

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to advise the hon. members of the House of this government's policy with respect to funding of medical services. I do so at this time in light of recent statements and media reports emanating from the office of the hon. Monique Begin, Minister of Health and Welfare Canada.

From the reports that I have received to date, the minister has indicated her intention to recommend to the Federal Government that federal legislation be put in place banning extra billing by physicians. I make it clear to the members of the House and to the public that the statements are made in isolation and without the support or agreement of our counterparts in the provincial departments of health throughout the country.

In point of fact, the provincial ministers at their recent meeting of December, 1980 reconfirmed that the historic provincial responsibility for the administration of health care must be maintained; that is, it is a provincial responsibility.

Now, in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, extra billing by physicians is minimal. As a matter of fact, it is not allowed. It is not legal in Newfoundland unless the doctor opts out of medicare. In our Province, only two physicians have elected to do so. As a matter of fact, I do not think either one has elected to opt out. I believe that neither one of these opted in to begin with, so there is no opting out really



MR. HOUSE: in the Province.

Hence, while - and I want this noted, Mr. Speaker- while Madame Begin's statements are not aimed at Newfoundland and while we do not disagree with her expressions of concern about extra billing because we have gone along with that kind of thing ourselves, we want to make it clear that the decisions regarding extra billing and decisions regarding various options with respect to financing health care services must remain with the Province and be a Provincial responsibility.

In my view, the statements made extend from a basic assumption that the medicare system in Canada is in danger of being eroded. Again I refer to the recent meeting of the inter-provincial ministers. At that meeting, the financing of health care was discussed and with one exception, Saskatchewan, everybody agreed that there is no erosion in medicare at this time. These programmes will remain secure as long as existing Federal-Provincial arrangements are maintained.

Mr. Speaker, the real concern of the Provincial Ministers of Health throughout the country relate to the recent suggestion of changes in the Federal-Provincial financing arrangements which could lead to

MR. W. HOUSE: substantial withdrawal of federal funding for health care programmes. Indeed, the continuing well-being of the programme will require undiminished support from the federal government. Now this is the real issue involving medicare .

To reiterate then, Mr. Speaker, the recent statements made by the federal minister imply that the federal government may be considering dictating to provinces how they finance their medicare programmes and other health care programmes. Such central control will not allow the variety of auctions that may be open to provinces for financing medicare services, in spite of the fact that the administration of this in our view is clearly within the provinces' mandate and jurisdiction.

We strongly disagree with the suggestion of the federal minister and feel that unilateral action to ban extra billings will impede the ability of the provinces of Canada to adequately provide quality health care services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I find it very, very difficult to understand how a government that already agrees with Ottawa, and has in principle put safeguards in place with Ottawa to do exactly what Ottawa requires, now comes out and goes against Ottawa simply for the sake of going against Ottawa and once again ganging up with the other ministers across Canada in pressuring Ottawa. Extra billings simply means that doctors can have their cake and eat it too, Mr. Speaker. They get money from the public purse as well as get it from the private individual. And I am glad to learn from the minister that it is not happening in this Province and should not happen in this Province.

MR. HOUSE: Very little.

MR. F. WHITE: Very little in this Province.

MR. F. WHITE: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this government through medicare has been very fair to doctors in Newfoundland. If you look back at the increases they have been granted over the last three or four years, if the same increases were granted to civil servants in this Province we would not have the labour unrest that we have today in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: And I can assure the minister, Mr. Speaker, that as long as Ottawa is going to pump millions of dollars into health care programmes and other programmes in this Province or any other Province, that they are going to have a say in how part of it is spent. And I would like to see them have a bigger say in how large parts of it are spent.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, a brief statement related to tourism.

One of the biggest assets of a viable tourism industry is sufficient quality hotel and motel rooms to accomodate our Province's visitors.

It is my pleasure at this time to express satisfaction with the efforts of the tourist accomodations industry to continually

MR. WINDSOR: improve and expand their facilities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. During the past year, for all areas except St. John's, 315 new rooms were added at a total cost of just over \$6.2 million. The major areas of investment were Central Newfoundland - \$2.0 million; Western Newfoundland, including the Great Northern Peninsula and Labrador Straits - \$1.9 million; and the Bonavista and Burin Peninsulas - \$1.3 million.

Government is very encouraged by the results of the industry's efforts and is confident that by adding the equivalent of a major new hotel, the tourism industry in our Province will be in a far greater position to accommodate the increasing attention being paid to Newfoundland and Labrador as a unique vacation experience.

The accommodations industry is to be congratulated also for the obvious confidence they have in the future economic prosperity of the Province and its travel industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say probably this statement could have been released a couple of days ago or tomorrow by the President of the Board of Trade. It shows that actually the private enterprise in this Province is spending money, and spending money into the tourist industry, instead of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this government, if they wanted to spend money in the tourist industry, they should start putting out suitable brochures on the CN boats, at the airports and so on, which this provincial government is not doing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was only just recently that a person was coming across the Straits from North Sydney to Port aux Basques and wanted to go to Labrador and asked, "Have you any tourist literature about Labrador," and the lady there said,

MR. WARREN: "Labrador? Where is that?" And here this government is trying to increase tourism coming into the Province and does not even send out their brochures and advertise that there is potential for the tourist industry in the Province.

MR. BENNETT: They do not know themselves.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?  
Before proceeding to Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of hon. members a delegation from the Town Council of Twillingate, in the district of Twillingate, led by Mayor Herb Gillett, who is also a former member of this House of Assembly and a delegation of one, two, three, four, five, six councillors I believe it is. We would like to welcome you today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was very disappointed yesterday that he never got any questions. I would like to ask him a question or two for his benefit today. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower, in view of his expressed lack of confidence in the government, so much so to the extent of signing not one but three petitions, did the minister tender his resignation to the Premier?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the hon. Leader of the Opposition, number one, read The Daily News today and found out who he should ask a question to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Show some decency, boy, and resign!  
Resign!

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: Or somebody got in touch with the Leader of the Opposition and notified him that it was in the Daily News. But to answer the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, the answer to his specific question is, No, I did not resign and have no intentions of.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much for that latest piece of information. Would the minister like to inform the House, because he informs the House of things different from what he says in the press and maybe he does not realize it is the same press, so maybe the minister would like to tell us what he meant when he said on television that he would very seriously consider resigning if this government did not move from its entrenched position?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that is fairly simple. Basically what I said in the whole conversation, if the hon. the Leader had seen the tapes he would have gotten the total concept of what I was saying, and that is that if I found that I could not do my job as Minister of Labour, which I have up to this time, or I consider I have up to this time and until somebody indicates that I have not, but I consider I have up to this time, when I find that I cannot do the job as Minister of Labour, I certainly cannot be Minister of Labour and in conscience I would not be.

AN HON.MEMBER : That is right.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.



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

MR. STIRLING: The Premier also gave some different information on television last night than what he gave here in the House yesterday. When the Premier said on television in answer to a question that he had rapped the minister over the knuckles and this sort of thing would not happen again and that we should not really pay attention to what the minister said, it was what he meant; now would the minister tell us what he meant when he signed the petition? Would he tell us exactly what he meant when he said that this government should never have allowed this strike to take place and that he believes that they should get back to the bargaining position? Could he tell us what he meant?

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

MR. DINN: I am particularly delighted for that question because the some twelve people who approached me with the petition passed me the petition and we talked about it. We had a conversation of, I believe, about an hour to three quarters of an hour on what was in the petition. And I think the people that I signed the petition for are disappointed at this point in time as to what happened as a result of my signing that petition, because there was quite a discussion. There were four items in the petition. The first item was that the strike should never have occurred, and I think everybody would agree that the strikes at the College of Trades and Workers' Compensation should never have occurred in that the process that the government has gone through in this procedure has been one of precedents that has been set over the years as to how negotiations are conducted in that a main body, the General Service, had a conciliation board,

MR. DINN: that it was the wish of both sides at the bargaining table in the College of Trades and Technology that nothing be done after, I believe, the 28th of March - I think that was the date, or the 28th of April, 1980 - that nothing further be discussed until the result of the conciliation board into the General Service dispute. So the conciliation board reported in September. Now, the hon. the Opposition labour critic last week asked me a question at the end of Question Period and I did not get an opportunity to answer the question. I got the impression that the answer was not required or indeed they did not want the answer, but now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition gives me an opportunity to give the answer.

The result of the conciliation board on General Service: Now, one has to think about this because you have two sides of the negotiating table on the 28th of April and if the College of Trades and Technology wanted to, they could have notified me as minister that they were going on strike and given me seven days notice at that point in time. But it was considered important that the lead group, the General Service conciliation board report so they would see what the conciliation board decided. The conciliation board decided that the wage package offered by government was appropriate.

MR. STIRLING: We get the picture. Sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: If hon. members do not want the answers, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I will remind the hon. the minister that answers as well as questions should be kept as brief as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is pertinent to what happened because when the conciliation board

MR. DINN: reported and -

MR. F. ROWE: Short answer, short question.

MR. DINN: - the union recommended rejection -

MR. F. ROWE: Gather your thoughts.

MR. DINN: - General Service accepted, MOS accepted and the College of Trades decided not to accept, which is their right. They have a right to strike in this Province and we understand that. But the fact of the matter is that since a majority of government employees, albeit in other bargaining units, decided to accept the report, then it was my contention as well as the people who spoke to me that the first item on the -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
A point of order has been raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The minister, in answering the question - Your Honour gave the minister a direction there a few minutes ago that his answer was too long. Now he is ploughing on with his political speech, Mr. Speaker, and I would submit, Your Honour, that if the minister is not relevant to the question that was asked -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - does not make it brief, that Your Honour name him. If he will not do the honourable thing and resign, Your Honour should name him and have him removed from the House.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the question asked requires an answer presumably. The hon. the minister is answering the question. Now, there would be the biggest howl

March 18, 1981

Tape 436

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:                   ever you could hear from the  
Opposition if a question was asked and a minister got up  
and said, 'The answer would be too long so I would have to  
table the question.' Then we would be accused of

MR. W. MARSHALL: not giving full and complete information. So the question that was asked, while the question which was asked was slightly shorter than the answer the minister is giving, the question, Mr. Speaker, demands the comprehensive answer which the minister is giving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the point of order, first of all it is not up to the Chair to determine whether or not the answer is satisfactory; that is up to the hon. member asking the question, and if it is not then the hon. member has a procedure which he may follow.

I pointed out already that questions as well as answers should be as brief as possible. I believe the question perhaps allowed the hon. minister the opportunity to give a lengthy answer, but be that as it may I would ask the hon. minister to conclude his answer as quickly as possible because other members, I am sure, would want to ask questions.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, the first item on the petition was that the strike should not have occurred. And I do not think anybody in Newfoundland having looked at the process could not but agree that the strike should not have occurred. Now the fact that they decided to go on strike, that is their prerogative. I cannot do anything about that; that is what is in the legislation and it gives them the opportunity.

The other item in the petition was the fact that it was an insult that government offer 8 per cent. Well, the fact of the matter is, as I pointed out to my friends, and they are still my friends -

MR. FLIGHT: It is an insult.

MR. DINN: - the fact of the matter is is that they were not offered 8 per cent, it was an average of 23 per cent, and that nobody in the bargaining unit was offered an 8 per cent wage package.

Number three was with respect to mediation, and I indicated to the petitioners, as I would to anyone in the labour movement who wanted to meet with me, I indicated that there is no provision in the legislation for mediation.

And item four on the petition was, and I will conclude with this, Mr. Speaker, item four was the fact that they wanted to get back to the bargaining table. And as I said to them then and I say to them now, as a matter of fact, on holidays or nights or anytime they want to meet, the bargaining table is always open to them and I will be waiting for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. T. LUSH: A question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not admit that his actions in this respect, namely signing the petition that condemned the government, would the minister not admit that in this respect, Sir, his actions were peculiar if not irregular, and incongruous and a breach of Cabinet solidarity?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in no way did I construe signing that petition breach of Cabinet secrecy or government solidarity in any way. As the Minister of Labour, one has to have trust; I mean the unions, the employer and the employee have to have the trust of the Minister of Labour. And surely if I cannot sit down at a negotiating table or in a room with people in the labour

MR. DINN: movement or employers and talk  
frankly back and forth, then there is a problem; I mean, a  
problem exists, a problem of credibility as to what happens -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: - between people. Now the fact  
of the matter is I have a certain amount of trust in people,

MR. DINN: and the people who signed that petition - as a matter of fact, I got a call from one of them apologizing to me for what has happened to this point in time, because they certainly at that point in time knew exactly -

MR. MOORES: Name him.

MR. DINN: - what my position was.

MR. FLIGHT: Why did they ask you to sign it?

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I signed the petition on the basis I did, I think was good, because what I was saying was they wanted to get back to the bargaining table, and I agree with that, and I am sure government agrees with that, that there is a position there and they know what government's position is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: So there is nothing wrong with that. I mean, that is my job as Minister of Labour. And, the other, that the strike should not have occurred, I have already explained that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think any hon. member opposite should see my job any different than that, than to see to it that I negotiate, that I talk to people and that I make sure that I do everything in my power.

Last week the hon. member was criticising me for not doing all -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - in power. Mr. Speaker, I consider that I have and will.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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



MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister can try to weasel his way out of this any way he wants, but the point of the matter is that the minister signed a petition saying that the government offer of eight per cent was an insult. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering, in view of the statement that the minister made some days ago with respect to this, saying that this settlement sets a trend for other industries or public service unions in a geographic area - in other words, the agreement will be a basis for other agreements for similar employers and unions - does this mean that the minister has also set a trend that he will be objecting to the eight per cent increase which the government seems to be holding out for other bargaining units?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I did, as a matter of fact make a statement last week that generally in all negotiations, all negotiations, that a trend is set when a main bargaining unit is signed. Now, that is true whether it is in the public sector or in the private sector. In the public sector, in this instance General Service, signed and they were the lead group. In the paper industry last year, Abitibi was the main bargainer, were the people that were the main group, once they signed, although other local conditions were negotiated, the main wage package was what Abitibi settled for. In the case of the fisheries, the main group last year was Fishery Products and when that was signed, generally in the industry, all negotiations centred around that wage package and I maintain that.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question at all. The minister stated that in this particular set of negotiations that this was setting a trend. The question I asked the minister was is the minister now setting a trend. In other words, will the minister now do this again, sign other petitions to this effect, saying that the increase of eight per cent is an insult? Will the minister take this position again in the future?

