

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1981

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 620

SD - 1

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Burin -

Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon.

members have noticed in today's paper the headline: 'Burin's Hero'.

MR. BARRY:

Burin's what did it say?

MR. HOLLETT:

Hero.

MR. BARRY:

'Heroine' it should be.

MR. HOLLETT:

It should be. Thank you for the

correction, Mr. Minister.

But having been involved in the original reporting of this incident and knowing the family quite well, especially Captain Earl Foote, her father, and her mother Dorothy, and the pride that the people in that region and I am sure all of Newfoundland have in this deed where Jessie was given full credit for saving the life of one of her schoolmates from drowning in Collins Pond last January, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, with the approval of all members of the House, if you would write a letter of congratulations to Jessie which she would have, of course, long before she receives her award for bravery from the Lieutenant-Governor later on this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed?

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have heard the motion. Those

in favour 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Contrary 'Nay'?

Carried.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The past couple of days there have been a number of points of order, etc., raised in which I reserved rulings until I have had an opportunity to check with Hansard and the like, and I would like to deal with some of those at the present time.

With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) yesterday arising out of a response to a question that he asked of the hon. the Premier on which I did reserve a ruling, I have since had the chance to check Hansard and find that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's point of order was, "that the hon. the Premier was imputing motives and attempting to mislead". The words used by the hon. the Premier were, "So first of all let it be recorded that the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to hydro developments in Labrador". It is my opinion that this is not a imputation of motives but a difference of opinion; therefore in this instance there is no point of order.

There was a subsequent point of order raised which I will deal with when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is in the House.

Also, with respect to the point of privilege raised on Monday by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the statement of the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) "scare tactics" to which the hon. member objects is not of a sufficiently serious nature to take precedence as a matter of privilege over all other business of the House. As is stated in Beauchesne, 5th Edition, paragraph 17 at page 11, 'A question of privilege ought rarely to come up.'

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House. This matter in my opinion falls rather into the realm of unparliamentary language at the least, or an imputation of unworthy motives at the most. It should therefore have been raised as a point of order at the time that it was uttered. Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Paragraph 323 (1) and (2). I therefore have to rule that there is not prima facie case of privilege. I will, however, point out that the connotation of an expression used in the House depends to a great extent on the tone, manner, et cetera, of the person speaking - Beauchesne, Paragraph 324, pages 114 and 115 - and that what is acceptable at one time may not be at another. Having had an opportunity to review Hansard, I find that this expression in the circumstances prevailing at the time it was used could be construed as offensive and unworthy of the House. I would therefore ask the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to withdraw his remarks in the interest of decorum.

MR. L. BARRY: No problem at all, Mr. Speaker. My interest is in making sure that the people of Buchans are properly informed, that no games are played with this very serious matter and I unequivocally withdraw any imputations of motive, and I just caution all members to be ware of toying with people's lives when they are in such a serious situation as the people of Buchans are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has withdrawn.

Also yesterday, hon. members will recall that I reserved my decision on a point of order raised during Question Period regarding certain words spoken by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): In his question to the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) the hon. member stated, 'I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation,' et cetera, 'I asked the minister about the cost and the information in connection with the low-bed; it went on to say, 'He did not know the cost on March 19 even though he had written a cheque, and the documents that were tabled, Mr. Speaker, I suspect are fake documents.' The offending words was in this context are fake documents, The oxford dictionary defines fake as 'a trick, invention, a fake<sup>d</sup> or cooked report, to tamper with for the purpose of deception, to steal.' I quote from Beauchesne at page 104, Paragraph 319. 'In the House of Commons, a member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself or to impute to any member unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case.' Page 114, Paragraph 322: 'It has been formerly ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted. But it is not unparliamentary ~~temperately~~ to criticize statements made by a member as being ~~contrary~~ to the facts, but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident.' And Paragraph 324,(1): 'It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular members or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): contrary to order. Much depends on the tone, manner and intention of the person speaking. Taken in the context in which the words were spoken, having had a chance to review them in Hansard, to say that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) has presented fake documents is to say that he has deceived this House. It is a connotation of deception; what one cannot say directly cannot be implied. While the word could be used to cast doubt on the authenticity of a document per se, this case it seems to me it was used in connection with a question to which it added nothing other than to qualify it so as to suggest some sort of tampering. As well there is a connotation of deception that is implied in the word 'fake'. The word 'fake' implies there was an imputation of intentional falsehood. Therefore I would rule that in the context in which the words were spoken, the remarks are unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to withdraw the remarks.

MR. S. NEARY: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member withdraws.

#### STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, of Wednesday, February 25, 1981 the following statement was made on page 13, 'New regulations will be introduced to govern the conduct of civil servants. These regulations will be implemented under the Civil Service Act and will specify conflict of interest situation covering investments and private assets, outside employment, public service appointments and promotions, dealings with relatives and acceptance of gifts and benefits. Restrictions will also be placed on the holding of shares and specific classes of companies and that there would also be regulations, guidelines governing the conduct of ministers.' Page 13 of the Throne Speech on February 25th.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am pleased today, Mr. Speaker, to make a specific announcement regarding that commitment in the Throne Speech. With respect to ministers, I will be introducing in this session of the House of Assembly an amendment to the Conflict Of Interest Act empowering me as Premier to issue guidelines to govern the conduct of ministers in their official duties. Cabinet has also recently reviewed and approved in principle draft regulations governing the conduct of civil servants. Today I have arranged for copies of these draft regulations to be hand delivered to NAPE, CUPE and the Newfoundland Association of Management Employees soliciting their comments and recommendations. I look forward to meaningful input and I trust that these employee associations will view this kind of consultation with favour.

In the performance of their duties, ministers and civil servants are continuously aware of information which is not generally made available to the public at large. In instances where they are exposed to highly confidential information, opportunities exist for significant gain. I therefore view regulations and guidelines as highly desirable and necessary to ensure that ministers and officials alike perform in a highly ethical manner and are perceived by the general public in the same light.

As I indicated earlier, I am proposing a specific set of guidelines to govern the conduct of ministers which I will personally enforce. With respect to civil servants, I plan to promulgate regulations under the Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973. An amendment to the Conflict Of Interest Act will be necessary in both instances, and these will be presented

PREMIER PECKFORD: to the House of Assembly  
for approval in the very near future.

I now wish to briefly highlight the scope and contents of the proposed guidelines and regulations. The regulations and guidelines will represent the primary instrument for use by Cabinet ministers and officials in determining acceptable standards of conduct in the performance of official duties. The regulations and guidelines will involve an honour system placing the onus on ministers and officials to make disclosure of potential conflict of interest situations.

