boundary. But he has used these two issues to create an uncertainty in the minds of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it was a cruel thing to do, it was a cruel thing to do to the people of this Province. I can find fault maybe with the way that the federal government is going about this. I can find maybe some fault with that, but I think it is unforgiveable that the Premier of this Province should use those two issues the way he has done.

The people have not read, or had not read the resolution as a subject of a joint address. They can read sections 41, 42, 47 or any section at all and not really understand what it is all about. I think the Premier of this Province realized what he was doing.

MR. THOMS: I believe the Premier of this Province has been intellectually dishonest and for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that the man is intelligent enough to be intellectually dishonest. Sometimes I doubt it.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the amendment, as I see it, is to now try to undo, if possible, the grave injustice that the Premier and the Government of this Province have done to the people of Newfoundland, the way the Premier of this Province has tried to hoodwink and, as my friend from Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) said, to defraud and to confuse and to fool the people of this Province. I would like to issue a warning to the Premier of this Province, that I do not believe that this Premier or this government can go on trying to fool all of the people all of the time. I do not think the people are going to stand for it. I think they are going to see through this administration, they are going to see through this Premier. And they are going to see behind the Premier, they are going to see that behind him are people who do not care about Canada and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you do not care about Canada, then you do not care about Newfoundland.

Where are the disloyal Newfoundlanders in this House? Where are they if there are any? I tell you this much, Mr. Speaker, they are not on this side of the House.

MR. MORGAN: There are none.

MR. THOMS: There are none on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, talking about the Constitution of Canada: I assume that speakers have been speaking about a number of different items. They have been talking about shared jurisdiction in the fisheries.

November 28, 1980, Tape 2528, Page 2 -- apb

MR. THOMS:

I can tell the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that regardless of who is in power :

MR. L. THOMS:

in the Province of Newfoundland, that the fishermen of this Province do not want the Province to have control of the fisheries, they do not want them. Now, I represent a district, Mr. Speaker, that is 100 per cent dependent on the fisheries. And I stand in this House today without any worries that I am going to be contradicted by the fishermen in my district.

MR. MORGAN:

They want changes.

MR. L. THOMS:

Oh, they may want changes -

MR. E. ROBERTS:

They do not want shared jurisdiction.

MR. L. THOMS:

- that is right, they want consultation and they believe the Province should have consultation but I do not think they want what this present government is advocating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. L. THOMS:

Maybe when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) visits with me in my district we can discuss this matter with the fishermen, get it first-hand from them. I am prepared to change my mind. All I am saying is that everybody that I have talked to so far - maybe they are just telling me what they want me to hear, but I do not believe that.

Offshore resources, Mr. Speaker; I think I have said just as much about offshore resources as I am going to say, I have made my position quite clear on the matter. I will be satisfied with nothing short of complete ownership, total, maximum benefits accruing to this Province. I will be satisfied with nothing less than the principle control over these offshore resources, I do not, any more than you do, want to see Ottawa in the same position, for example, that I understand London is in, where decisions can be made without due regard to Newfoundland, to the quality of life in Newfoundland. I do not want Ottawa making these decisions on my behalf, I do not want to see Newfoundland change environmentally, and from a point of view of the quality of life, drastically, because of the offshore oil and gas boom. I do not want to see that happen. That is why, Mr. Speaker,

MR. L. THOMS: I think, you know, we must be prepared. I do not think we are, I think we would be doing a much greater service to the citizens of St. John's, and to the citizens of this Province, if we were, Mr. Speaker, making sure that our police force is trained, making sure that we have an adequate police force to police not only the city of St. John's but this whole Province. The police force should be extended outside of the city of St. John's, and I think that this Province should be paying more attention to that than debating something that will not happen. It just will not happen. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we can be satisfied in this Province, with anything less than total, maximum benefits from the offshore oil and gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not saying that somewhere down the road, wherever that magic point is, when we become as rich as British Columbia, or as dirty, filthy rich as Alberta is at the present time, or as rich as Ontario is, that we should not share with other Canadians. I believe we should share. How that takes place?

MR. THOMS:

direct sharing; the fact that we send more taxes to Ottawa so that the other Provinces, the less fortunate provinces, as we have been for thirty years-within the Canadian family, we have been a less fortunate family province than the ones I have named. But I want to see the day, Mr. Speaker, when this Province is giving back its fair share to the less fortunate provinces.

Mr. Speaker, whenever the debate on the constitution is on, we hear a lot of talk about the local preference policy. In the present amendment that is going to England, the federal government, and Mr. Trudeau have put in there a provision in connection with what is commonly called a mobility clause. Mr. Speaker, it is nothing new. I stated in this House in the last session that I found our local preference policy to be abhorrent. I am totally, unequivocally against such a policy, such a stated policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want, and I do not believe that Newfoundlanders want the Government of this Province telling them where they can work and where they can live. I do not believe the people want to hear that. I do not believe the people want to be told where they can work and where they can live. We will always have a local preference policy. The man from Grand Bank would normally get the job that is open. He is normally going to be the only one looking for it. Normally -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS:

In the offshore. And in

the offshore.

- only about 5 per cent of the workers offshore will be unskilled labour.

MR. MORGAN: You mean only 5 per cent will be applying for it? Only 5 per cent of the people outside the Province will be applying for it?