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

MR. DINN: I did not in this instance and I will not in other instances.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. DINN: I explained to the people that I signed the petition for and I deem it, by the way -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) what was in the petition.

MR. DINN: - I deem it, by the way, and I say this here publicly in the House of Assembly, I deem it

MR. DINN: a lack, a breach of trust on behalf of the people who got me to sign that petition.

MR. FLIGHT: What? What? What?

MR. DINN: I mean, I explained exactly what I signed. The fact of the matter is that -

MR. MOORES: Do you hear this?

MR. DINN: - given the conditions after an hour of discussion -

MR. MOORES: A breach of trust.

MR. DINN: - and them understanding and telling me what I signed on behalf of, and then giving me a pen and my signing my signature -

MR. THOMS: You did not read it?

MR. DINN: I certainly did. Not only that, but I have not got a copy of the petition here and I think -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - I think I can quote the petition verbatim.

MR. FLIGHT: Did the minister (inaudible) that petition?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: Photographic on that one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, from what the minister is saying there seems to be no rhyme nor reason for what he is doing. Either the minister signed the petition unwittingly, he did not know what was on it, or either -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: - or either, Mr. Speaker, he is disagreeing with the government's position, So it is one of these two alternatives: Either the minister signed it unwittingly, or

MR. LUSH: he disagrees with the government's position. So which is it the minister did? Why did he sign the petition? One or the other, he has done it.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that quite clearly for the hon. member. I negotiated, I talked to around ten or twelve people, and I went through each item on the petition and there were inaccuracies in the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well why did you sign it?

MR. FLIGHT: You changed it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Well, I would have assumed, I did not sit down and painstakingly-and maybe that is a mistake. Maybe that is what you have got to do. But the fact of the matter is that I signed three petitions, I think I ticked - I happened on one petition to tick the ones that I agreed with, which is one in four. The fact of the matter is that I did not painstakingly take the petition and go through it. I mean the hon. member must think that, you know, that is all I have time to do. The important part of the discussions that I held with those people, the important part was the principle of this, is that they believe the strike should not have occurred and they wanted to get back to the bargaining table.

And by the way, I have not heard from the union since, Outside of taking the petition and publishing it, I do not believe the Minister of Finance yet received it. Although probably the whole Province has the petition. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has not received the petition, number one. And number two, that it seems to me that if I cannot talk to unions, I mean what am I doing as Minister of Labour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

MR. DINN: I have to do that. That is my job.

March 18, 1981

Tape No.

NM - 3

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a lack of courage and what weasel words we have just heard -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - from an hon. minister who obviously is trying to cling on to his job.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the - insulting words, by the way, will not smooth this over. That is the second time the hon. gentleman has insulted the members of that bargaining unit. The other day he accused them of being bribed. And now he says they are in breach of trust.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Let me ask the minister, did the minister read the petition? And if he did read the petition, did he know what was in the petition? There were four points, as I understand it, in that petition. The minister did not cross out any objectionable wording in that petition. Now did the minister read it? If he did, did he understand clearly? Was it explained to him? Did he ask questions about it? Did he understand what he was signing?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated to the hon. gentleman that, number one, there were inaccuracies in the petition.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. NEARY: So what? You signed it anyway.

MR. DINN: Well, I spent an hour with the people explaining what was in the petition and what was wrong and what was not. And the fact of the matter is that my job is to negotiate with people and to talk to people and see if we can get resolution to a dispute, and that is what I was doing. Now if the purpose of that petition was to politically embarrass, well, I mean that shows to me a certain rapport that these people apparently do not want to have with the Minister of Labour. I mean if they cannot sit down and talk to me on a general basis and discuss these things, they have a problem. I do it with all unions in the Province. Now I knew what was in the petition and I indicated then what was wrong with the petition and what I disagreed with. Government's position with respect to that strike is the offer that is on the table and I agree with that offer right now.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has admitted that he knew what was in the petition. He had read the petition, he spent an hour with the workers—which is most unusual by the way. The minister is sidetracking the issue, Mr. Speaker. When the minister talks about negotiations he is talking about negotiations with the negotiating committee and not with the individual members of the unit, and that is where

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman is trying to drag a red herring into this whole matter. But the hon. gentleman knew what he was signing. Now when the hon. gentleman read the petition, did he detect, did he know that there were parts of that petition that criticized the government of which he was a member, denounced government policy that he helped make in secret at an oath bound meeting of the Cabinet? Was the hon. gentleman aware - obviously he was - that there were parts of that petition that denounced government's policy?

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I indicated to them what the government policy was and the fact that there were inaccuracies in the petition and the fact that I did not agree with those parts. I did not agree with those parts in the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman now feel to this day that he did the right thing, that he denounced government policy by signing that petition? Does he now stick by his guns? Does he have the courage now to say in this House that he knowingly signed a petition that denounced government policy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I mean I did not denounce government policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: I certainly did not.

MR. DINN:

I certainly did not denounce government policy. As a matter of fact, I indicated to the petitioners what government policy was. I explained that there was no eight per cent offer. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we have the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) over questioning me like this for doing my job, what I consider to be my job. The hon. member when he was minister made a complete disgrace of his portfolio.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Buchans.

The hon. the member for Windsor -

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower, too.

Obviously any idiot would

recognize that the purpose of that petition, the only purpose, would have been to put pressure on government to resolve the strike and to get the workers back to work. I mean, that petition could have served no other purpose. Now, did the minister realize that that was the purpose of the petition? And what did the minister hope to accomplish by signing the petition? Did the minister sign the petition hoping to put pressure on the government, to resolve this strike that should have been resolved long ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

and Manpower.

The hon. the Minister of Labour

MR. DINN:

the hon. member, the petition petitioned government to get back to the bargaining table. That is what it was petitioning.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained to

MR. FLIGHT:

But you are the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

to the petitioners that I was ready and the bargaining table was there. As a matter of fact, on Monday when there was a holiday, I was in my office -

And, Mr. Speaker, I was indicating

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

the petitioners' negotiating committee -

- patiently waiting for a call for

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

bargaining table.

- to call me to sit down at the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

When hon. members ask questions,

I presume they want to hear an answer. It is very difficult, I am sure, for them to hear.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister knows, the role of the Minister of Labour is to get two parties together. If this strike had been in the private sector, he would have been using his influence and eventually using his clout to bring the unions and the private company, whichever company it might have been, together. Why has not the minister used his ministerial authority to get those parties together instead of going out and signing a petition to put pressure on the whole Cabinet? It seems that the minister was hoping to accomplish by pressure on the government that he is a part of, what he does not appear to be able to accomplish with his own ministerial authority.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the pressure right now would be on the negotiating committee for NAPE in that their workers are petitioning that they get back to the bargaining table and they have not even called me yet.

MR. R. MOORES:

And you signed the petition.

MR. DINN:

I would think it is pressure on both sides to go to the bargaining table. Yet I have not got a call from the people who are petitioning to go to the bargaining table. I would think the pressure is on the negotiating committee now.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower as well.

I specifically saw the minister,

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WHITE: -I specifically saw the minister on television talking about the possibility of resigning. Now, if the minister now says that he was not doing anything wrong, why did the question of his resigning from the Cabinet come up in the first place if it was not in his mind that he might have to resign over this matter?- which he should do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would consider that anybody who arrived at a conclusion at some point down the road, a year or two years down the road, that he could not do his job, that he would resign.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) for two years.

MR. DINN: If I thought that I would get into a position down the road that I could not do my job - and I believe I am doing an excellent job right now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: I believe that I am doing an excellent job right now as Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: But I would certainly consider down the road, if I thought I was impairing the labour movements or any employer or employee from negotiating, then down the road I would certainly consider resigning.

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

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is this. Since the minister is the Minister of Labour and Manpower, and since he has obviously compromised the government's situation in dealing with unions in this Province, particularly the Public Service unions, he has compromised the government's position in dealing with them, if the minister will not do the honourable thing and resign from the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, why does he not go to the Premier and asked to be moved to another department of government?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think the fortunate thing, the very fortunate thing, because I think this thing got blown out of proportion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: I believe that the very fortunate thing is that we have a Premier like the Premier we have in that he does not listen to, he does not listen necessarily to what members opposite say, nor does he listen necessarily to what is printed in papers, he will ask the minister to come in and explain, "Jerry, what is the storey on this?" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: and I gave him the exact story.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have no apologies to make to anyone.

MR. FLIGHT: You can say what you like, it is what you mean.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). Since there will be ongoing confrontations and strikes in the Province, does the minister not feel that because of the way that he has behaved in this particular strike that his credibility would be such that he would have no negotiating or no power of influence over bodies in the Province, does the minister not see the danger that if he remains as Minister of Labour and Manpower what will happen in future strikes and negotiations in this Province?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, unlike many hon. members opposite, many hon. members opposite, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: - the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the people on the coast want him to resign and other hon. members opposite, I have not heard of one person in the labour movement, nor have I heard of one person as an employer, nor one person in government requesting my resignation. So I must be doing a great job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

We have time for one final supplementary. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again referring to a statement that the minister made some days ago when talking about this dispute -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

Obviously hon. members are aware of the parliamentary traditions where interjections back and forth are allowed, but when they become continuous and loud the Chair intends to intervene. It does nothing to improve the decorum of the House.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am still very confused as to why the minister signed this particular petition. Maybe - I am asking the minister - was it because he could not get his colleagues to move in this dispute, could not get them to get back to the bargaining table and this is why he signed the petition? Was this the reason why he signed the petition, and whether he still supports the petitioners?

MR. FLIGHT: To put pressure on them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Having gone through about twenty-five minutes of Question Period -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: - and having explained what I have done with respect to the petition and talked to the petitioners for an hour, and, Mr. Speaker, they are requesting a return to the bargaining table and they have not sent the petition to the hon. the Minister of Finance

MR. J. DINN: (Dr. Collins) yet nor have they called my office to ask me to have the negotiating committee to go to the table, I mean there must have been something other than petitioning me for - I mean, there might have been ulterior motives-I do not know. I cannot attribute motives to people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: The fact of the matter is is that there is no request from that bargaining unit to go back to the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of forty residents of the community of Piccadilly in the district of Port au Port.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by forty residents there, they are all householders, and the prayer of the petitions is, "That we, the undersigned, ask the government to provide the people of Piccadilly Head with decent drinking water".

Now, Mr. Speaker, this particular group of people have, over the past four years, presented some four or five petitions to this particular House and last year a water committee was set up in the community under a new plan which the government brought out last year whereby the residents of the area would pay a certain amount of money and the government would match a certain amount of money. Now under that particular plan this water committee was incorporated. I might point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that the problem in this particular area first came to light, and I brought it up in the House of Assembly some three or four years ago, when children became sick in this particular section of Piccadilly and I asked the Department of Health to go out there and they checked the water in the community and they found that whereas .4 counts of coliform per millilitre of water is dangerous, some of these people had as high as forty, practically sewer water as far as the safety of the water was concerned. And at that time the Department of Health had advised people to either stop using their wells or to use chlorine in them and to boil the water.

Now this has been going on for some four years, Mr. Speaker, but one of the things that has happened is that although the government brought in this programme last year, this programme of matching the



MR. HODDER: community services programme whereby there was matching between the residents and the provincial government, I understand this year, Mr. Speaker, that the programme is being wrapped up. And these people have already been incorporated under this particular - and they have a standing water committee. I understand under the plan you have to have fifteen families; there are some thirty to forty families there who are willing to shell out the money for the water system. It is a health hazard. People have open, shallow wells, you cannot drill wells there because it is a very low lying area and the deep wells are found to have salt water usually mixed with the fresh, so they have to have a reservoir built.

So, Mr. Speaker, for the members' information, this is the Piccadilly Head portion of Piccadilly which has its own water committee and it has been incorporated by the Department of Municipal Affairs. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the minister take this petition into account. It is a very, very serious matter and there is a health problem here. There were two water committees formed in this area, one group, I might say, has been funded and has received their water system, but this particular area which was actually the worst area where the health officials found the water to be most contaminated, these people

MR. HODDER: have not received water. So I would table this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Further petitions?

MR. NEARY: I rise to support -

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to speak in support of this petition? The hon. member for LaPoile .

MR. NEARY: - the petition presented by my colleague the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) on behalf of forty of his constituents who live in the community of Piccadilly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the minister is going to respond to the petition, but if he does he could tell us what is happening in his department as far as water services are concerned. I understand, and the member pointed this out in his remarks, that the Water Services Branch of the department has been dismantled. There was a police investigation into certain aspects of the Water Services Branch of that department a couple of years ago; we have never gotten the report in the House, they dismantled the Water Services and decided to contract the work out, and I believe this is where the thing got bogged down, Mr. Speaker; it cost more to contract the work out, actually, than it did to maintain a Water Services Branch in the minister's department. So it might be a good opportunity for the minister, if she would be kind enough to respond to the petition and give us a progress report on what has happened to the Water Services Branch of the minister's department.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, because there is a health hazard involved in this

MR. NEARY: particular community,  
I would suspect that the matter is urgent and I would like to draw the petition to the attention of the Minister of Health (Mr. House) before an epidemic breaks out in that community. I think government should move quickly. It is not an ordinary, routine petition, it is a matter of urgent public importance, as far as that community is concerned, and something that should be dealt with swiftly, should be dealt with quickly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation at all in supporting the prayer of the petition and look forward to hearing the minister's remarks on some of the things that have been raised.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further petitions?