With respect to ministers, I shall assume full and final responsibility for determining whether in fact a conflict of interest situation exists and I will take appropriate disciplinary action where appropriate. In the case of civil servants, Cabinet will assume that responsibility.

Conflict of interest situations outlined in the regulations and guidelines cover investments and management of private assets, non-financial interests, outside employment, improper influence in public service appointments and promotion, dealing with relatives and acceptance of gifts and benefits.

Restrictions will be placed upon ministers and civil servants in the trading and ownership of common shares in companies engaged in exploration for oil and gas in areas regulated under the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Regulations, 1977, in mining exploration or in land speculation. Ministers, or companies in which ministers have an interest, cannot qualify for government grants, loans, leases or Crown land without my expressed prior approval. In the case of civil servants, decisions on these matters will rest with the Cabinet.



PREMIER PECKFORD: Restrictions will be placed upon outside employment of ministers and officials. Ministers will be required to inform me of all applications for employment or offers of employment which conflict with their official duties. In the case of civil servants, this must be brought to the attention of Cabinet.

Restrictions will be placed upon former public servants from receiving government contracts, grants, loans, and other forms of financial assistance and leases -

MR. NEARY: What about former premiers?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - for commercial purposes, within one year after cessation of employment without the approval of Cabinet.

I make this announcement today to reiterate my administration's pledge to restore honesty and integrity to government. I view this issue as being of vital importance. Public perception of the conduct and performance of ministers and civil servants alike is an important issue and these steps are taken to conform with the commitment given a little over a month ago with the express purpose to be seen and recognized as adhering to highly ethical standards of behaviour.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, those are pious words just issued by the hon. the Premier. It seems that every time that one of his ministers gets in trouble that he comes in with a flowery statement telling the people of this Province all the things he is going to do. Now we will catch another minister tomorrow or the next day with his fingers in the cookie jar and then we will have another Ministerial Statement.

Mr. Speaker, there are some good points in the statement just read by the hon. gentleman, but the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman did not indicate, Mr. Speaker, the necessity for bringing in these regulations, by being forced to make this statement in the House. Is it because of all the skulduggery that has gone on in this Province in the last ten years? Will the regulations be retroactive, Mr. Speaker? Will all the information that is being used by a former Premier of this Province

MR. NEARY: former Premier of this Province and former ministers and former civil servants, will they come under these regulations? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) who motivated this statement just read by the Premier is not in his seat today, so I am going to find out now how honest the hon. Premier is and what kind of a government of integrity that he is going to run. When the hon. Premier spoke to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) about the hiring or the alleged hiring of a low-bed to bring up his cabin cruiser from Harbour Breton, what transpired? What took place between the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett)? Did the hon. Premier take the Minister of Transportation's word that he had paid for that work that was done by the Department of Transportation float and the pickup truck and all the officials that were involved? Did the hon. gentleman, when he discussed this with the Minister of Transportation, merely take his word that the bill had been paid?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, two things; the reason for the statement is that this government intends to keep its commitments that it made in the Throne Speech, which was long before there was any question or thought of any minister indicating any wrongdoing that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would like to. On page 1 of the Throne Speech on February 25th, number one item and priority of this government is an honest and official

PREMIER PECKFORD: political system . I quoted from page 13 and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the comments that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he talks about the motivation for this kind of statement and it was passed and deliberated in Cabinet for the last three or four weeks. That is number one, Mr. Speaker. Let us get that straight. Number two is the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) notices the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett). Yes, the Minister of Transportation is not in the House today, Mr. Speaker. We can all see that, I am sure. He is on the government's business. He is on his way to Labrador to attend a conference which he committed to attend three or four weeks ago. I think it is a development association meeting in Southern Labrador, in Marys Harbour, Labrador.

Mr. Speaker as it relates to the incident that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wants to raise again, let me say that I have spoken to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) on the matter, as I have indicated before, and the Minister of Transportation has paid for the services rendered to him at the time and that is where the matter rests. The Minister of Transportation has paid in full.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, he has paid in full. And I am persuaded to that point of view, and not only persuaded I know it to be a fact. And when the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) returns to the House no doubt he will then have the additional documentation which was not available to him because it was in the mails to his bank. So that is the situation on it, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: if the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) wants to keep referring to the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) about having his finger in the cookie jar or whatever, if he wants to try to somehow smear this administration or the Minister of Transportation, he can go right ahead, Mr. Speaker. This administration stands on its record, stands on the kinds of reforms that we are bringing in. The member for LaPoile can do all he likes. The people of Newfoundland will decide that in due course as they did before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have seen the sincerity and the honesty of this government in connection with the former Minister of Transportation, who is now the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), when he was condemned for breaking the Public Tendering Act in this Province by a unanimous recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee. We saw how the Premier dealt with that and now we see how the Premier is dealing with this latest one.

The information the Premier just gave the House is contrary to the facts. And I am going to ask the hon. gentleman a straight question and I expect to get a straight answer: When the hon. gentleman discussed this matter with his Minister of Transportation, did he ask for a bill and did he ask to see the receipt?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before

PREMIER PECKFORD: this matter became an issue in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the hon. gentleman to produce the evidence that the bill was paid two days before the matter was raised in this House, to produce the receipt. My understanding of the way the public service operates, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Newfoundland Exchequer Account is that the moment the bill is paid a receipt has to be issued. The Auditor General insists that the moment cash is received or a cheque is received or a money order is received, a receipt has to be issued immediately, and that if it cannot be issued that day, it has to be issued the first thing the next day. Now where is the receipt?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the member for LaPoile, you know, has some information, then let him present it outside this House or wherever, not use this House. Let him present it. When the Minister of Transportation returns to this House, he will produce the additional documentation that the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is looking for. He will produce the cheque and all the rest of it. There is nothing dishonest, there is nothing underhanded about this transaction at all. It is totally aboveboard, honest and straight. The member for LaPoile hates to hear it, Mr. Speaker, he hates to hear it but that is the truth of the matter and these are the facts. And that is where it stands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Incidentally, I might just comment on what the hon. gentleman said there about the House; this is where we get our information -