MR. THOMS: No, I am not saying that at all. Only about 5 per cent of those employed offshore will be unskilled labour. It is not going to help reduce the unemployment problems in this Province at all. But just look at the -

MR. MORGAN: We can train them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Now we are talking! Now we are talking! Let us train the Newfoundlanders. Let us train them. Let us put our energies into training them. But what is happening? What is happening when it comes to all this talk about the local preference, that only the Newfoundlander is going to get hired? What are we accomplishing? How many Albertans are in Newfoundland looking for a job today, Mr. Speaker? How many are from British Columbia looking for a job today? How many of them? Seven hundred? There are 7,000 Newfoundlanders at Fort MacMurray, 7,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: I find, Mr. Speaker, that what this government is trying to do is to tell me where I can live and where I can work. That is the logical conclusion.

If Newfoundland is to have a local preference policy that prevents a British Columbian, or somebody from Saskatchewan, or somebody from Nova Scotia, or somebody from Toronto - if they are to have a policy, a regulation, a law preventing those people from

MR. THOMS:

coming to Newfoundland and seeking employment, if they so wish to do, then what is to stop, what is to stop the other provinces from turning around and making the same regulations? What is to stop them from doing it?

MR. MORGAN: They need Newfoundlanders in Alberta, nobody else will work there.

MR. THOMS: That is not true. That is the biggest bunch of garbage you can talk about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: That is not true, it is not true. We have Newfoundlanders across this nation who are not in positions - the vice-president of the Bank of Montreal certainly God is not taking a job somebody else does not want.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: And I could go on and on and on. There are thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders throughout this nation, throughout this continent and throughout this world who are in positions that the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) would give his eye teeth to be in.

MR. MORGAN: You do not want to reduce the unemployment situation.

MR. THOMS: Of course I want to reduce our unemployment situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are going to have the highest unemployment rate in the world.

MR. THOMS: To what extent - may I ask this question, may I ask this question, Mr. Speaker - to what extent has the local preference policy made any difference in the unemployment figure in Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS:

That is a lie. That is a lie.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) a year and a

half ago (inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

It has not. That is fraudulent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

If the 20,000 in Ontario come home

(inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Grand

Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will never support,

I will never support a policy of this Province or of this nation or of any province that tries to tell the people where they can live and where they can work. Mr. Trudeau has included that in his constitutional proposals and I agree with him. I agree with him 100 per cent. Like I say, it is not something new. I said in this House before and I will say it again, that if the people of this Province do not agree with me, the next time around when the Premier calls an election, the people in my district will have an opportunity to vote against me if they so wish to do.

MR. MORGAN:

You are one of the seven (inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

- on the basis that I was against the local preference policy. This government will soon be, Mr. Speaker, bringing in a regulation that says the only person who can work in St. John's is somebody who has been born and bred and brought up in St. John's. To take it to its logical conclusion, you will have local preference policies within local preference policies, within the Province

MR. LUSH: And that is the effect it is having, by the way.

MR. THOMS: I saw the local preference policy in action. It is happening and I am concerned. I do not like the way it is happening, I do not like the way it is happening.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province deserve something better. The people of this Province deserve a government that is going to at least make some pretense, do something about the here-and-now needs of these people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: The here and now needs. But the Premier and this government are using one of the oldest tricks in the book. When everything is going badly at home you focus attention on things abroad. So in other words, what Premier Peckford is doing is nothing in the Province of Newfoundland, nothing, zilch, zero, nothing -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you call 900 jobs offshore nothing?

MR. THOMS: Nine hundred jobs which you can thank the Liberal Government in Ottawa for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: If you think - if you are stunned enough, if you are stunned enough to believe -

MR. FLIGHT: And he is.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member should

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): refer to hon. members by their districts.

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Not you.

MR. W. ROWE: The hon. stunned member.

MR. THOMS: If the hon. member, who may or may not be stunned, is trying to tell the people of this Province that this administration is responsible for the discovery of offshore oil and gas off the Coast of Newfoundland or for the jobs which came about as a result -

MR. MORGAN: Would you explain that?

MR. THOMS: Of course not. How many -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: How many -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It might be very beneficial, perhaps, if the hon. member for Grand Bank were to address his remarks to the Chair when he is speaking. It might save some of the hassle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is kind of hard to do because directly across, you know, it is really, really difficult.

MR. NEARY: He is in the right position, you should be in the movie, Jaws.

MR. THOMS: I am hoping I can convince the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, to take a tour of my district with me. The fishermen have been asking for him now for some considerable time, and maybe at that time we can further discuss this matter. Mr. Speaker, I think my time is up and I move adjournment of the House. Or you can move adjournment of the House, I will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Is the House then ready for the question?

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in this debate but as it is close to one o'clock, if the government side agrees then I would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate has been adjourned.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. DAWE: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon.

Minister of Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE: I believe the normal traditions are when someone on the opposite side has spoken and someone on this side wishes to speak or vice versa, that they usually alternate back and forth and I believe I was on my feet. Unfortunately, perhaps, the Speaker did not see me at the time but I was on my feet.

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately—that is the tradition but, unfortunately, I did not see anybody to my left rise and I recognized the hon. member for Fogo.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

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