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of 5,000 residents of my district, in presenting this petition. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is as follows: "We, the undersigned, support the Labrador City Library Board in their endeavours to obtain government funding for a new library building in Labrador City."

Mr. Speaker, due to the lengthiness of the background of this particular petition, and rather than take up the time of this hon. House, I would ask permission to table the background of the thing instead of reading it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it all right to table the background information with the petition? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, on this

MR. STIRLING: side we are very pleased to again work with the member. We have had now - this is the fourth situation in which the member had to bring in a petition, the second in which he had over 5,000 names, to get government to reverse as far as that community first time was the planting of the flag on the Labrador boundary; the second time was when the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) said there was no way that they could continue to operate Wabush Mines that we were silly for suggesting that Wabush Mines could continue to operate and stockpile; the third time was when the minister had announced that Newfoundland Hydro was going to jack up the prices, and there was another petition of 5,000 people brought in and we ganged up again, this side of the House supporting the private member. Now they have decided to change their minds on that and again we are very pleased to support the petition, again with the 5,000 people, to get the facilities that they deserve in Labrador City - Wabush area, as they deserve throughout the whole of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We take great pleasure in again supporting the petition of the 5,000 people and again I hope we will be able to change the opinion of government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member wish to speak to this petition? Further petitions?

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the following petition. I will read, first of all, the prayer of the petition: "We, the undersigned, support the efforts of the Western Newfoundland Historic Trust to have the Brakes properly

March 18, 1981, Tape 444, Page 4 -- apb

MR. WOODROW: restored and designated  
by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador."

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have on this petition 220 names from the communities of Meadows, Cox's Cove, Gillams, Templeton's Collegiate in Gillams and there are also more names to follow.

Now requests have been made for restoration of the property as an historic site, to Cabinet when they were in Corner Brook last year; also to the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and to my colleague from Humber West (Mr. Baird) who just moved back to his own seat, and of course myself.

The Brake family is believed to be the second one to move into the Bay of Islands area, coming in the late 1800s, in the late 1700s, I am sorry. The premises used during the late 1800s and 1900s were a complete service centre. The property is located on the beach in Meadows and consists of, one, a general store which contained a post office, two - barber shop; three - telegraph office; four - ranger office; five - a two story warehouse for sale and services of Acadia engines; six - the home of the owner, which was lived in up until 1974; seven - a barn, a blacksmith shop, all still standing; eight - a bakery shop and a slaughter house; nine - the property also served as ferry transfer service point for persons travelling from inner bay to the Outer Bay of Islands; number ten - the reason for the restoration is as follows: There is nothing from the past for the future generations to see that is a part of our heritage. It would also serve as an educational and a tourist attraction. Number eleven - the Historic Trust has made an estimate of what it will cost to restore it and the owner will sell at a reasonable price. Number twelve - if it had been in the hands of the Historic Trust, between \$50,000 and \$60,000 would have been allocated to work on it this year.

Now as a result of the brief presented to Cabinet in Corner Brook last year, I am glad to quote from a letter written by the Premier to Mr. Michel Lavasieur -

AN HON. MEMBER: You should learn French, boy.

MR. WOODROW: - and I will quote, "This struck me as particularly interesting and I have been assured by the department that they are examining your proposal in great detail. I feel sure that this could be a worthwhile undertaking and could eventually become a splendid example of an historic Newfoundland settlement."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a minute from a council meeting which reads as follows, this was the council in Meadows - Mr. Speaker, if I go overtime I am going to ask the members for a bit of leave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, very much.

This minute, I have it at my disposal, it was proposed in council, the council of Meadows, it was regularly moved and seconded that the community council of Meadows would maintain the Brake property after it was restored to its original state.

Mr. Speaker, I place this petition before the hon. House for their kind consideration as it will let young people of the future generation know what our past was like, and I refer it to the department concerned.

Now I also have, Mr. Speaker, an extract, I have fifty-two copies made, for each member of the House, which I think I am allowed to table and they can be passed on to the members concerned. I regret that the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Dawe) is not around. I am sure if he was he would probably have something to say about it. But I have been trying, Mr. Speaker, since I was elected to get some kind of a museum in some part of the Bay of Islands. I have tried desperately hard and I

MR. WOODROW:

am hoping that this will be the result of my efforts and the result of others such as Michel Lavasieur who has worked and who is working desperately hard to see this property become a historic site for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by member for Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow), given all the courtesy from this side of the House to give him full time to be able to present his case, because that is the kind of thing that we support on this side of the House, the kind of thing that needs to be done to preserve rural Newfoundland and give us some opportunity to show the people of Newfoundland and Labrador just what our historic roots are.

MR. NEARY: They can call it the Woodrow Museum.

MR. STIRLING: And, Mr. Speaker, while we are dealing with that, maybe the member can get after the province because they are so concerned with the offshore oil and the constitution that I understand that there is an outstanding offer from the Federal Government, something like about a million dollars voted towards setting up such an historic community as he is talking about and that the Provincial Government, as I understand it, have not been able to make up their minds what to do with it. There are any numbers of hundreds of thousands of dollars and millions of dollars available if we had a government that would co-operate with Ottawa and ask



MR. STIRLING: for their assistance. And I presume that you are going to send a copy of this petition to the federal member for your district. I am sure that you will find that he will give you the same kind of support that we have on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions?

This being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, it is my responsibility then to call Motion No. 1, moved by the hon. the member for Menihek (P. Walsh), which reads; WHEREAS the people of Labrador should enjoy the same standard of service as Island residents of the Province; and WHEREAS better transportation and community services are necessary for the development of a vibrant Labrador society; and WHEREAS the Government of the Province has a proposal before the Federal Government on a coastal Labrador DREE Agreement; and WHEREAS the Government of the Province has a proposal before the Federal Government for a start on the Trans Labrador Highway; and WHEREAS the Province is ready to move on both of these matters now, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities to sign these agreements at the earliest possible opportunity.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while the Island portion of the Province's transportation system is poor relative to other provinces, the Labrador portion is almost totally lacking in any sort of a system at all, yet it is this portion of the Province which is very rich in

MR. WALSH: natural resources and where a substantial portion of new resource development will occur during the rest of this century and beyond. Proper transportation systems in the Labrador region, while being of monumental importance to the resource development, will also have significant positive social impact.

Mr. Speaker, as a continuing element in the construction of the Labrador transportation system, the Province proposes to build a toll road from Labrador City to Churchill Falls. This road would constitute a large element of the future arterial road across Labrador road known as the Trans-Labrador Highway, which would link three distinct populated centres together. Going from West to East, these centres are the Labrador City area, the Churchill Falls area and the Lake Melville area with the following populations, Mr. Speaker: Labrador City, approximately 14,000, Wabush with 4,000, a subtotal of 18,000; Churchill Falls with 930, Lake Melville with 1,222, Happy Valley, 8,075 and Mud Lake, 70, for a overall population, Mr. Speaker, of 28,097.

Mr. Speaker, these three areas, developed at different times, have very few economic and social connections and are largely independent of one another. The first to be developed was the Lake Melville area where, during the Second World War, the Royal Canadian Air Force established a base. Following the war it became primarily an American base, but in the early 1970s, the United States Air Force withdrew. Due to this and as well as the phasing down of the logging operations caused by the failure of the Labrador Lumberboard, the local economy suffered and is now in a depressed state.

MR. WALSH: However, with the imminent development of the hydro sites on the Lower Churchill River, the area will take on a new importance, becoming the major landing and supply base for the construction projects. The most likely development site is the Muskrat Falls, twelve kilometers West of Goose Bay, which after a five to seven year construction period will be capable of generating 600 megawatts. Following Muskrat Falls, or possibly preceding it, would be the development of the Gull Island site located thirty-seven kilometers West of Goose Bay. This is the largest unharnessed source of hydro electricity in Labrador. Once fully developed it will be capable of generating 1,700 megawatts. This enormous project would take six to nine years to complete. Following Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, there would be other similar hydro developments. Thus the outlook for the Lake Melville area is quite bright.

Located 260 kilometers due West of Goose Bay, and midway between Goose Bay and Labrador City, is the community of Churchill Falls. This is a town of 930 population which is practically all the labour force employed by the Churchill Falls-Labrador Corporation. Their main function is to operate and maintain the vast hydro facilities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, the area around Labrador City-Wabush was developed in the early and mid 1960s. Developers were the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines respectively. The local economy is almost exclusively based on the mining of ore. Reserves in this Western region of Labrador are estimated at a total of ten billion tons, Mr. Speaker. In 1979 estimated production was 33 million tons, roughly fifty per cent of the total iron ore production in Canada.

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, the three populated centres - Labrador City, Churchill Falls, Lake Melville - are serviced by a variety of means of transport. These are largely independent of one another and go in a North-South fashion. There is only the most rudimentary of East-West transportation. Access to Labrador City, located in the Western extremity of Labrador, can be gained either by air or by rail. The rail link operated by the Quebec, North Shore and Labrador Railway begins at the Port of Seven Islands, Quebec, to the South. It penetrates 650 kilometers Northward through Labrador and back then into Quebec to Schefferville. A rail line branches off the main route and goes some forty kilometers West of Labrador City. Incoming provisions are usually materials for mining operations and consumer goods. Iron ore is a near exclusive shipment outward. Freight is also brought in by air, as are most travellers. The only road in the area is the ten kilometers of road connecting Labrador City and Wabush to the nearby Duley Lake provincial park.

Mr. Speaker, Churchill Falls is serviced by air and by a combination of road and rail. The air service is the sole means of passenger travel and accounts for some movements of freight; however, most provisions come via a combination of rail and road. Supplies are landed at Seven Islands and then transported by train 400 kilometers Northward to Esker. From there they are then transported by truck over Brinco Road. Mr. Speaker, we call it the Brinco Road because it was built by the developers of Churchill Falls, which was BRINCO. This is a 160 kilometer good quality gravel road which connects Esker with Churchill Falls. It was built as a supply route for the construction and operation of the Churchill Falls hydro site. Also Churchill Falls is linked by

MR. WALSH:                                   tolt road to Goose Bay-Happy Valley. Due to a rail strike during construction of the hydro facilities, the so-called Freedom Road was built. This 260 mile road provided an alternative supply route during construction. Currently it is closed during the Winter months and is seldom used during the remainder of the year. The main importance is that it provides access to the mineral belt of Central Labrador for mineral explorations.

Mr. Speaker, finally 300

kilometers to the East is the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area at the head of Lake Melville. The transportation system there consists of forty kilometers of road North to North West River and an airport, the Eastern end of the Freedom Road and port facilities. During the Summer months supplies are brought in by ship. However, Mr. Speaker, ice conditions prevent shipping from five to six months. Up until this period of time, of course, we have got some more information on that as we all know. Consequently during Winter months goods must be air-freighted. Mr. Speaker, the construction of a proposed tolt road from Labrador City to Churchill Falls will have a significant short and long-term impact. The short-term impact would be the construction activities and the removal of the isolation presently felt by residents of Labrador City. Mr. Speaker, the long-term benefits would have to be determined by examining the road as a

MR. WALSH: segment of a greater Trans-Labrador highway which could eventually be linked to the Central Canada road system. In fact, the major feasibility study of the Trans-Labrador Highway was completed in 1975 by R. J. Noah and Associates and the provincial Department of Transport. It discussed the merits of a highway from Baie Comeau, Quebec to a community on the North Shore of the St. Lawrence to Forteau, Newfoundland. That would be 950 kilometers and go via Labrador City - Churchill Falls - Goose Bay, and an alternative route via Labrador City - Esker - Churchill Falls and Goose Bay was also examined in the study.

Following is a list of impacts expected from the road. The long-term facts are based on a presumption that at least a Trans-Labrador Highway will be constructed. Mr. Speaker, in short-term, the construction of the road would mean an injection of \$38 million into the Labrador economy over a five year period. This would be a substantial boost, not only to the depressed Newfoundland construction industry, but also to the Labrador region economy. Studies on the Island have shown 20 per cent of the contract paid as wages. This would represent \$7.76 million to the residents of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of isolation on the people of Western Labrador was recognized in the 1975 study - in particular, it was pointed out in 1972 - was a crippling three month strike. And in recent years labour turnover has been unduly high.

A primary cause of labour restlessness is the isolated condition of Labrador City, Wabush and Schefferville, a condition basically attributed to the lack of road access to the region. This creates a feeling among employees of being cut off from the rest of Canada.

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, the completion of the tolt road removes to some degree the feeling of isolation and dependency of employees by allowing at least Summer travel between Churchill Falls and Western Labrador. Also it would give people access to the wilderness area.

Mr. Speaker, in long-term, this road would be the basis for a Trans-Labrador Highway.

Mr. Speaker, the construction of a Labrador Highway would facilitate the development of the enormous resource potential in Labrador. It would provide a supply link for construction of additional hydro facilities. It would permit the development of the lumber industry around Lake Melville by giving access to markets on the Island and in Western Labrador. Mineral exploration and mining development would be sped up by giving greater access to the central mineral belt. The development of tourism and commercial inland fishing would be enhanced. Finally, it would permit the easier flow of goods and labour to developing areas in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, the renewable resources based economy of the Labrador Coast is contained by an inadequate regional transportation network. In order for the growth associated with the fishery and other resource areas to occur in an orderly fashion, inter-regional and community road networks will be required to be constructed and upgraded. For example, much of the fish collected and distributed in Labrador is done by boat. This system in the Labrador Straits area has come to depend upon rudimentary road system which connects the communities in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in 1977 - 1978, Labrador Straits recorded 37.9 per cent and 36.4 per cent respectively of the total Coastal Labrador fish landing. It is estimated that the Straits fishery will in the future continue to account for at least 30 per cent of the total Coastal Labrador fish landings.