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - in this House, not outside the House. And if the hon. gentleman is not prepared to allow this matter to be scrutinized by the Opposition, scrutinized by the Justice Department or by the Public Accounts Committee then we can only assume there is some kind of a cover-up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: So I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if he will, as he did in the case of Devine Advertising and in the case of McConnell Advertising, will the hon. gentleman bring in a motion to have this matter referred to the Public Accounts Committee at as early a date as possible to have it scrutinized to see if in fact the House is getting the correct information and the people of this Province are getting the correct information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, all the information on this matter will be laid on the table of this House, have no doubt about that. The member for Lapoile need not think that this government or me as Premier is going to hide one iota of information, that it will all be put on the table of this House. And the next time the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) stands in his place, he will do just that. And it can be scrutinized by the member for LaPoile, it can be scrutinized by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), it can be scrutinized by the press, it can be scrutinized by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. This was a honest

PREMIER PECKFORD: and straight transaction; the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) got involved in moving his boat from Harbour Breton, he paid in full for the services that were rendered, and there is absolutely no wrongdoing. And when the Minister of Transportation returns he will produce that additional evidence, and whoever wants to scrutinize it can scrutinize it. But the fact of the matter is that right now the Minister of Transportation is not here, that the cheque that paid for this thing is on its way to the bank - I think it is in Clarenville, his bank in Clarenville - and when that is completed the minister will produce the documents to demonstrate that.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Premier does not understand the procedure of paying bills to the Newfoundland government. When a bill is paid, whether it is by cheque, by money order or by cash, a receipt is issued immediately. Where is the receipt, that is what we are saying. That is the key to the whole thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if you want to get specific about the receipt, the Minister of Transportation has the receipt.

MR. NEARY: He does not have a receipt.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He does so have the receipt.

MR. NEARY: He tabled all the documents and there is no receipt there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: He has the receipt and he will have the cheque when it is returned from the bank and then it will be tabled in this hon. House.



March 25, 1981

Tape No. 626

SD - 3

MR. L. THOMS:

And if he does not?

MR. NEARY:

And, Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He will.

MR. THOMS:

If he does not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He will.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member

for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

No doubt the hon. the Premier has seen the receipt because the hon. Premier took to the television, told the people of this Province the bill had been paid, told the House the bill had been paid. No doubt the hon. gentleman saw the receipt and, if he did, would he now tell the House if that receipt was dated on or before March 19th? Was it dated before March 19th or was it dated after March 19th? It is the receipt I am talking about; a cheque does not count because you can put whatever date you like on a cheque.

MR. S. NEARY: We are talking about the receipt.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) is not in his seat and when he is in his seat he will make a full statement and produce the rest of the documentation. And the only reason why it has not been produced is because the cheque is the mail to his bank and as soon as it comes in he will be producing that and the receipt and the whole matter then will be cleared up with the Minister of Transportation here in his hon. House.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the receipt the Premier is talking about - and we want to see that receipt - if that receipt is dated after March 19th., what will the Premier say about it then? Will he then say the bill was paid before March 19th.?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
That is a hypothetical question.  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. I want to answer it though,  
Mr. Speaker, if you do not mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let me just indicate to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that he can create and concoct what he likes in his own little, tidy, devious mind. I am telling the hon. member for LaPoile that when the Minister of Transportation returns to his seat he will explain in full and produce the documents contained therein that are relevant to this issue.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, we will be anxiously awaiting for the hon. minister.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. S. NEARY:

One final supplementary, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS:

I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Grand Bank

(Mr. Thoms) wishes to yield to the hon. member for LaPoile

(Mr. Neary).

MR. S. NEARY:

We have no choice now but to

wait for these documents and we will be waiting in wild

anticipation.

I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) about the statement he made in this House and the statement he made outside of this House that he tried to get some other company, he tried to get a private company to move this yacht before he used government facilities. Did the hon. gentleman cross-examine the Minister of Transportation on that? And if so, would the hon. the Premier tell us if it is a fact that when the Minister of Transportation made a statement that he could not get a flatbed to go down to Harbour Breton to bring up his yacht, that while this flatbed was gone from the Department of Transportation, the Department of Transportation in Grand Falls had to hire a flatbed themselves, because their's was gone to Harbour Breton to get the boat, to send a piece of equipment to Western Newfoundland? Now how could they get a flatbed to do that when the minister could not find a flatbed himself to go down to Harbour Breton?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I know nothing of

whether the Grand Falls district office of the Department of Transportation had to hire another flatbed at the time. Whether they had access to more names in the Grand Falls area where a flatbed was available than the Minister of Transportation, all I know is that the Minister of Transportation did contact two

PREMIER PECKFORD: companies in his area to get the flatbed in question and was unable to do it. And it was then after that he had -

MR. S. NEARY: We have information to the contrary.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Can I speak without being interrupted, Mr. Speaker? I do not interrupt the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he is asking the question.

MR. S. NEARY: Give us the names of (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Can I respond? May I have the same courtesy extended to me as I extend to you? Can I -

MR. S. NEARY: Do not try to cover up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

MR. S. NEARY: Sincerely and honestly, now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. member to restrain himself. He has asked the question and presumably he wants the answer. It is difficult to give when you are getting interruptions.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) tried valiantly to get private contractors at the time.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, whether he had access to information as to the number of companies and that there was a company somewhere in the Grand Falls area that had a flatbed that he did not know about, I do not know that. All I know is that the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) tried to get a flatbed from private contractors before he took the decision to ask and request the Department of Transportation to provide the necessary service. I know that to be true. I do not know that the - I did not know that the Grand Falls office had to hire another flatbed. Therefore why the Minister of Transportation never hired that same flatbed - obviously he does not have access to the names of people who have flatbeds all around Central and Eastern Newfoundland. But he did try in his own area to access a flatbed before going to the Department of Transportation.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, I would like to direct it to the hon. the Premier, there is certainly a great deal of uncertainty and doubt, and some people might even say suspicion, in connection with this whole situation. It may be completely honest, straightforward as the Premier has said. But in view of this, would the Premier not - you see, one of the problems with the tabling of documentation, particularly the kind of documentation that we have had tabled here, is that it is in longhand, it is from certain individuals in the Department of Transportation and Communications. But in view of the uncertainty and the doubt and

MR. THOMS: the type of documentation that is being presented, would the Premier not consider requesting the Public Accounts Committee to look into the matter? And I feel if they come up with a clean bill of health on this matter then I think it will be accepted by everybody.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I understand the suspicion and it is unfortunate too and some of the words are unfortunate. I do not think it is unfortunate that the Opposition raise the matter. I think that is legitimate and, you know, I am glad they did raise the issue - no problems there with that. But I think it is unfortunate, some of the words. I appreciate the tone in which the hon. member asked a question because I think he is sincere in his motivation and his intent. The problem here, you are dealing with an individual and his character and his career and all the rest of it, and I am speaking of the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett), and unfortunately it is sort of, in the last number of days, it has sort of gotten out of whack. I have spoken to the Minister of Transportation before he left to take off from St. John's this morning about it again because in the same way I suppose as a lot of members of this House, there are suspicions raised. And when you see reports in the paper, as there have been, quoting the word 'fake' and so on and alleging fake documents and so on, it does tend to hurt the reputation and character of the Minister of Transportation unnecessarily. And one of the thing you had going through this is that the cheque was in the mail and he felt helpless to be able to produce anything when he could not produce the cheque at the time when he produced the rest of the documents.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 628

EL - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So it is unfortunate. I think  
what we should do at this point in -

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) cheque.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think what we should do at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, is wait until the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) returns to the House. I have asked him to go through the whole thing in chapter and verse then for the House, and to produce the additional information; and at that time, after that is done, after the Minister of Transportation makes those statements and stands by those statements, to decide from there whether in fact additional enquiry is necessary. I think that would be the proper approach.

I think it is unfortunate that it has taken the kind of dimension it has taken, not in the sense the question should not have been asked but we have to be careful in asking the questions and giving the answers, because we are talking about a person and his character and his career and, therefore, I tread carefully on it. I have obviously sat down with the minister of Transportation and gone through it in great detail; to do otherwise would be shrinking my responsibilities and obligations as Premier of the Province responsible for these things and for the ministers who serve in the Cabinet.

So I think at this point in time it would be best to wait until the Minister of Transportation is back in the House, can make the full statement, with the other documentation, and then take it from there. But I do appreciate the hon. member's question and we must ensure that justice is not only done but is seen to be done.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are making a little bit of headway now, a little bit of progress. When the hon. the Premier discussed this matter with the Minister



MR. NEARY: of Transportation, did the hon. the Premier ask to see the documentation, to see the bills that were presented to the Minister of Transportation, and to see the receipts? Because these are the obvious questions to ask the minister. Because in the documentation that was laid on the table of the House that I referred to, and it was ruled out of order, as a fake document, all we have resembling a bill is an intradepartmental memorandum from a gentleman by the name of Barry, who we are told is the minister's executive assistant - from Barry to minister - and a list of the expenses involved. That is not a bill. Did the hon. gentleman ask to see the bill and see the receipt when he talked to the Minister of Transportation?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into specifics on that issue right now, I am going to wait until the Minister of Transportation comes back into the House and makes his full statement with the additional documentation before getting into the specifics of it. I am very, very sorry that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) still sees fit to use the word 'fake' in a way in which he tries to then have himself excused from the rules of the House that have already been adjudicated upon by the Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary -

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

MR. NEARY: - on this particular matter. I want to come back to the receipt again, Mr. Speaker, and I want to try to establish a fact, a point in this House, in this discussion that is taking place now. Will the hon. gentleman indicate to the House whether or not he has seen a receipt? If he has seen a receipt, was the receipt dated

MR. NEARY: after March 19th? And if he has not seen a receipt, if the receipt shows that it was issued from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account from the Public Treasury, from the Department of Finance after March 19th., will the Premier then undertake to have a thorough investigation into this matter? Because obviously

MR. NEARY: the bill was not paid before March 19th., and the minister had no intention of paying it.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, how can you respond to that kind of a question, 'and the minister had no intention of paying it'? And then to go on, innuendo and so on. I refuse to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, primarily because the way it was framed and the way it was asked which implies right from the start that there is wrongdoing and I do not intend to answer it. I really do not.

MR. NEARY: There is all the sincerity and integrity for you.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) a question related to the strike by workers at the College of Trades and Technology. And I wonder if the minister can indicate to members whether he has taken any steps recently or whether any steps have been taken by the union to resolve this long strike at the College of Trades and Technology?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, since the last time I spoke in this House I was in contact with people on both sides and the answer to the specific question as to whether there has been any change in negotiations, there has been no change in either side with respect to offers or changes in positions.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the question was not whether there were any changes; the question was specifically whether the minister has himself made any moves in an attempt to get both sides back to the bargaining table or whether the

MR. LUSH: union has made any moves to indicate their willingness to get back to the bargaining table.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first half of the question is yes. The answer to the second half of the question is no.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: I take it that the minister is indicating that he has made some moves. Has the minister received any correspondence from the officials of NAPE in recent days indicating their position in the whole matter?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may know that I went to Halifax for very important meetings on Sunday and Monday, arrived back in the Province yesterday afternoon at approximately two thirty, or two forty-five, proceeded to the House of Assembly, and was in my office this morning, received a brief from the Railway Labourers Union and never got to clear off my desk; so it may very well be that there is some communication on the desk but I have not received it or have not noticed it in my basket as of yet.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 631

AH-1

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago while the minister was away from the House I asked the President of the Treasury Board whether or not the union had indicated their wish to have a mediator to try and settle this strike. The President of Treasury Board indicated that he believed there was a request and he believed that it was rejected. Can the minister verify that? Can the minister indicate to the House whether or not NAPE did ask for a mediator? If so, and if they were rejected, why?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should listen to what goes on in the House. He asked me a question of that nature, I believe, a week ago with respect to a mediator - it was one of the points on a very famous petition. And the fact of the matter is that I did contact - or my officials, as I informed the hon. gentleman last week, my officials did contact the negotiators on behalf of NAPE and they talked about at that time, I believe, as to whether they would accept a mediator's report and return to work, and the answer to the question and to the negotiations and to the conversations by the negotiators at that time was no and the issue was not proceeded with further.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker a supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the minister, he is willing to look into this

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 631

AH-2

MR. LUSH: procedure, that he is willing to use this process of the collective bargaining unit or the collective bargaining process, I should say, of having a mediator? It looks like by the answer he gave that the union rejected that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have different information but I will not pursue that at the moment. My supplementary to the minister is, has the minister looked into the cost of both strikes - that is the one at the Workers' Compensation board and the one at the College of Trades and Technology - in terms of what it is costing the government now to pay extra wages to the employees that are working overtime and paying the cost of transportation, because I understand that there are transportation arrangements by driving these strike breakers to and from work. Has the minister looked into that cost and is he willing to table the details of that cost here in the House of Assembly?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, just to respond to the hon. member's preamble, the minister has neither rejected nor accepted requests for mediation. I informed the hon. member and this House last week what the procedure was. There is not provision in the legislation, the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, for mediation; mediation would have to be accepted or rejected by both sides at the bargaining table. It is not up to me. I am a conciliator in this process, I sit basically in the middle of the table, and if there are changes of positions from either side and they are not provided for in the legislation, then Treasury Board and/or NAPE has to agree to a different process, one that is not in the Collective Bargaining Act right now. So, that is the answer to his preamble and the answer to his question was no.