MR. WALSH:

In 1980, despite considerable growth projections in the other sub-regions of the coast, projected fish landings, for example, in the Straits will be 900 metric tons in 1985 as compared to landings of 3,200 metric tons in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, most of this fish will be moved over the local road network twice as raw fish, being collected in the processing centres and as finished product being shipped out of the area. And in addition, fresh salmon from the North of Red Bay is delivered to that community for road transport to Blanc Sablon, where it is shipped out by air.

Most of the fish landed in the Straits area will be caught during the mid-Summer trap salmon seasons when ambient temperatures and potential for fish spoilage is at its peak. Any possible reduction in transit times where fish are held at less than optimum required temperature conditions



MR. WALSH: would be significant in preventing spoilage and/or deterioration.

Mr. Speaker, the communities which can expect the most growth as a result of expanding renewable resources, resource economy are: L'Anse Au Clair, Red Bay, Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour, Williams Harbour, Black Tickle, Cartwright, Makkovik, Nain and Hopedale. Mr. Speaker, these communities do not have an existing road network which is -

MR. NEARY: Did you say Makkovik?

MR. WALSH: Yes, I did.

MR. NEARY: Davis Inlet?

MR. WALSH: Yes, I did.

MR. NEARY: No, you did not.

MR. WALSH: I am sorry. I apologize.

Davis Inlet.

These communities do not have an existing road network which is adequate to handle the increased economy, the economic activity which will be occurring within them. Many of these communities have little more than footpaths, which presently prevent the use of equipment on it as simple pickup trucks for community service such as garbage collection.

The isolation of these communities due to their physical remoteness, is compounded by the fact that several of the communities are not physically integrated units.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated the cost of road construction in these communities will be: Nain, one mile, at a cost of \$225,000; Hopedale, 3 miles at a cost of \$375,000; Makkovik, 2 miles at \$225,000; Davis Inlet, half a mile at \$110,000, Rigolet, 1.5 miles at \$225,000, Cartwright, 3 miles at \$250,000, Mary's Harbour, 1.2 miles at \$75,000; Fox Harbour, 1.5 miles for

MR. WALSH: \$225,000, Charlottetown, a half mile at \$110,000, for an overall total, Mr. Speaker, of \$2,366,000.

Mr. Speaker, during the construction of the community road in Mary's Harbour, it is proposed that a road be constructed to connect this community with Lodge Bay, a distance of seven miles, seven miles aside from the savings to be realized by construction of this road when the construction equipment is in the area. The road will add to the economic development of both communities. Such a road will give Lodge Bay residents access to the medical clinic in Mary's Harbour as well as to provide these residents with improved access to the hinterland area between the Axes and the St. Lewis Rivers, one of the major forest areas on the Labrador coast.

Mr. Speaker, this road will, as well, provide for the increased interaction of the people of these two communities, enhancing the quality of the life for the area's residents in a section of the region which is physically isolated from the rest of the coast.

Mr. Speaker, the overall cost of this road transportation system and network in Labrador is a total of \$30 million. Mr. Speaker, this government has had a request in Ottawa for DREE funding for various projects in this Province, and one of them is the Trans-Labrador Highway and the coastal road network, and to this day, Mr. Speaker, there has not been any funds forthcoming. This government is willing and ready to put their share into it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: How much? How much? A lousy 10 per cent?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for

Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to go on record as saying that this resolution almost contains enough ingredients for me to support it--almost! Now, then, Mr. Speaker, when one begins to read the resolution one can see that it does lead out some very valuable information. So with that in mind I would like to amend the resolution as follows: by deleting all the words after 'community services' in paragraph 2, and replacing them with the following: 'and support for the development of the fishery on the Labrador coast which is necessary for the development of a vibrant Labrador society; AND WHEREAS the Government of the Province has a proposal before the federal Government on a coastal Labrador DREE agreement; AND WHEREAS the government of the Province has a

MR. G. WARREN:

proposal before the federal government for a start on the Trans-Labrador Highway; and whereas the Province say that they are ready to move on both matters;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge both the federal and provincial governments to sign these agreements at the earliest possible opportunity.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN:

BE IT THEREFORE FURTHER RESOLVED that the House of Assembly establish a Select Committee to meet with representatives of both levels of government who are involved in negotiations of these agreements for the purpose of determining the reasons for the extensive delay which has occurred in the implication of these programmes; and a Select Committee report back to the House of Assembly within sixty days with their recommendations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Seconded by?

MR. WARREN:

Seconded by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair would rule that this type of an amendment does not negate the original motion. I do treat it in the same category as other amendments referred to in May's Parliamentary Practices, 19th Edition, page 387, which means that the object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability etc., etc., and it is my understanding that this is what this particular amendment does. And I would also further rule that in the case of this particular amendment, the debate that will follow will not be restricted solely to the amendment because I believe the purpose is one and the same, the amendment and the motion. So I therefore rule that the amendment is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would like to read the amendment. Perhaps it could be agreed rather than to read the entire amendment, I could point out to the hon. members exactly what has transpired by this amendment.

The second paragraph of the Resolution now reads, 'WHEREAS better transportation and community services etc., etc.', now will read, 'WHEREAS better transportation and community services and support for the development of the fishery on the Labrador Coast are necessary for the development of a vibrant Labrador society'.

And then I believe the resolve part, the final paragraph now reads, 'RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the federal government to live up to etc., etc.', that is amended to read, 'This hon. House urge both the federal and provincial governments to sign these agreements at the earliest possible opportunity'.

And then one final paragraph that has been added, 'BE IT THEREFORE FURTHER RESOLVED that the House of Assembly establish a Select Committee to meet with representatives of both levels of government who are involved in the negotiation of these agreements for the purpose of determining the reasons for the extensive delay which has occurred in the implementation of these programmes and the Select Committee report back to the House of Assembly within sixty days with their recommendations'.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order. I think, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. MARSHALL: - the gist of the thing, the hon. gentlemen want to get their friends in Ottawa off the hook again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

There is no point of order.

The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Do you want to ask the question of time?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. How much time do I have now? Do I continue with twenty minutes from now?

MR. SPEAKER:

It is appropriate that the question is asked so that we do have a reference for the future in case there is any misinterpretation of the Standing Orders.

MR. NEARY:

We have a precedent.

MR. SPEAKER:

We already have a precedent? Well, therefore I can tell the hon. member he has only twenty minutes in the debate on a private member's motion.

Now we have two precedents.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Okay, Mr. Speaker. I am surprised that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) got up and made a few sarcastic remarks and took off like a house on fire. However, if he had the stomach and the gall to come back and listen, maybe I could put him back in his place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in October, 1977, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the government of the day, which at that time was led by the former administration - and I am not allowed to open my mouth about a former administration - submitted the Labrador Development proposal for submission to the Government of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what is referred to down in Labrador as (inaudible).

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that proposal there was some \$19.9 million for resource and economic development, there was \$35 million for social and

MR. WARREN: There were \$30 million for social and community developments, and there was \$130 million for transportation and communications. Now, Mr. Speaker, you have a grand total of \$176,250,000. So naturally, Mr. Speaker, when this went to the federal counterpart, who at the time by the way was a Liberal Government in Ottawa four years ago, and naturally they said, "Look, you are asking for too much, Go back and amend it." So, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day, the former administration, the first thing they decided to do was completely eliminate education - education was completely cut out automatically, some \$14 million for education. They cut out community legal services, another \$2 million. They cut out tourist and recreational facilities, another \$3 million. They cut out the forestry allotment, another \$3 million, because they said under the new forest agreement it will cover the whole Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in transportation alone from this original proposal there was some \$50 million taken out, some \$50 million taken out, and it was put into a new concept - one is with the airstrips and the other is concerning the Trans-Labrador Highway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the original resolution it says, "Whereas the government of the Province have a proposal before the federal government for a start on the Trans-Labrador Highway - " Now, Mr. Speaker, that is hearsay, that is completely hearsay. The only proposal that has gone into the federal government for the Trans-Labrador Highway is at the beginning when they said, "Look, we want a Trans-Labrador Highway." They did not use any specific figures or where it was going, any plans whatsoever. That is the only proposal that has gone into the federal government, Mr. Speaker, on a Trans-Labrador Highway.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get to the crux of this whole debate. Last week, March 10th., I asked the Premier a few simple questions and he said, "Well," he said, "we do not negotiate figures." And other than the Premier, and maybe one or two of his colleagues, nobody knows if and what is in the proposals, whether they have gone to the federal government, or whether the federal government came back to them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that it is not all the federal government's fault. It is not all the federal government's fault.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: This government is just as much to blame as the federal government. So let us lay our cards where they are supposed to be laid down with the provincial government; after all it is a federal government. If we are going to knock the federal government, let us knock our own government first, because this is the government that is just as much at fault as the federal government.

MR. FLIGHT: Moreso.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. member have something to say?

MR. FLIGHT: Does the Minister of Social Services have something to say?

MR. WARREN: In January 1979, Mr. Speaker - those dates are very important - in January 1979, the Province went back to the federal government again and they said, "Look, here is what we want in the new Labrador DREE agreement." Now they came up with a figure somewhere in the vicinity of roughly around \$50 million. Now the figure - I do not know. In fact I would say there is hardly anyone in the hon. House who knows, not even the Premier and two or three of his colleagues. But they came up with a figure somewhere in the vicinity of \$50,000.



March 18, 1981

Tape No. 451

NM - 3

MR. WARREN: Now, that was in January 1979. Now as you know, Mr. Speaker, March 26th., 1979, just a month and a half later, the Prime Minister of Canada dissolved Parliament, dissolved Parliament, March 2th., that was just a month and a half later, dissolved Parliament, and we know the consequences on May 22nd. We all know the consequences. Joe Clark got elected as the new Prime Minister of Canada. Now,

MR. G. WARREN: that was on May 22nd. with a new minority government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Clark got elected, you know, automatically the people thought, 'Now, okay there is the answer for the Labrador DREE agreements, here is our answer'. But this government, Mr. Speaker, - I want to tell the hon. House and tell the public that this government never so much as talked to the PC government in Ottawa for the seven months they were in there until January 1980.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker. they never saw the Labrador DREE agreement, It was never even discussed until one year later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Prove it, prove it!

MR. G. WARREN: Now, if the hon. members on that side of the House can prove it, lay some correspondence on the table of this House proving that they went back with a new proposal to the Clark Government, as we will call it, the short Clark Government. And there is not one thing, not one bit of evidence showing that this government was concerned about Labrador. But they were more concerned about the synchrolift.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, in January 1980 the Province goes back again. By this time, as we remember now, in December 1979, the Liberals and the New Democratic Party ganged up on the lousy government in Ottawa and voted them out on a non-confidence motion. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was in December.

MR. G. WARREN: So this government played it very smart, you know, 'Oh, we had better get our DREE agreement into Mr. Clark now before the federal election, you see'. So in January they go up, after the non-confidence motion, they go up to Mr. Clark and says, 'We have to get our proposal in there now'.

MR. STIRLING: No, no! That cannot be true!

MR. G. WARREN: Oh, yes! Oh, yes! So they got their proposal into Mr. Clark's government when he was already out campaigning for the election and they said, 'This is our proposal.' Now Mr. Clark could not do anything, there was another election on the go--and we know, thank God, what happened on February 18th. We know Mr. Clark was kicked out of office where he deserved to be, should be, and the Liberals took power in Ottawa. Since then, Mr. Speaker, this government has said, 'Well, boy the jumpin' dyin', we had better get some DREE agreements signed for Labrador'. All of a sudden it was - from that day onward - it was one year before that there was no talk at all with the PC's in Ottawa but since Mr. Trudeau won on February 18th., 'Now, we had better get our DREE agreements signed'.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is all a bluff.

It is all a bluff by this government saying they are all ready for negotiations and by the federal government saying they are all ready for negotiations.

MR. T. HICKEY: (Inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN: Would the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) like to say something? I hear him shouting over there. If you want to say something I will yield.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister have something to say?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well he has not made any speeches in the last four or five (inaudible) does he want to say something now?

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I thought for one minute that this government was paying the same kind of service to Labrador as they are paying to St. John's, as they are paying to the synchrolift in St. John's, Mr. Speaker, I would definitely support the resolution from the beginning. I would support this resolution from the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at another aspect of it. In the present format there is approximately, as I said earlier, \$50 million. Now I want to reveal some further information, that in January 1981 there were negotiations between the provincial government and the federal government on how much money would be allotted for the different aspects of the DREE agreement. So it was agreed in these discussions that the Straits road has to be a ninety/ten settlement, the Straits road has to go ahead, that is a must. Now surely goodness this government must know that there is only so much money in that DREE agreement, so now what are we going to do? What are we going to do? Well, naturally we have to start cutting out, Mr. Speaker. Now, what are we going to cut out? We do not know, we do not know what is going to be cut out.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you one thing, since the last two and a half years the people on the Labrador coast, and Labrador in general, are sick and tired, plain sick and tired of the provincial and the federal governments playing

MR. WARREN:

cheap political football with their lives and that is what both governments are doing, playing cheap political football and in particular this government.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) compliment you.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker - oh, yes as a matter of fact, if you read the resolution, you will say that I am saying it is both governments.

MR. THOMS:

Get him to support the resolution.

MR. WARREN:

So, Mr. Speaker, now, Mr. Speaker, practically every three months, every three months for the past two or three years either the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (J. Goudie) or the Premier or sometimes the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) or some Federal minister or the member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock) or myself, now that is five or six individuals, have been saying to the people in Labrador the DREE Agreement will soon be signed. Now, this is what the people in Labrador have been listening to from politicians for the last two and a half years, the DREE agreement will soon be signed.