MR. LUSH: A supplement Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated a final supplementary, assuming other members wanted to ask questions. But seeing none rising, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is indicating what I thought all along, that he is doing nothing. Well, Mr. Speaker, he mentions that there is no provision for a mediator within the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. Well, I ask the minister how come that this measure was employed with a strike by the Waterford workers a couple of years ago and then come under the same Collective Bargaining Act? At that time a mediator was brought in from the mainland and now the minister is saying that it cannot be done. So, will the minister answer why it was done in that particular case and why it cannot be done in this particular case? It is his

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 632

RA - 2

MR. T. LUSH: responsibility to look into it.

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his preamble indicated that the minister was doing nothing. I can assure him that if he checked with either side - the negotiating committee for the College of Trades and Technology, the Workers Compensation or Treasury Board-I think he will get confirmation that the minister has done everything within his power. As to his question as to why a mediator was brought in in the case of the Waterford Hospital a year or two ago, I was not minister at the time.

MR. LUSH: No. (Inaudible).

MR. J. DINN: The minister at the time did not make that decision, it was a decision made by both sides to the collective bargaining process.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware that the minister cannot make the recommendation, but certainly it is the minister's responsibility to try and bring both sides together and make that kind of suggestion. Has the minister ever done that? Has the minister ever met with both sides to try and make this suggestion that they settle this strike through mediation?



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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated last week, I indicated just previously in the Question Period, what I have done as Minister of Labour and Manpower to resolve this dispute. I will continue my efforts, and, Mr. Speaker, I do not think - and I can assure the hon. member that there is nothing within the power of the Minister of Labour and Manpower that I have not done to conclude negotiations to get this strike ended. It is just at a stalemate now.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, if what the minister is saying, that there is nothing in his power he has not done, well, obviously, what he is saying is that if he were the minister during the time of the Waterford strike that it would never have been settled. So I am asking the minister to exercise the same powers that were exercised by the Minister of Manpower at that time, when we had this strike at the Waterford Hospital, and why cannot he do it?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is inaccurate in his preamble again, totally inaccurate. I indicated to the hon. member last week, previously today in Question Period, with respect to the mediation in the case of the Waterford Hospital it was a matter at that time of agreement of both sides of the table. Right now we do not have agreement of both sides of the table to anything, we are at a stalemate, and I have done everything within my power to get resolution to this situation.

MR. DINN: I have not been able to, I have not been successful, but I will continue to try, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, quite obviously, if the minister has done everything in his power, then he is certainly suggesting that the union have not done their part. So, Mr. Speaker, again it seems to me that - my information is that the union have asked for a mediator. Can the minister confirm that? Has the union asked for a mediator?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. member check Hansard. I gave an answer to that question a week ago. I gave an answer to that question not too long ago and, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the hon. member, with respect to mediation, that my officials were in touch with the negotiating committee for NAPE and that they were and that they were talking about conditions of mediation at the time. The conditions for mediation at the time were turned down by NAPE and as such the proposal for mediation was not proceeded with further.

MR. LUSH: On whose part?  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand what the minister is saying, I really do not. Who rejected the mediation offer? Who rejected it? Did

MR. LUSH: the union reject this?  
Can the minister be very specific? Did the union reject this step in the collective bargaining process? Is that what the minister is saying, that the union rejected the services of a mediator? Is that what he is saying? Please be precise.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot help it if the hon. member does not understand the collective bargaining process. You know, I think it is unfortunate that he as shadow to the Minister of Labour and Manpower would get up in this House and say that he does not understand it. I will try to explain it to the hon. gentleman sometime, if I have lots of time. It is quite an involved process. It is all in the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act. I indicated to the hon. member there is no provision for mediation, there is no power within the minister to provide mediation, that it requires both sides to the collective bargaining process -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - to agree to mediation, and, Mr. Speaker, in this instance there has been no agreement on both sides to mediation in this case.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question number 18 on the Order Paper of March 4th., by the hon. the member for LaPoile, I believe.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Mr. Speaker (Simms): This being Private Members' Day, we are debating private member's motion number two. Debate on the amendment last day was adjourned by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), who has about three minutes remaining, I believe.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 634

SD - 1

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

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

I think it is pretty obvious now that I had forgotten that I adjourned the debate on this. We are discussing the resolution, are we not?

MR. WARREN: Yes, coastal Labrador.

MR. THOMS: In connection with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. member will permit, I might give him an opportunity to collect his thoughts and introduce a group in the gallery, if you would like.

On behalf of all hon. members, I would like to welcome to the gallery today seventeen to twenty girls from the First Marine Drive Pathfinders of the First Marine Drive Guides who are visiting the House of Assembly along with Mrs. Mary Brown, and they are from the district of St. John's East Extern. We hope they enjoy their afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I will still allow the hon. member about three minutes.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.  
The resolution that we are debating, and presumably will continue to debate this afternoon and vote on this afternoon, is that, 'This hon. House urge the federal government to live up to its responsibilities and sign the agreement - the Coastal Labrador agreement - at the first opportunity'. However, Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) introduced an amendment to this resolution whereby he is urging not only -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. THOMS: - the man is completely fair.  
There is one thing you can say about my friend from Torngat

MR. THOMS: Mountains (Mr. Warren), he is completely fair. I would not have done it, I would have been more political, Mr. Speaker, I would have taken out the federal government and inserted the provincial government but, Mr. Speaker, not the member for Torngat Mountains. What he wants is the amendment to read: 'That this House urge the federal government and the provincial government'. And, Mr. Speaker, therein lies the rub: Has the provincial government done everything that it has to do to bring the agreement to fruition? I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, and I am not trying to exonerate the federal government completely, but I would suspect that this particular agreement has not been signed, even though it is a very generous agreement, it is a 90/10 - we cannot go back and look at it and talk about 50/50 or 75/25 - as I understand it, it is a 90/10 agreement and I have no difficulty whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in supporting and giving all due regard to the fact that my hon. friend from Torngat Mountains has seen fit to leave in the federal government in the amendment so that it will read: 'The federal and the provincial governments', get off their rear ends, get off their behinds, get off their butts and get the agreement signed for the benefit and for the good of all the people on the Labrador Coast.