If we go back, we can find statements that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development made over a year ago. And we find statements that Mr. Rompkey made over a year ago. We find statements that the Premier made almost two years ago. So, Mr. Speaker, the people are sick and tired because all we are doing is playing political football with their lives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is going to continue - and we have to have the Straits road - what I am going to do, because there is so much confrontation, because there is so much confrontation between this government and the

MR. WARREN: government in Ottawa, I am going to recommend to the Department of Fisheries that they take out the whole shot of the Fisheries component in that agreement and the Federal Government will administer it themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: By doing that, Mr. Speaker, we will get rid of the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) playing politics with anything that he has. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am going to recommend, that the whole \$15 million or \$20 million that is in the DREE Agreement for the fisheries along the Labrador coast, be taken out completely and let the money stay in there for the straits road and for other necessities and let the federal department administer its own programmes for the fisheries because if we do not do that I-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: -I will tell the hon. members, if we do not do that, my friend, the people on the Labrador Coast will be the same as they were the last two years, with politicians playing political football with their lives and this is what is wrong with this government. This is what is wrong with this government.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I am going to recommend publicly that the fisheries component, in the Labrador DREE Agreement be taken out.

MR. BARRY: Why do you not take out the roads agreement?

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. BARRY: Why do you not take out the roads component as well?

MR. WARREN: Well, if you want to talk about roads - if your government and you as a member would go down to St. Mary's - the Capes and see what kinds of roads those people have to drive on, then you would not talk about roads, would you?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Do not open your mouth too loud, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Are you saying that the member is not doing his job?

MR. WARREN: No, I am saying that your government is not doing anything, that is what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.!

MR. NEARY: That is the boy, 'Garfield,' heave it out of you.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, as I suggested before, that some hon. Cabinet Ministers should go down along the Labrador coast some of those times and see what kind of fishing facilities that this government owns, - not the federal government - that this government owns. It is not fit to split a codfish in, Mr. Speaker. And this government is concerned about it? So, how can you have quality fish when this Provincial Government is concerned about having the plants there by name only?

Now, Mr. Speaker, why a select committee. Why I am asking for a select committee is that four or five members of this hon. House could sit down with representatives of both the Provincial and the Federal Governments and see what is holding up the DREE agreement. Now, that is not too much to ask. What is holding it up? The Provincial Government is saying the Federal Government is at fault.

MR. WARREN: Maybe they are right. And I will assure you today that if they are right the federal government is holding up these DREE agreements, I will probably go and fight the federal government as well as I am fighting this government. I will do the same thing if they are the ones who are holding it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Now, how do we know?

DR. COLLINS: Will you resign?

MR. WARREN: I did not say I would resign. Will you resign because of the people who are still on strike over there at the Trades College?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Why did not the minister resign today? If I were involved like the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) was I would resign, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett)

Mr. Speaker, you should be ashamed that you are a member of the Treasury Board and see people living on \$148 a week. You should be ashamed, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am supporting a Select Committee, so that members of this House of Assembly can go and talk to negotiators on the federal and provincial levels and find out what is going wrong with those agreements, what is going wrong with them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: - and then come back in sixty days and lay it upon the table of this House. And then we will know for sure who is at fault -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. WARREN: - and then whoever is at fault this government and all this House can really blast whoever is at fault.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Do you know? Are you sure?

Are you absolutely sure? Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the minister look in the mirror more often and he will know who is at fault.

And to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who has been so opposite to the federal fisheries policy, I will repeat what I just said a few minutes ago, that I am going to recommend that this Coastal Labrador DREE agreement, the fishery will come out of it altogether and be a new set-up that will be administered by the federal government. At least then we will not have fishing facilities along the Labrador Coast that are unfit to spread and cure fish in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Now, this is where the problem is, Mr. Speaker. The provincial government at the present time have a list that long of discrepancies with the plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

So that is your attitude. Now, the attitude, Mr. Speaker - there you see a minister of the Crown - 'Oh, we will close the plants. Because we own them we will close them.' That is the kind of minister, Mr. Speaker, that people have in the fisheries - 'We will close the plants. We will close them down.' Mr. Speaker, the federal government can manage the fisheries ten times better than the minister ever could try.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

So with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the hon. House that I will be advocating

MR. WARREN: a Select Committee and I believe that once we can come up with enough evidence from both negotiating teams, the federal and the provincial, and find out really the crux of the whole problem, who is at fault, then I believe this House should go on record and blast whichever government is at fault.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that at least this amendment to the Resolution should go ahead to show this government, really, to put their hearts and souls where their mouths are sometimes, because, Mr. Speaker, they are showing a lot of talk but very little action.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to stand in support today of the resolution as introduced by my colleague, the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) and to have a--

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: - few comments on the amendment as put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The concept, the idea, justification for funding of a Trans-Labrador highway or the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway, whichever way one wishes to address it, has been ongoing here in this hon. House, I know, for several years now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. DOYLE: Order, Mr. Speaker. What is wrong with that crowd? Why do you not listen to what the man is saying, boy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, four years ago -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has the floor. I would ask hon. members to allow him to continue. The hon. the Minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was suggesting while there was an exchange of information going on here across the floor that four years ago I stood in this hon.

MR. GOUDIE:

House I just wanted to suggest, by the way, for the information of my colleague opposite, the gentleman who just took his seat, that this is not a new issue, at least in the House of Assembly, yet, it is not, and it has not been with the Provincial Government for some time, in that four years ago, when I was sitting in the private benches here, I rose one day to address this very topic and made the offer to any hon. member of the House of Assembly that if they could prove to me in some concrete way a system of having roads built in Labrador or in any other part of the Province, but for my interest's sake in Labrador, that I would be willing to buy lunch for that hon. person for the remainder of that particular fiscal year. I might add, that I never did have the chance to spend that money because -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: Pardon?

MR. STIRLING: You cannot now.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, I found out how to get the road built. It is just the question of getting the two levels of government together to sign these agreements that we are talking about.

MR. STIRLING: Are you supporting the amendment?

MR. GOUDIE: No I am not supporting the amendment.

MR. STIRLING: You are not supporting the amendment?

MR. GOUDIE: No, and I will explain why in just a few minutes time. I do not think it is necessary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pardon?

MR. GOUDIE: I do not think it is necessary to have a Select Committee of the House to sit down over a sixty day period and talk to the Premier, as Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, and to the appropriate ministry in Ottawa

MR. GOUDIE: to find out who has been holding up this agreement. I know who has been holding up the agreement. The agreement has been sent in for months, if not years, along with a number of other agreements. The Coastal Labrador agreement is referred to in both the main motion and in the hon. member's amendment. That has been there for, I think, something like three years now. I believe it started off at \$130 million as a proposed agreement, Mr. Speaker-

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: - and it has ended up to be considerably less than that. And if we are to take what the Premier has stated both in this hon. House, publicly around the Cabinet table or around the caucus table, that he as leader of this administration is ready to sign the agreement, then I would suggest that it is the federal government who is at fault. They have not indicated any interest, Mr. Speaker, up until this point in time, certainly until the last few months or so, in signing any of the agreements as they relate to Labrador.

I personally have been involved not in the Coastal Labrador agreement, I had not been personally involved in that one, but I have been involved in another agreement, another agreement, by the way, which will inject \$35 million into the hon. member for Torngat Mountains' (Mr. Warren) district over the next five years. That agreement has been delayed now for a full year beyond its implementation.

MR. NEARY: Why? Why?

MR. WARREN: Because the government (inaudible) /Conne River

MR. GOUDIE: Because of what?

MR. NEARY: Why is it delayed?

MR. GOUDIE: I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said.

MR. WARREN: Conne River. Conne River.

MR. GOUDIE: Conne River has been playing a leading role -

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. GOUDIE: - in delaying the implementation of this agreement.

MR. NEARY: How is it delayed?

MR. GOUDIE: But the other relevant point is - I will address the hon. member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) comment in just a second. There are two proposed agreements under this new one as opposed to the one which has been in place up until 1979. The two proposed agreements should have been in place effective 1 April, 1980. They have not been in place. Interim funding was extended for eleven months of the year, up until the end of February this year, to carry on with some of the regular programmes, but the \$500,000 a year additional, which would be included in the two agreements, one for Conne River, one for Labrador - we have not been able to implement these programmes because the agreements have been signed up.

AN HON. MEMBER: The agreements -

MR. GOUDIE: I beg your pardon, the agreements have been held up.

MR. NEARY: Is that a separate agreement?

MR. GOUDIE: There are two agreements.

MR. NEARY: Has the original been drawn up?

MR. GOUDIE: There is one for Conne River -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) renewal (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: There are two proposed agreements now - one for Conne River which will involve approximately \$5 million of funds for five years. Another agreement for Labrador which will involve approximately \$35 million for seven communities now.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not understand how Conne River is holding it up.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, I have made the presentation to Mr. John Munro in Ottawa that the Labrador communities have all agreed to go ahead with the proposed agreement as it was outlined.

MR. NEARY: All right.

MR. GOUDIE: I suggested that that agreement should be signed and we will go ahead with it.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. GOUDIE: If Conne River wants to carry on and debate the items in their proposed agreement, they should be free to do so.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. GOUDIE: But he would not agree to that.

MR. NEARY: He what?

MR. GOUDIE: He would not agree with it.

MR. NEARY: Munro would not agree with it?

MR. GOUDIE: That is right. He wants both agreements signed at the same time.

MR. FLIGHT: So he should.

MR. GOUDIE: So the whole situation has been hamstrung up until now. I understand now that -

MR. NEARY: Well, that is wrong. He should sign that agreement for Labrador.

MR. GOUDIE: Of course, he should sign the agreement but that is the way it has been going on for the last year. Although I understand now that Mr. Munro is in

MR. GOUDIE: a position to communicate officially the position of his government to this government indicating that the agreements can be signed, and hopefully that will be done to take advantage of the new fiscal year beginning the 1 April.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, back to the main resolution and to the amendment as introduced by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).



MR. GOUDIE:

Talking about a Trans-Labrador Highway, that is the one in which I have a great deal of interest right now, and I say that selfishly because it relates to my district. I also have an interest in the proposed coastal Labrador DREE agreement because if it goes ahead the way it was recommended, then most areas of Labrador will be affected by that agreement in terms of funding programmes. But the one that I am concerned with is the proposed Trans-Labrador Highway agreement. That would complete a link from either Esker or Churchill Falls, depending on what engineers have to say, the experts, with Wabush - Labrador City, and that in turn is being connected to Baie Comeau, through the efforts of the Province of Quebec, building some kind of a road system from Baie Comeau up to Schefferville, which is already connected by a highway to Labrador City - Wabush, thereby completing a link all across Labrador.

Now, you want to talk about funds for developing a highway system in Labrador, and I think that highway system should be completed, I do not agree that the Trans-Canada Highway is yet completed. We have, as I said in other remarks in the hon. House, suggested that there is a road across an Island, but, in my opinion, that does not complete the Trans-Canada Highway in our Province because there is a section of the Province, two and a half times the size of the Island, North of here, which has no road system other than within the communities themselves and a tote road running from Happy Valley - Goose Bay to Churchill Falls, which is completely inadequate, it is unsafe in many areas.

All we have been getting in terms of funding, and in these remarks I will criticize the provincial government as well, if that is what hon. members opposite like to see happen. I have criticized my

MR. GOUDIE:                                 colleagues around the Cabinet table, in caucus, and in other areas. We should be getting more funding either from the provincial government or a cost shared programme, either one, it does not matter to me, my main interest is getting the section of road from the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area to Churchill Falls upgraded and in a suitable condition for people to travel. Just as an example of why we should have that, the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, now a part of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, offers a travel assistance programme to its employees to allow them to enjoy a holiday, particularly during the Summer months. Traditionally the residents of Churchill Falls have travelled by aircraft to some other point in the Province, on the Island part of the Province, of Newfoundland and Labrador. In the last couple of years, because there is a good ferry system now between Lewisporte and Happy Valley - Goose Bay, these employees have elected to use this travel assistance programme to take their vehicles and their families across the 200 mile stretch of road, from Churchill Falls to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, thereby utilizing the ferry service which takes, by the way, Mr. Speaker, only thirty-six hours from Happy Valley - Goose Bay to Lewisporte. And as Your Honour will realize, having been a resident of Labrador for most of your younger days, this is quite an advance over the transportation system we had in place when Your Honour was a resident of Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

But in any event, more people in Labrador City - Wabush, in Churchill Falls, are looking to travelling overland to take advantage of this ferry service than they are to travelling by air, and the reasons are very obvious. Three years ago I came from Happy Valley to Lewisporte, four members in my family, a

MR. GOUDIE: pickup truck, and travelled round trip for \$320. And I would suggest - my colleague, the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), is not in the House now, but I would suggest that a round trip ticket from Wabush to St. John's for one person is in excess of that amount of money. It is three hundred and fifty-something dollars for one person to get from Wabush to St. John's and return. And you are talking of families living in these communities of two, three, five, eight, even ten members in the family. So one can imagine how expensive it is for people to not just go on a holiday but come down and visit, perhaps, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I do not know if he has any relatives in Wabush - Labrador City, or Churchill Falls or not.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: But if he does, then I would assume she has some desire somewhere along the way to come down and it is costing her a fortune to do it.

MR. THOMS: It would cost at least \$2200 to get out of there.

MR. GOUDIE: That is one of the social effects, Mr. Speaker, of not having a Trans-Labrador Highway system in place. If you want to look at the economic effects of not having such a highway

MR. GOUDIE:

in place. My colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), within the last couple of weeks made statements publicly that with the probe of the motor vessel Arctic into the Western end of Lake Melville, then all kinds of possibilities now surface for industrial development in the Western Lake Melville area of Labrador bringing on stream possibilities for aluminum smelting, further exploration and use of the forest resources that we have, perhaps the fisheries can play some kind of a role in relation to an operation being set up or some kind of facility being set up in the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area to take advantage of these new possibilities for transportation. But in any event, once this kind of a system comes in place, where there is year round shipping in and out of Lake Melville, the central part of Labrador, then there is going to have to be an automatic step to construct a suitable Trans-Labrador Highway or a railway system - I do not know which one, whichever is the most practical and economical to put in place, I would suggest. But in any event, it is badly needed. I fully support the amendment, the original motion as put by my colleague for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), I do not think there is any significant change in the amendment as put forth by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) other than the latter part of his proposed amendment which deals with a Select Committee of the House. I do not think that is necessary.

I am fully satisfied and I think other hon. members of the House, on this side of the House at least, to Your Honour's left, are aware of where the problem is, why these agreements have not been signed. It has been the lack of political will, if you will, in Ottawa to sign the agreements and have these funding programmes put in place. We are ready to go, the Premier has said it dozens of times, I have heard him say it, to sign any and all of the agreements

MR. GOUDIE: put forward to Ottawa by this government over the last two and three years. I take faith in that statement and I suggest that the responsibility for the delay of all of these agreements as they relate to the development of Labrador, be it transportation or other developments, rests in the lap of the federal government and in that regard I support the motion as put by my colleague the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that we, on this side of the House, have no problem at all in supporting the principle of a Trans Labrador Highway. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the idea is not original, the idea started with the Smallwood administration back at the time that the Churchill Falls construction was going ahead and all the other - the mines in Western Labrador. At the time all these developments of our natural resources in Labrador were taking place, the government at that time felt that it was imperative, it was a matter of life and death, for Labrador either to have a Trans Labrador Railway or a Trans Labrador Highway. We would prefer to see a Trans Labrador Highway but if that is not economically feasible, Mr. Speaker, then both governments might consider a Trans Labrador Railway and use the electricity developed in Labrador to operate the railway. All you need do to build a Trans Labrador Railway is to put down the third line and have the electricity that is developed in Churchill Falls or in the Lower Churchill operate that railway across Labrador.

That may be the easiest way out of the dilemma as far as transportation in Labrador is concerned, Mr. Speaker. So we have no problem at all in supporting the idea of a Trans Labrador Highway. What we do have problems with, Mr. Speaker, is the 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED' in this

MR. NEARY: petition, 'That this hon. House urge the federal government to live up to its responsibilities and sign these agreements at the earliest possible opportunity'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member who moved this Private Members' Resolution did not indicate to the House if indeed agreements were being negotiated. The gentleman who introduced the Private Members' Resolution obviously did not take any time at all to do his homework, to do any research on this matter. The member did not tell us whether a survey had been done for the road from Happy Valley to Labrador City and Wabush, did not

MR. NEARY: indicate whether the road has actually been laid out, whether the survey has been done, did not indicate the cost of a road from Happy Valley-Goose Bay to Labrador West, did not tell us what it was going to cost. It did not tell us whether or not the responsibility for building this road was provincial or federal. And I would submit that it is a provincial responsibility. It did not tell us the cost, how much it is going to cost and how much the provincial government is prepared to put up for that Trans-Labrador highway. Now, these are all very important questions.

The highway first of all - let us face the facts, Mr. Speaker, just for any of the members who may not know, as some members do not seem to know their responsibilities as Cabinet Ministers, that all roads in this Province are a provincial responsibility. All roads in this Province are a provincial responsibility.

MR. HANCOCK: They do not understand that, I am sure.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe I will have to repeat it again for the sake of those who are so deaf that they may not hear. Every road, every highway in Newfoundland is a provincial responsibility. And yet, Mr. Speaker, let us see what this resolution says. Mr. Speaker, just listen to what it says: That the hon. House urge the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities. What responsibility?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get sidetracked on that.

MR. HANCOCK: A spell of silence is cast over the members of the government.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know, because it is indefensible. The argument, the point that I make is indefensible. But, Mr. Speaker, this motion, the resolution and the amendment made by my colleague, raises some very interesting questions, raises some very, very good points that should be elaborated upon. And the first question that I want to put to the government

MR. NEARY: in connection with this resolution is what negotiations is the hon. member talking about, what negotiations? There are no negotiations. There have not been any realistic negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) in this Province has submitted to the Government of Canada a whole raft, a whole list of proposals, a whole list, ranging from making St. John's an international airport, to upgrading the port facilities in Corner Brook and St. John's, to upgrading and improving the Trans-Canada Highway, CN, the coastal boat service, airports in Newfoundland, Trans-Labrador Highway, containerization. In Ottawa they refer to it as Charlie Brett's wish list.

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. NEARY: Wish list, that is what it is called in Ottawa, Charlie Brett's wish list, wish list.

AN HON. MEMBER: It may now be a petition list.

MR. NEARY: A whole raft of items, items that are put down merely for discussion, put down for - I am sorry the nipper is not in the House to hear this - these items are put down, Mr. Speaker, merely for discussion purposes. The hon. Minister of Transportation knows that and next week when Mr. Pepin arrives in this Province, the minister and Mr. Pepin will sit down and they will try to arrive at transportation priorities in this Province. So there are no negotiations. These are merely discussion papers, items for discussion, a wish list.

MR. HANCOCK: A list you would send to Sants Claus, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HANCOCK: It is like a list you would send to Santa Claus.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Mr. Speaker, it is like a list that a little boy or a little girl would send to



MR. NEARY: Santa to ask for a whole lot of stuff for Christmas hoping that they might get half, they might get a few items off that list. And that is the way the minister's list is. I have seen the list. I had it here in the House yesterday and held it up for members to see. It is a wish list.

MR. HANCOCK: Half the major roads were not included.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HANCOCK: Half the major roads around the Province were not even included.

MR. NEARY: No, half the major roads around the Province are not included. The Trans-Labrador highway is just mentioned incidentally on that list,

MR. S. NEARY: one of the items, one of the items on the list.

MR. BRETT: No wonder they are confused up there. Everything I send up there (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are not too many things that the hon. gentleman sends up to Ottawa. The hon. gentleman has had no dialogue with Ottawa over a Trans-Labrador Highway, no discussion, no liaison, no dialogue, he merely submitted his wish list.

MR. TULK: He admitted it was right, 'Steve!

MR. S. NEARY: Well, it is right, it is down in my office. I had here in the House yesterday. And so, Mr. Speaker, it is misleading and false to say that the Government of Canada should live up to its responsibilities and sign an agreement. How in the name of heaven are they going to sign an agreement when the negotiations have not even taken place?

MR. S. NEARY: I mean the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) knows the difference of that. How can they sign an agreement? The agreement has not even been discussed. What will be discussed next week in this Province when Mr. Pepin arrives here will be the question of transportation priorities in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about our coastal boats?

MR. S. NEARY: Your coastal boat service is going to get the axe.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) federal government Crown corporations.

MR. S. NEARY: Ah, well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend heard what I had to say about that matter yesterday and I am afraid today - and the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) may take a little comfort in this - that I am afraid I am in hot water with some of the big shots up in Ottawa. I am in hot water, so I am told today, long distance. I am in hot water because I released information

MR. S. NEARY: prematurely. Because I tried to save hundreds and thousands of jobs in this Province. And because I tried to save communities from economic ruin, I am in hot water in Ottawa. As if I cared if I am in hot water with Ottawa!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: When Ottawa needs to be nailed, Mr. Speaker, I will nail them. But I will not go out like this government with both guns blazing, shooting from the hip or from the lip at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and amazed that the Government of Canada would give this Province one red cent with the way that this honourable crowd have been behaving over the last couple of years. I am amazed that they are so co-operative and so willing to sign agreements.

MR. WARREN: \$47 million.

MR. S. NEARY: The coastal Labrador agreement will be signed shortly, the signing of the agreement is imminent. It will be signed. There are only a few matters of housekeeping to be cleared up and then that agreement will be signed. And the Government of Canada will foot 90 per cent of the cost of the road from Red Bay to L'Anse au Clair, 90 per cent of the cost of that road will be paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, by the federal government, by the Government of Canada.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Which is a provincial responsibility.

MR. S. NEARY: And that road is a provincial responsibility.

MR. ANDREWS: We will get some of our Upper Churchill money back.

MR. S. NEARY: We will get some of our Upper Churchill money back. We will get some of the money back that Mr. Moores spent on setting off two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to start the development of the Lower Churchill, about \$200 million and \$300 million to buy Churchill Falls. And we might get some of the money back that the hon. gentleman received, he and Mr. Winter, paid out by the provincial government when they were going around with their noses into the seal fishery in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen, for helping, for assisting Mr. Moores in his little seal fishery campaign.

MR. H. ANDREWS: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Privilege?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of privilege, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. H. ANDREWS: I take exception to that because I did not receive one cent. I did it at my own cost, as a matter of fact, some travelling that was incurred out of my own pocket for the good of Newfoundland. I was refused permission by the CBC to travel with that group of people because it would be in conflict of interest with my job as a reporter at the time. I did not receive any money from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. S. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the hon. gentleman was trying to suck his way in with the administration at that time and CBC would not give him time off. But if the hon. gentleman says that he did not receive a penny for transportation, that he did not receive any tickets to hockey games, that he did not receive any trips, that he did not receive any benefits, that he did not receive any income, then I am prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's word.

MR. MORGAN: And withdraw your statement and charges.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, that is what I said. When I accept the hon. gentleman's word, in case the hon. minister does not know that, I automatically -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of privilege I think it has resolved itself. The hon. member was not imputing any motives or allegations.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now getting back to the point -

MR. HANCOCK: You will have to learn to keep your mount shut.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, they had

MR. NEARY:

better be prepared to do their homework. Mr. Speaker, the point is that there are no negotiations, that Ottawa even if they wanted to, even if they wanted to at this moment, could not sign an agreement because there is no agreement to sign. If Ottawa said right now this very minute, "We are prepared to sign an agreement to build the Trans-Labrador Highway", where would the agreement come from? Can the hon. gentleman tell us where the agreement is going to come from? Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this is just another excuse. This is just a part of the pattern that we have seen in this Province in the last two years of attacking the Government of Canada, find every excuse you can to attack Ottawa, attack Trudeau, attack the Government of Canada, a very bad example that has been set by the Premier of this Province that is costing this Province untold losses, Mr. Speaker. Millions of dollars are being left in Ottawa as a result of the confrontation politics of this administration. The coastal Labrador agreement that my hon. friend spoke about today will be signed shortly, that is, Mr. Speaker, that is if somebody in this Province, in this government, will sign it. The agreement has been worked out, apart from a little bit of tidying up, a little bit of housekeeping, and the agreement is ready to be signed. But the problem that Ottawa has is finding somebody to sign the agreement. Mr. Speaker, I understood from my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), that he would like to see the fishery money removed from that agreement and have the federal Fisheries Department spend the money directly -

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - in coastal Labrador. And I agree with my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White), and to that I say, "Hear, hear!"

MR. HANCOCK: Or any other department.

MR. NEARY: When you have a minister who is as incompetent as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province, I cannot blame Ottawa for wanting to -

MR. MORGAN: You are just mad at me because I am not going to open your plant over in Burnt Island (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - I cannot blame Ottawa for wanting to spend -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) like that.

MR. NEARY: - I cannot blame Ottawa for wanting to spend the \$15 million the way that they want to spend it, not the way the minister wants to spend it. For too long in this Province, Mr. Speaker, for too long the Government of Canada have been paying 90 per cent of the cost of projects in this Province and getting 10 per cent of the credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now it is going to be - now the situation is going to be reversed. Where you have projects paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, the credit will go to the Government of Canada, that great Liberal government up there in Ottawa, and not to this government down here who get information leaked to them so they can upstage the ministers in the Government of Canada. That is what they have been doing for the last seven or eight years.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not an original idea. I am going to vote against the resolution. I am not voting against the principle of a Trans-Labrador Highway, because many is the time I have debated that in this

MR. NEARY: House. I think we should have a Trans-Labrador Highway going right on down to the Strait of Belle Isle and a tunnel across the Strait of Belle Isle to link up the two land masses, the Island of Newfoundland and the mainland part of the Province. But, in the meantime, that is off in the distant future so what I would suggest - and I agree with my hon. friend - that when we build the road what we need is a good ferry service across the Strait of Belle Isle, and that is a provincial responsibility. I have no doubt at all, Sir, no hesitation at all in saying that as soon as this government gets its transportation priorities straightened out - and let us hope they will get them straightened out next week - and as soon as they have firm plans to present to the Government of Canada, as soon as they can lay out the detailed information to the Government of Canada, I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, that that generous Liberal government in Ottawa, who have been so good to us down here for the last thirty years, who have been so good to us, will help to construct a Trans-Labrador Highway but they cannot sign an invisible agreement. There is no agreement and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) should advise his colleagues of that. He should not allow his colleagues to get up and make fools of themselves.



MR. NEARY: He should not allow his colleagues to try to mislead the House. He should straighten his colleagues out on the facts.

MR. HANCOCK: The only guy they can get to speak to is the deputy minister, they cannot even get to speak to the minister.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the resolution. I am going to vote in favour of the amendment which includes all of Labrador and which focuses attention on the agreement that we have before us, where a lot of homework has already been done, and that is the coastal Labrador agreement. Let us get that one signed. Get it out of the way. Let the Provincial Government work out its priorities in transportation in this Province, and I have no doubt at all, Sir, that the great Liberal Government up there in Ottawa will help the Province build a Trans-Labrador Highway and do all the other things that are so necessary for the economy of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We now know, Mr. Speaker, the question has been answered by the Opposition members who spoke in the debate so far, why the DREE agreement for Labrador, the very important agreement for Labrador, cost-shared by two governments, which means a major factor in the overall development of the Labrador Coast, and transportation in particular, because without transportation, the proper development of transportation, it is impossible to boost the economy of any area of the country of Canada.