I have a

MR. THOMS: certain affinity with the people of Labrador. I worked in Labrador, I worked there for four Summers. I know what it is like, I know the frustrations, I have been to the Coast of Labrador. I have talked with the people on the Coast of Labrador and I know the frustrations they go through and I do not think there is anybody in this House who would not want but see that this agreement is signed as quickly as possible so that these people can get the benefits of it. And I see no reason why the amendment that was introduced and moved by the member for Torngat Mountains (G. Warren) cannot be supported by members on both sides of this hon. House.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this perhaps is one of the most important Private Member's resolutions to come before this House this whole session, and I do not want to let this opportunity pass without saying a few words about the resolution and the amendment that has been put last week by one of the members of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is clear. It comes from the member for Menihek (P. Walsh), who is very concerned about a particular issue in his own district in Western Labrador and that has to do with the Trans-Labrador Highway, but being a member from Labrador, who is concerned about all aspects of development in Labrador, this resolution, as put by the member for Menihek, talks about: 'WHEREAS the people of Labrador should enjoy the same standard of service as the island residents of the Province; and WHEREAS better transportation and community services are

PREMIER PECKFORD: necessary for the development of a vibrant Labrador society'and, Mr. Speaker, here is the operative part of the resolution and the one that obviously the members of the Opposition have somehow ignored,'and WHEREAS the government of the Province has a proposal before the Federal Government on a coastal Labrador DREE agreement,' a proposal already before them, Mr. Speaker, and only - and has a proposal before them only after the widest public debate on coastal Labrador before that proposal was put. It took, Mr. Speaker, two or three years to prepare that proposal to ensure that the Northern coast of Labrador, that the Central coast around Cartwright and in the Northwest River area and then the Southern part and the Straits of Labrador all had an opportunity through public hearings, sponsored, I think at the time by the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and involving the development associations in the area, involving the Labrador Inuit Association and involving the Nas-kaupi Montagnais Indian Association and all the rest of them, that this proposal was finalized by the government, by the Provincial Government and then put forward as a normal, regular DREE agreement to the Federal Government.

And the other operative part of the resolution 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.' The amendment talks about urges the Federal Government and the Provincial Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that would be an excellent



PREMIER PECKFORD: excellent amendment if in fact the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador had not done its homework, had not prepared a proposal on Coastal Labrador affairs for the federal government, had not prepared a proposal on the Trans-Labrador Highway and had not submitted those proposals to the federal government. But as it stands

now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A point of order.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a lonely

life but I do not believe we do have a quorum in the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is only one on the opposite

side of the House, Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded, and now there is none.

MR. THOMS:

There is none.

MR. SPEAKER:

There has been a quorum call.

We do have a quorum.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you know it is

unfortunate that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) would take this opportunity to call a quorum when he knew in his own mind that there were enough members in the confines of the Chamber to constitute a quorum and more particularly since a number of members of the Opposition were having meetings with Ministers of the Crown. On the one hand they want to have a meeting and get the ear of a minister on some particular problem they have out in their constituency, meanwhile a colleague from the same side of the House then would call a quorum. So the Opposition want it both ways, they want both to be able to call a quorum whenever they like to try to embarrass the government, and then secondly they want the ministry to talk to them about problems they have in their constituency at the time when the quorum is called. So, I mean, how can you operate a House of Assembly when that kind of operation is going on?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, what I was saying was that, number one, that this is a very, very important resolution because it is dealing with a large area of our Province which is very important to us for many, many reasons that we all know about. And secondly, that the amendment to the resolution that was put by the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) is really an irrelevant amendment and one that is not germane to the whole situation as we find it now today. If, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador had not prepared a proposal on Coastal Labrador, if the provincial government had not prepared a proposal on the Trans-Labrador Highway, then of course that amendment urging the provincial government as well as the federal government to get on with the job of developing Labrador, they would have a case, they would have a very strong case. But such is not the facts, Mr. Speaker, such is not the facts.

Now in Ottawa, in Moncton, at the DREE office here in St. John's, throughout the whole federal system, bureaucratic system of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, there exists two proposals and have existed for a long while, two proposals, one dealing with the Coastal Labrador agreement that has been prepared by the Province in consultation with the people of Coastal Labrador, and, secondly, there exists an agreement dealing with the first phase of the Trans-Labrador Highway, or a road from Labrador City to Churchill Falls. Those proposals are on the table in Ottawa, in Moncton, at the DREE office here in St. John's, and have been negotiated besides - especially the Coastal Labrador Agreement - has been negotiated and ready for signing, and we have been ready for some time to do that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now on the Trans-Labrador Highway agreement, Mr. Speaker, on the secondary roads agreement, a component of which is the Trans-Labrador Highway, we have just barely started. We submitted it last year and the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, especially at the ministerial level and just below, have not even seen yet what has been negotiated because the DREE people have not been eager -

MR. NEARY: I will phone Ottawa and find out.

PREMIER PECKFORD: -have not been eager to sit down and negotiate a roads agreement of this sort, have not been eager at all to do it. As a matter of fact, we are in a bit, Mr. Speaker, and we will be making fairly definitive statements on this in the next week or two on the whole question of DREE's road because there seems to be in Ottawa today a difference of opinion as to whether in fact the federal government should continue to participate in regional economic expansion

PREMIER PECKFORD: as is now practiced by that department. And I would strongly, and I have strongly urged the Minister of DREE as late as last Thursday to argue strongly in his Cabinet for the continuation of DREE. The problem is not DREE today, the problem is the amount of money that has been put into DREE to get on with signing these agreements, and it is not only true in Newfoundland it is true all across the nation. It is accentuated in Newfoundland, it would seem, in recent times because how can one not be somewhat skeptical when you get one hundred million dollars eighty/twenty for the steel industry of Cape Breton Island at the same time as that same government has turned down funds for the syncrolift and has not signed the Coastal Labrador agreement, nor has seriously sat down to negotiate the Trans-Labrador Highway or the first phase of the Trans-Labrador Highway, recognizing that it is going to take quite a few years to finish the project? At least we could start the first phase now and over ten or fifteen years have a decent highway in Labrador called the Trans Labrador Highway linking up all the major centres. So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment, we cannot accept the amendment because we have done our homework on the particular items mentioned, the Coastal Labrador agreement and on the Trans-Labrador Highway, so therefore the onus is on the Canadian federal government to sign these agreements, immediately sign the Coastal Labrador and to seriously negotiate now on the secondary roads agreement that has not even been started. So we want to get on Mr. Speaker and to get these things started. Now the other thing is it comes down to a question of the sharing of the wealth of the nation, and we say, and we think we have genuine reasons for doing so, that given the finances of this Province,