MR. MORGAN: Now, in this case in the Northern part of the country of Canada, it is important that some federal funds be spent for that purpose. And to answer the question, what responsibility does the federal government have in this matter? The question was asked by the last speaker. 'Where is the responsibility? Well, it is all with the provincial government.' Now, that is the attitude of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. It is the attitude of one man from this Province who represents this Province in the Federal Cabinet, that Newfoundland should not be getting federal dollars unless we appreciate them more because it is our responsibility and we should carry out our responsibility. They fail to recognize that the important part of the federal national government is to develop the underdeveloped parts of our country, and one part of our country I am talking about is Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - the Northern part of our country. Why is it that millions of dollars have gone into the Northern part of Quebec over the last number of years? And I would say, millions, almost billions of dollars gone into transportation development in Northern Quebec. Is it because the federal government says, we are not going -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where? Name where it is.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, is it because they are saying we are not recognizing any responsibility -

AN HON. MEMBER: They cannot take it.

MR. MORGAN: - we are merely going to give it to Mr. Levesque and his government, over the past four or five years, and the previous Bourassa government?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible). not saying anything.

MR. MORGAN: Are they saying that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Give the minister a chance to talk.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, the spokesman on fisheries he will get to ask a question, or speak on fisheries, would he keep quiet in this debate now. Let him speak in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the federal government has a very serious responsibility, and the last speaker pinpointed the reasons why the DREE agreement for Labrador is not signed, because he kept on emphasizing roads are the responsibility of the provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER: So they are.

MR. MORGAN: And why should the federal government put funds in roads?

MR. HOLLETT: He did not say that.

MR. MORGAN: Why in the development of transportation?

Now, that is the key factor that I am going to lead up today, and it was not said before, and I am going to say it now.

MR. NEARY: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The key reason is that we have a federal minister representing this Province in the federal Cabinet who was willing to sign an agreement for Labrador no longer than what? - six weeks ago, shortly after Christmas, for a 50/50 cost-shared. He was willing to sign a 50/50 cost-shared, a giveaway policy of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland which they over there supported. Yes, Mr. Rompkey, 50/50 is a good deal, we will take it. We will take it, Mr. Rompkey, 50/50 is a good deal for

MR. MORGAN: Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: We want the road paved, Mr.

Rompkey, upgraded and paved -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - on the Southern part of the  
Labrador Coast, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: They are on their knees.

They are on their knees.

MR. MORGAN: We want it upgraded and paved, it is  
so important to the Southern portion of Labrador, but Mr.  
Rompkey will accept 50/50. We will accept 50/50.

AN HON. MEMBER: How nice of them.

MR. MORGAN: But we said, no, Mr. Rompkey and  
no, Mr. Trudeau.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We will not accept 50/50.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You have lashed out money in the  
Province of Quebec, you have lashed out money in the Northern  
parts of Canada, and let us be fair to Labrador. We do not  
agree with a 50/50 cost-sharing for the highway in Southern Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why it was  
not signed six weeks ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: It was not said before though.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: It was not said before. The fact  
is that we do, as a government, fully recognize that the federal

March 18, 1981

Tape 461

PK - 5

MR. MORGAN: national government of Canada has a very  
heavy responsibility toward

MR. MORGAN:

the overall development of the economy of Labrador . And unless we have, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, we have the transportation infrastructure in place, we are not going to see the development of Labrador. The hon. gentleman who brought in the amendment made a good point. He talked about developing the fisheries on the coast, and to link it in with the transportation, and I agree with that. I agree there is a very definite need for that. But do not try to twist it around to say, 'Well, look, without Ottawa Labrador would not have any development along the coast'. Let me give you an example. It was not ninety/ten. It was Newfoundland taxpayers' dollars, monies spent last Summer, just last Summer. Where? Henley Harbour. Is that Labrador? Yes. Newfoundland dollars.

MR. NEARY:

How much?

MR. MORGAN:

Turnavik, L'Anse-au-Loup, Cutthroat, Red Bay, Cape Charles, Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown, West St. Modeste, Black Island, Rigolet, Youngs Harbour, Nain, Williams Harbour, Marys Harbour, Cartwright, all Newfoundland dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Spent last Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What for? What for?

MR. MORGAN:

What for, Mr. Speaker? What for? I will tell you what for. Last Summer I took the time to travel the total coast of Labrador and to sit down and talk to the fishermen directly.

MR. WARREN:

How many? How many?

MR. MORGAN:

The fishermen's committees along all that coast, Mr. Speaker. Without the partisan involvement of my friend across the House, I visited all the -

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - the communities along the coast and I listened to what the fishermen had to say. And I understand from talking to them that they have yet to see a politician representing them come down and do that with them, to ask them what they want. They have yet to see that along the Coast of Labrador. They will after the next election. They will have someone from our side on that coast of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these funds were spent because we as a government recognize that, without the federal government, we do have a responsibility for the fishery development along the Coast of Labrador and we are recognizing it and carrying it out in a very true fashion. Not the behind the curtain fashion of the federal government by saying, 'Oh, no, you should not get any more than 50/50 for your highway in Labrador, you should not get any more. Fifty/fifty is sufficient. You should not get any more money than that for Southern Labrador highway cost-sharing, that is sufficient.

MR. BRETT: Ninety/ten on the Island, fifty/fifty in Labrador.

MR. MORGAN: I would like to see, for example, the federal government, if the federal government wants to take over the facilities required on the Labrador Coast - I recall back when I was Minister of Transportation, at that time we discussed then the need for transportation facilities along the coast. And we had to virtually beg the federal authorities to look at the development of airstrips. And I recall going to meeting after meeting after meeting and finally after about twelve or fourteen meetings we were successful in getting an agreement signed to develop airstrips along the Labrador Coast, a very important need.

MR. WARREN: Who was paying for it?

AN HON. MEMBER: The truth hurts.

MR. MORGAN: The federal authorities as they should be doing, they should be doing these things.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that last Summer we did not just spend these dollars in these communities, provincial dollars. Last year, in two communities in the hon. gentleman's district who wants to condemn the Newfoundland Government for doing nothing in his district along the Coast of Labrador, last year, we pumped in \$1.2 million Newfoundland dollars, again, into two communities, Nain and Makkovik.

MR. WARREN: What? To do what?

MR. MORGAN: To do what? \$1.2 million last Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And what was it for? Well, we happen to own in Nain and Makkovik fish plants, owned and operated and subsidized by the Newfoundland Government which last year took and processed 900,000 pounds of cod, 270,000 pounds of char and 300,000 pounds of salmon and paid the fishermen better prices than they were getting on most parts of the Island last Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear! Yes it was.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to play politics with Labrador, that is fine. We do not want to play politics. The fact is that if he is sincere about Labrador - he is far from a native Labradorian, he moved in there, I understand, from some part of Trinity Bay, that is fine - do not come in here in the House of Assembly and indicate that Labrador is being neglected by government, because it is not. Much more needs to be done, we all agree on that. If only we could get the federal government in Ottawa



March 18, 1981

Tape No. 462

IB-4

MR. MORGAN: to recognize the same responsibility and say, 'Yes, Labrador is underdeveloped. It needs additional dollars. It needs development of its resources and to do that we need transportation infrastructure.' Now, if the federal government did that, and recognized their responsibilities, then we could see the Labrador portion of our Province become developed in a manner that could be contributing to our economy, substantially, because the resources are there.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, enough on Fisheries, we only have a few minutes.

MR. NEARY: There is enough time.

MR. MORGAN: I will speak in a later debate on Fisheries. I will have lots to say on Fisheries later on, and again when I travel the coast, next Summer, of Labrador, again -

MR. THOMS: You do not have an audience.

MR. MORGAN: - to look at our facilities we are putting in place down there.

Let me disclose this afternoon something the federal people and, I think the Opposition, would not dare disclose in this House. I was surprised when the last two speakers spoke about Labrador, transportation, and there was no mention of the important link between the Island portion of the Province and Labrador, the need for freight service improvement or transportation improvement in general from St. John's, or from any part of the Island portion of the Province, to Labrador. And is it a coincidence that just recently, no longer than ten days ago, the Ship Owners Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, in a lengthy telex to the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Pepin), demanded a full-scale investigation? A full-scale investigation into what? A very serious matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen cannot take the heat in the kitchen, let them get out. Because the fact is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - the Ship Owners Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I have a

MR. MORGAN: copy of the telex, which was sent no longer than ten days ago representing all the ship owners in the Province, asking the federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Pepin, for a full-scale investigation into the recent awarding of a contract for millions of dollars for a service between St. John's and Goose Bay. St. John's and Goose Bay. Now, we will all agree there is no question of the need for the service. What their complaint is in their telex, and I repeat, they are pointing out that tenders were called and there are irregularities in the method in which the tender was awarded.

Now, is it a coincidence that the hon. gentlemen who spoke in the House today, because the federal minister Mr. Rompkey is implicated, they would not dare mention it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. MORGAN: Is that the reason why they would not dare mention it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: They are not going to mention that one.

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason they would not dare mention it, because Mr. Rompkey is implicated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: See the poison, take the poison. The facts are the facts. Mr. Speaker, the situation is, and it can be easily verified by any member of the Opposition calling Mr. Pepin and asking for the information, because the telex is gone to Mr. Pepin, a lengthy telex from the Ship Owners Association of Newfoundland demanding and asking for a full-scale investigation.

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: - as to why the irregularities in the awarding of a contract to a company owned by Mr. Mel Woodward in Labrador, a good friend of Mr. Rompkey's -

MR. C. POWER: A good Liberal.

MR. MORGAN: - and why Mr. Rompkey intervened many times -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. POWER: A big Liberal.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, these people -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not like a bit of corruption, eh?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The only problem -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker, with the Opposition members, they want to give it but they cannot take it.

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: They want to give it but they cannot take it. They cannot take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is the whole problem, they cannot take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: All I am saying is, Mr. Speaker, there is no talk of rumours -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - check the, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am having difficulty hearing the hon. minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Sit down!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) sit down!

MR. POWER: Sooky, sooky, boys.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: He only comes up to blow.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

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

MR. HODDER: Sit down, boy, you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. HODDER: Sit down! He is not sitting down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister who is now speaking in the House made a very serious statement, made some very serious charges and accusations there a few moments ago, that if they cannot be verified, Mr. Speaker, will breach the privilege of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: If they cannot be substantiated, if they cannot be proven, then the hon. gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: Do not be so foolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down, boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make him sit down, Mr. Speaker. A man is supposed to sit in his chair.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- Mr. Speaker, if they cannot be proven, they cannot be validated, then the hon. gentleman has breached his privileges of this House by his vicious attack on the federal Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Rompkey.

Now, what did the hon. gentleman say? The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Rompkey -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) gentleman, he is taking up my time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK:

Keep him five minutes. Slow down 'Steve', keep him five minutes.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, Hansard will prove what the hon. gentleman said, but I will summarize it, I will repeat what

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman  
said, that Mr. Rompkey was implicated in this contract  
that was awarded.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HANCOCK: There were irregularities.

MR. NEARY: There were irregularities  
that implicated Mr. Rompkey, that is what the hon, gentleman  
said, in the contract that was awarded for the operation of  
the ferry service between St. John's and Happy Valley -  
Goose Bay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the  
hon. minister either has to prove that or he has to withdraw  
that statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: If he cannot prove it, Mr.  
Speaker, he has breached his privileges of this House -

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep talking.

MR. NEARY: - and I ask Your Honour  
to check Hansard to see if I have not put the thing in its  
proper context.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: To the point of  
privilege, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of  
Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: - I will clarify it easily  
by saying, everything I say in this House today I will say  
outside the House, word for word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: That is all you wanted.  
That is all you wanted.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A submission to the point  
of privilege raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile?

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

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

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: It is quite clear that we are not dealing with a point of privilege here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. THOMS: Scrub it off you boy, you are full of (inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, could we have a little order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries is imparting some knowledge to the House, knowledge that he has. The hon. members opposite find the knowledge uncomfortable and do not want to accept it. That is their privilege. When the hon. member rose to make that point, he was merely interrupting the hon. Minister of Fisheries' debate, his statement to the House, which in itself was out of order, and it is clear he brought forward no evidence that the privilege of this House or the privilege of any member of this House had been impuned in any way.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a comment to what the -

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Your time is up, anyway.



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows full well -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour is fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot slander or libel -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) in the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: I will give you the facts.

DR. COLLINS: Sit down.

MR. NEARY: - you cannot slander or libel an individual in this hon. House, and the hon. the Minister of Finance is completely wrong, and I am sure Your Honour would like to take a few minutes to take a look at this, because it is such a matter, where some very serious charges have been made by the minister, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and I believe Your Honour should take a few minutes to examine Hansard to see exactly what the hon. gentleman said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: You will get one of your medals for that.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

To the point of privilege

I will have to reserve my ruling until I check the Hansard and see what the hon. minister said.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, continuing along in the same vein as I was talking about, the improvement of transportation from the Island portion of the Province to the Labrador portion, there is no question about the need, but this came up just recently and I was surprised that not one member mentioned it. This new service

MR. MORGAN: was announced no longer than - what? - fifteen days ago, this brand new roll-on roll-off service between St. John's and Goose Bay, a tremendous development. Nobody mentioned it, a federal deal. Why did they not mention it? Because, because of the demand for investigation asked for by the ship owners of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are demanding an investigation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: They are demanding the investigation.

MR. POWER: That is right, they are demanding it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The Ship Owners Association, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Speaker, each member of this House can call Mr. Pepin and ask him, Has he received a lengthy telex from the ship owners of Newfoundland and Labrador asking for an investigation into the irregularities in the awarding of a contract recently? Irregularities in awarding a contract -

MR. WHITE: Smear, that is all he does.

MR. THOMS: Smear artist.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no -

MR. POWER: (inaudible) the facts of life.

MR. MORGAN: If the facts are there the facts are there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: If the hon.gentlemen do not want to hear the facts, well that is fine, but the facts are there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was more than a coincidence that the hon. gentlemen who spoke did not mention this new recent development of the federal government. Why? Here is why: First of all a deal was made on the purchase of a new vessel then the tenders were called - the tenders were called after the fact - asking for specifications for a certain kind of boat, not a roll-on roll-off service, but a boat with certain crane sizes to go into smaller communities along the coast of Newfoundland before it goes to Labrador -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - and suddenly, after the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - contract was awarded -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down, boy, sit down!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) want to know the story, do you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The house is in disorder.