PREMIER PECKFORD: especially on major projects, the best that we can do is ten per cent if you are talking about a fifty or sixty million dollar project, like, for example, you are talking on the Coastal Labrador road. We just do not have the finances to do it, because, Mr. Speaker, we have to turn around and then assist with the Ministry of Transport in finishing the revitalization of the Trans-Canada Highway. We have to sign that and try to get a good deal as we can - and undoubtedly it would be ten or fifteen per cent or whatever. We went into the first phrase of it fifty/fifty and it almost broke us. There is no question about it, the amount of funds that we had to put up on that was just stupendous, it was fantastic. Now if the Trans-Canada Highway and the other highways in Newfoundland were equal in standard to what they are all across Canada, then you would have to drop your - you would have to increase your percentage as a Province's share of additional funds. But our problem is, Mr. Speaker, that we are always in a catch-up kind of situation and we are still in the developing stage of our economy, the developing stage of our services, and obviously when you get into other areas of the nation where there is already a well developed, for example, road system, then you cannot expect the federal government to keep financing ninety/ten, but you can, and the federal government does in most areas, in all areas of Canada that are in a like position like Newfoundland. And one of the arguments that we put forward, Mr. Speaker, on the Coastal Labrador road as related to ninety/ten is that the Northlands Agreement in Manitoba, and some of the places even in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, the have provinces, that they have financed it ninety/ten and eighty/twenty, hundreds of millions of dollars at ninety/ten.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 637

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we would suggest and have suggested to the federal government, what is the difference in Labrador and Northern Manitoba or Northern Saskatchewan, that it is a like situation and given that we are in a developing stage there that this kind of infusion of Canadian dollars must be put in on the front end and after you have established a transportation system which is relatively equal to that of other areas, then you can increase your share of rebuilding it or whatever along with the other areas of the country which are doing likewise.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So we have been very strong on those points.

But even if that was not so, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is at this point in our history we are not in a position to finance additional projects.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know it is not the Premier's intention to deliberately mislead this House, but the hon. gentleman in a statement he made, if I interpreted his statement as correct a few moments ago about the Trans-Labrador Highway, an agreement waiting to be signed, I just talked to the DREE officials on the phone and I can tell the House that there is no agreement. It is merely a proposal at this particular point in time. It is on the wish list -

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

I believe I have heard enough of what the hon. member is trying to say. It is obviously not a point of order, it is a difference of opinion. The hon. member is offering information, that is not a point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is terrible, I mean, this is just a complete flaunting of the rules of the House. I mean, how can this institution continue to be a reputable one with such things like that?

MR. S. NEARY: Now that is what (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is we have a roads agreement before the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which I will have the copies of just momentarily here before me to show it, to prove it -

MR. S. NEARY: Okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Coastal Labrador Renewable Resource  
Development proposal-right here.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) phonecall.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just one second now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just let the hon. member for  
LaPoile (Mr. Neary) keep his mouth shut while somebody else  
has the floor here and is allowed to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just one second now, just keep  
quiet!

Here is all the documentation on this.

I have all the agreements here -

MR. S. NEARY: Where is the agreement?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, could you have  
the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Here is the justification reports-  
DREE, Cost Sharing Highway Projects, February, 1980. This was  
some of the justifications that went up from time -

MR. S. NEARY: Where is the agreement?

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is no agreement because the  
federal government will not sign it. It is a proposal to the  
federal government, it is an agreement to be signed. You cannot  
have an agreement until two sides sign it.

MR. NEARY: Caught again!

MR. G. FLIGHT: It is a proposed agreement.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A proposed agreement, exactly.

We have an agreement ready to sign, if you want to call it that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. S. NEARY: It is only a proposal yet.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, that is because the federal government, Mr. Speaker, has not been willing to sit down and talk about it to us. It is up there, it is ready for signing. This is my whole point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) had better tell the truth for a change.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, you know, he is interrupting in the debate, first of all, and that is fine, but he just shouted across the House, 'The hon. gentleman better start telling the truth for a change'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely and completely out of order and calls for an immediate, unqualified retraction by the hon. member.

MR. S. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: If I offended the hon. gentleman - I do not think it is unparliamentary-but I withdraw it anyway if it offended the hon. gentleman.

MR. W. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Speaker! No, Mr. Speaker!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that is not a good and sufficient retraction. It is not a retraction, Mr. Speaker, or whether he offended the hon. member. What the hon. member has done is he is offending the privileges of this House of Assembly. This is a House of Assembly, Mr.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Speaker, which is based on civilized practices and we are trying to maintain them despite the attitude and the continued types of interruptions by the hon. member.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made a statement which is not - and he has retracted but he has not retracted, Mr. Speaker, 'if he offends the hon. gentleman.' Mr. Speaker, I cannot find - whether I find the hon. gentleman offensive one way or the other inside or outside the House is - I will not even comment on it, that is not the point. The point, Mr. Speaker, is that he has offended this House by making statements like that and he should be made to retract without any qualification whatsoever. There are procedures if he does not.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is turning the House into a complete shambles. I withdrew, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not interested in the hon. gentleman. I am interested in the statement the Premier made and that is what I want to get at, the truth of the matter.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 639

SD - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You are not speaking to the point of order.

MR. NEARY: So I am raising another point of order (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have to rule on the first one first.

The first one is that there were unparliamentary terms thrown across the House. My understanding is that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has withdrawn it, as I would have directed him to do so, but he did it before I directed him to do so. Is that a correct understanding?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the information that was given the House a few moments ago by the Premier are contrary to the facts. The hon. gentleman made a statement, and Hansard will confirm this, Mr. Speaker, that there is a proposed agreement down in the DREE office on a Trans-Labrador Highway. And after checking a few moments ago, I am told there is no proposed agreement, it is merely a proposal, it is on a list, there have been no negotiations for an agreement -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That is exactly the same point of order that I ruled on a moment ago. The hon. member is providing information. It is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion with respect to the facts. So I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to get on with it before my time is gone because obviously the Opposition does not want to hear the truth, they want it delayed by points of order so that I do not have an opportunity to tell the truth and

PREMIER PECKFORD: the facts of the matter as it relates to here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is a secondary roads proposal, agreement, whatever you want to call it, before the federal government that we wished to sign yesterday. And the part on the Trans-Labrador Highway is here, there is the map of part of the Trans-Labrador Highway, and here is the justification report, the setting, 'The resources of Labrador contribute greatly to the provincial economy and offer immense potential for the future. In recognition of this, the government of Newfoundland and Labrador has adopted policies to improve the quality of life in Labrador and to facilitate further resource development'.