I am going to have to recess.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

This is the first opportunity,

I believe, that the Chair has had to relate something to hon. members that has been a matter of concern in view of the fact that the Deputy Speaker had to recess the House because the House was in disorder-the first time, incidentally, since this General Assembly began. I want to make mention of it, also, because of the fact that a number of members on both sides of this hon. House have spoken to me about it in private, and it is the question of interruptions and exchanges. I have mentioned before on numerous occasions, as members no doubt realized, that during the first few days of this session, in fact, the Chair was very flexible and lenient in this particular regard, mostly because of the fact that it was a new session and the Chair took into consideration that hon. members had been away from the House for quite some time and no doubt had some frustrations to rid themselves of. But I think it is now fair to say that enough leniency has been shown. We all know that certain exchanges and comments back and forth are an accepted part of parliamentary tradition and practice and when an hon. member who is speaking appears to be inviting those exchanges and not objecting to them, then the Chair will not intervene unless, of course, the House is in disorder. However, when these exchanges and comments become loud and constant, then the Chair will have no choice but to intervene. I think that hon. members on both sides of the House will agree that recently there have been some members who seem to be abusing this parliamentary courtesy and are being loud and continuous.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I want to assure hon. members, especially those who have mentioned this matter to me in private, and, indeed, all members of the House, that the Chair is determined from this point on not to permit or tolerate these types of loud and regular outbursts and will go out of its way to protect the rights of the members of this House by whatever means are deemed necessary. And I know and hope that in this regard I will have the support of the members in the House. The Chair has been entrusted with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the members and enforcing the rules. It is, however, a two-way street and members know, too, that they have a tremendous responsibility as well, that of adhering to those rules and adhering to the rulings of the Chair. Loud, excessive and continuous interruptions and exchanges do nothing to enhance the dignity and decorum of this House, and having heard many members talk about the preservation of dignity and decorum in their speeches in this House, I know that you would insist that the Chair do whatever is necessary to uphold the very essence of these parliamentary traditions. I sincerely request your co-operation in this particular regard.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries has one minute remaining.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I lost most of my time by interruptions that you are now referring to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in cluing up what I was saying, I said earlier that the statements I have made about the awarding of a contract which has the Shipowners' Association of Newfoundland and Labrador terribly upset because most of them were bidders on the same contract, there were irregularities in their view, and from what information I have seen there is no question

MR. MORGAN: there were irregularities in the awarding of the tender. As a result of that, because the tender was awarded by CN Marine without the authority, without the knowledge -

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - of the federal Minister of Transport -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I rise on a point of order but, Mr. Speaker, we are debating a resolution and in this resolution there are two things: the Trans-Labrador Highway and the coastal Labrador DREE Agreement. Now, any contract between CN and a private company has nothing to do with this resolution.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, quite to the contrary in my view, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact we we are talking about transportation and development of transportation in Labrador as it pertains to linking with the Island portion of the Province. I am referring to a recent, important development by means of awarding of a major contract for a roll-on, roll-off service between St. John's and Labrador -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: - and, therefore, what I am referring to, the method of the awarding of the contract itself -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. gentleman is again and again interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order.

MR. MORGAN:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about transportation referred to in the original motion and also in the amended part of the motion put forward by the hon. member who last spoke and raised a point of order. We are talking about transportation, the development of transportation in Labrador and how it effects the overall economy of Labrador. And I am referring to a contract that was recently awarded which has the shipowners of Newfoundland and Labrador upset because, in their view, of irregularities in the awarding of the tender.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair will handle it.

MR. MORGAN:

It is for the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of improving the transportation from St. John's to Labrador and therefore it is automatically relating to the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, I rule that there is no point of order. Obviously relevance is a difficult area to define and I believe there has been a great degree of flexibility allowed in this debate in any event. However, I must now advise the hon. minister that his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Bank,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

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

I must say I have a great deal of sympathy for you in your attempts to control probably the one person who offends against the rule and brings down the decorum of this House and nobody does it more so than the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: And nobody on the other side, I do not think, misleads this House moreso than the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that particular phrase 'misleading the House'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: I asked the hon. member to withdraw those remarks.

MR. THOMS: I did not say 'deliberately'.

MR. SPEAKER: I have asked the hon. member if he would withdraw those remarks and that will resolve the situation.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Yes, Your Honour, I will withdraw the word that I used, 'misleading'.

Mr. Speaker, let us just look at the resolution for a moment. The first 'WHEREAS' clause states that the people of Labrador should enjoy the same standard service as Island residents of the Province. There is nobody who can disagree with that particular portion of the resolution unless, Mr. Speaker, it is the Minister of Fisheries. They deserve better transportation services. I hope, Mr. Speaker, somebody in the debate - I have not heard everybody who spoke in the debate - has pointed out that it is a provincial responsibility, roads in the Province. We look to Ottawa for the funds. In this particular case



MR. THOMS: I do not think the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) mentioned it, but it is a 90/10 agreement that they are looking for. So we do look to Ottawa, but the prime responsibility for roads, for transportation in the Province, is with the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, they are asking that this hon. House urge the federal government to live up to its responsibilities. I believe the federal government has lived up to its responsibilities, I believe they have; I doubt and I question whether or not the provincial government has lived up to its responsibilities. And the amendment quite properly, Mr. Speaker, points out that this House - I would not have put it in. My hon. friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) put in the words 'federal government and the provincial government'. I would not have put in federal government. One of the problems in this Province is that this government has not acted in a mature manner when it has come to negotiations with Ottawa. They are like a bunch of school children, juveniles. I will not call them delinquents because that may be unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, but they have acted in a juvenile, childish manner, an immature manner.

MR. FLIGHT: An illiterate manner.

MR. L. THOMS: That is not surprising of course when you look at all the front bench -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: - and without giving it a thought you can think of four ministers who today should not be ministers of this Cabinet. If they had the decency, if they were honourable, they would resign.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we can let the member for Stephenville go on. I do not ask for the protection of the Chair from a mouse like the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: The mouse that roared.

MR. THOMS: He can roar all he wants to. Let him have it. Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: That is the problem, that is why we do not have any coastal Labrador agreement, that is why we do not have an agreement of a Trans-Canada Highway. And many other -

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. L. THOMS: No. If the hon. member had his way, Mr. Speaker - and I heard him and I was embarrassed by him; the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) heard him and the member for Humber West was embarrassed by him - if the member for Stephenville had his way, Mr. Speaker, we would not have any DREE agreements - we would not have any DREE!

MR. STAGG: We would not need it.

MR. THOMS: He recommended, he went into Corner Brook before the Committee of the House of Commons, - and argued that we should not have any department of DREE.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. L. THOMS: We do not need it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: What we do not need in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and this is why I agree with my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), what we do not need in this Province is the federal government, willv-nilly, giving in-competents such as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), monies to spend in this Province. I agree with my friend from the Torngat Mountains that the \$15 million that is included in this agreement for fisheries should be taken out. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Put it in a ball field.

MR. THOMS: - the reason for this is because the people of Newfoundland have no confidence in the Minister of Fisheries to properly and adequately and competently spend that money. They do not have the confidence, the fishermen of Lawn and St. Lawrence and Lord's Cove and Lamaline and Grand Bank and Fortune and St. Lawrence and Little St. Lawrence. I can find none of them that will agree with the competence of the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. TULK: You cannot find them in Newfoundland.

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Fisheries talks about travelling the Coast of Labrador, but he will not come to the South Coast of Newfoundland. I do not know if my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) has been able to get him to go down and visit the fishermen in his district -

AN HON. MEMBER: He will not go down there either.

MR. THOMS: - or the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), I do not know if he has been able to get the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to go down to look at the facilities and to answer the question and the problems.

MR. STAGG: That is because they are trying to -

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to get him there.

MR. TULK: He was down in my district last week.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the real problem in this Province today. That is the message that the people of this Province are getting, that is the message, that we have a boy dictator, we have a boy king.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: We have a schoolboy Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Careful now, careful.

MR. THOMS: We have an immature government made up of immature individuals governing this Province today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: That is why these agreements are not signed. There are exceptions; my friend the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), he is an exception. In my dealings with him, Mr. Speaker, he is an exception.

MR. THOMS: The member for Gander, (Mrs. Newhook) the Minister of Municipal Affairs, she is an exception.

MR. TULK: She is a lady.

MR. STAGG: That is nice to know.

MR. L. THOMS: She is an exception. There is the odd backbencher who is an exception. There is the odd backbencher.

MR. STAGG: Yes, a few odd ones.

MR. THOMS: My friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), Mr. Speaker, is not one of those exceptions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: He is not one, but then thank God, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is wait for this Premier to get enough guts to call an election and then we will not have to deal with the member for Stephenville anymore. He is gone.

MR. THOMS: I do not know if my hon. friend yesterday mentioned him as one of those that have gone, but there is no question about it, he is gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those in the House of Assembly, probably unlike the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), who has had an opportunity not only to have travelled the Coast of Labrador, but I have had the opportunity along with my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) to spend many, many Summers -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: - in the -

MR. STAGG: Do you visit your district twice a year?

MR. THOMS: I visit my district often enough. That is probably what is wrong with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), he is too close, the people get to know him. Along with my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush),

MR. L. THOMS: we spent a number of Summers in Labrador. We know and we can feel the frustrations of the people of Labrador. We know the frustrations.

Mr. Speaker, these people now are suffering, not because the federal government has not accepted its responsibility as this resolution states, but because the Province, the PC, the Tory administration of this Province has not accepted its responsibility and acted in a mature manner.

MR. F. STAGG: We are not on our knees like you folks.

MR. L. THOMS: There is nobody on their knees on this side of the House. I have never gotten on my knees to anybody, Tory or Liberal or NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: And there is nobody asking little Alpie and his administration to get on their knees. There is nobody asking that, Mr. Speaker, no one! But they should be mature enough, they should be old enough, they should be, Mr. Speaker, responsible enough, they should be statesmen-like enough to be able to go - Mr. Speaker, it takes two to negotiate.

MR. F. STAGG: They should be like Neville Chamberlain.

MR. L. THOMS: But it is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for an adult to negotiate with an infant. You have to take an infant and smack it across the bottom, and maybe that is what is happening. And there is no trouble to know who the infant is in this respect.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you believe in spanking?

MR. L. THOMS: Of course I believe in spanking children. Do not be so ridiculous! Of course, I do!

MR. D. HANCOCK: That is what happened to the crowd, 'Les'.

MR. L. THOMS: And at 6:00 p.m. if you want to come out I will spank your bottom for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: That is what happened to the hon. members, they never got spanked enough when they were growing up. That is what happened to them! That is what happened to those Townies they did not get spanked often enough.

MR. L. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who spoke previously, worried about the \$1.2 million that this administration spent in Labrador. \$1.2 million they spent in Labrador! Mr. Speaker, he is very proud of this fact, very proud of it. This is an administration that can spend \$200,000 in comic books, and then the Minister of Fisheries has to get up and be very proud of the fact that there was \$1.2 million spent-and that was \$1.2 million of federal funds.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) relevance.

MR. L. THOMS: Relevancy? It was the minister who brought up - I would like to know what the relevancy was of the poison and innuendo and smear that the Minister of Fisheries was bringing in this House this afternoon. I would like to know what the relevancy of that is to this particular bill. I did not hear you calling relevance when maw-mouth was saying that, did I?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: Get up on a point of order then, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is not the federal government who has shown a lack of responsibility towards this Province. This year, Mr. Speaker, \$1.2 million - \$1.3 billion into the economy populated by some 570,000 souls. And my friend for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) has the audacity to bring in a resolution saying that the federal government lacks or shows no sense of responsibility, is not living

March 18, 1981

Tape No. 468

DW - 3

MR. L. THOMS:

up to its responsibilities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is true.



MR. THOMS: It is not true, Mr. Speaker. There is not one iota of truth in it. The ones who are not living up to their responsibilities, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Are over there.

MR. THOMS: - are the Tory administration of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: They do not care. They do not give a damn, Mr. Speaker, what happens to the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: They do not care what happens to the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if anything I say is unparliamentary, they know what they can do about it. They have the same rights and the same privileges to stand up on a point of order as someone over here has to stand up on a point of order. Let them not mumble under their breaths. Newfoundland has seen enough mumbling under its breath.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: And that is all they are getting from this administration. And an immaturity where the people of Labrador are suffering. The member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) did not mention that, but my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) recognizes that the prime responsibility in this matter is with the provincial government. You are at fault, you are the reason why this agreement is not signed. You are the reason.

MR. NEARY: You are the problem.

MR. THOMS: It was my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who said that all you have in right now is a wish list. And you are talking about agreements, and I do not know when - my friend, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), is a lawyer - I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if a wish list would

MR. THOMS: qualify in the courts of this land as a contract.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. THOMS: There is probably, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can hazard, nothing to sign.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. THOMS: They have not negotiated an agreement yet.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is correct.

MR. THOMS: They have not done it.

MR. GOUDIE: Negotiations (inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Now if you have, then you have nothing to hide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: You have nothing to hide. Why not go along with my friend for Torngat Mountains and appoint a select committee. Maybe if you crossed the floor and became a Tory you would get your select committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no, no!

MR. THOMS: Maybe this is the price of crossing the floor, getting select committees.

MR. WARREN: Not for me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no! He is not that cheap.

MR. THOMS: I do not think though, Mr. Speaker, my friend for Torngat Mountains is quite that cheap. I think he would need more than that to cross the floor of this House.

MR. STIRLING: Look at the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

MR. TULK: He looks better over there.

MR. STIRLING: The Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead, boy. Keep her going!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I think I do have a couple of more minutes left, but I would at this time adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 18, 1981

Tape No. 469

PK - 3

MR. NEARY:

I must say you have come a long way.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

It being 6:00 o'clock, this House  
stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.