MR. NEARY: That is a philosophy.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, what they -

MR. NEARY: That is a philosophy.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is very difficult in debate to have members shouting across the floor to one another. We will never get any debate carried on in the House if that continues. I must ask the hon. member to my right to restrain himself and allow the hon. the Premier to finish.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And then we go on, Mr. Speaker, with the justification report of the populations, of what is happening in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the sad situation that has been caused there, and we talk about Labrador City and Wabush, and we talk about the absolute necessity of this proposal being signed now. Then we get into the existing transportation system, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the population centres and the amount of mileage and what has to be done there.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And then we get into the overview of the impacts, the construction impact, and talk about the construction of the road 'would mean an injection of \$38 million into the Labrador economy over a five year period. Our proposal is a five year agreement to begin the road from Labrador City to Churchill Falls and this will be a substantial boost not only to a depressed area' - and then we get into the social costs and impacts of it and what this highway will mean. And this is the back-up justification report for it that has been presented to DREE in a booklet which contains justification reports for the other parts of it, Mr. Speaker. Then I wrote the hon. the minister on May 23rd, 1980, Mr. Speaker, that is almost a year ago, 'Dear Mr. De Bane: As you are no doubt aware the Province of Newfoundland, since Confederation with Canada, has placed a great deal of emphasis on bringing the level of public services up to the standards which have been enjoyed by other Canadians'. And we go through the whole business, 'Since this has been a very major undertaking', on we go, 'in assisting the Province in achieving these goals in the transportation sector, DREE in the Province', this is May 1980, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of DREE, 'since 1970 have entered into a series of agreements which have provided large sums of money to construct or re-construct a major secondary highroads agreement'. And this went with the full package. 'The latest such agreement which has been amended on several occasions to provide additional funding and to increase the scope of work was signed in 1976. We are presently entering the final year of that agreement.

'I feel it is safe to say that the various DREE Newfoundland highway agreements have had a tremendous impact upon the development of our resources. As I indicated to you previously, the upgrading of our secondary highroad system - '. And then we get down and I ended off by going over the agreements and then we have

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 639

SD - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: the agreements here to be signed,  
proposed new DREE highways programme agreement.

So the whole agreement has been

PREMIER PECKFORD:

before the Federal Government. That is why we say on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, number one, Labrador is a very important component in not only the transportation but the economic system of this Province, therefore we went about preparing proposals for agreements between the federal and Newfoundland governments. Our proposals are done and they have been submitted to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for over a year now. The coastal Labrador one has been there two or three years. We are ready to sign yesterday. We will sign today. We will put the TV lights on today if the Federal Government will now sit down and seriously sign these agreements.

MR. NEARY: (inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have our share of the money.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The member for LaPoile does not like to hear it, Mr. Speaker. We have our share of the money and the agreement has been in Ottawa and has been there now for over a year, some for two years, and it was only too bad -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is not the Minister of DREE, because I am sure he would sign them with us.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised, The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. the Premier is misleading the House, whether he is doing it deliberately or out of ignorance I am not sure, but I am told, Mr. Speaker, by DREE and by Ottawa that there is no

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 640

EL - 2

MR. NEARY: agreement. I am asking the Premier if he is calling it an agreement to produce the agreement and put it on the table of the House or stop misleading the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, I do not think there is a point of order at all. I think it is just a difference of opinion between two hon. members, as the hon. Speaker has ruled before.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the reference is the same as I have given before earlier that it is a difference of opinion. In the meantime, I must ask the hon. member if he would withdraw the remark, 'misleading the House'. I have ruled on several occasions that I find that to be unparliamentary and it is not necessary to be used.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to advise the hon. the Premier now that his time is expired unless there is leave.

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No leave.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I am very pleased that the Premier is in his chair at the moment because he is being very quick



March 25, 1981

Tape No. 640

EL - 3

MR. HISCOCK: when we ask questions to come and produce paper and produce information. I just got a phone call-that is the reason why I have been going back and forth - and people on the Coast of Labrador, the Provincial Manpower is now having interviews down in Goose Bay with regards to the oil, to service oil ships this Summer, in Goose Bay. And they are having their interviews down there. They never contacted the Canada Manpower down there until they got down there, number one.

Number two, there are people actually out on the coast, Mr. Premier, who want to apply for these jobs, cannot apply for these jobs because they are in Goose Bay and, number two now is here we have people on the coast wanting to get in for these interviews and cannot get in and these jobs now are only going to be taken by people in the Goose Bay area.

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is concerned about Labrador and the coast, I would go as far as to say that the Premier should get on to his Manpower Minister and the officials down there and make sure. I was just talking with one of the officials down there, 'We have not got time. We have not got time to go out to the coast' - three or four months in advance - 'We do not have time'. And the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) there, just has a smirky smile on his face. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister of Labour and Manpower does not even know what is going on in his department. And I am extremely upset by this because this is the second time this has happened, that we have had jobs on the offshore rigs, or the supply boats, and provincial Manpower officials went down, never contacted the federal people so that the federal people could pay the provincial people down in the district and get them into Goose Bay so they can have an opportunity! We are sick and tired of that side asking everything from Ottawa, Ottawa!

I would support this resolution 200 per cent to get the coastal Labrador agreement in my district, the Strait road and the Trans-Labrador Highway. I do not care if it done by the federal government, which it will have to be done by in the end. But was it not the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when was Minister of Transportation who went down and went with the bulldozer to Freedom Road? Did we not have a Liberal Government down in Labrador and ended up getting the road from Goose Bay to Labrador City? And we had, believe it or not, we had a scrap truck come from Sept-Iles last year and come all the way up into Goose Bay and take a load of scrap and bring it out to Sept-Iles. The road is there, the base is there. And I would even go as far as to say again, without being partisan, if we

MR. HISCOCK: would have turned around since we went into Labrador in an industrial way and spent \$10 million each year in the past thirty years, the road would have been done. No help from Ottawa, but we would have done it and we would not have the alienation that we have down in Labrador now.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to ask Ottawa to go ninety/ten on this and turn around and claim that they have it as Canadians, their rightful right as Canadians, because Northern Manitoba, or Northern Saskatchewan, or Northern Alberta gets it. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. Either Labrador is part of this Province or it is not.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And if we as a Province are not prepared to spend ninety per cent of our own dollars on this instead of taking it out, whether it is right or wrong, this is how the people perceive it. And we are not going to get rid of that alienation by asking Ottawa to turn around and do everything. There is a moral responsibility here, Mr. Speaker, and that moral responsibility lies with this government. If there was a Liberal Government on that side it

MR. HISCOCK:

would be a moral responsibility on the Liberal Government to make sure that we carry out our responsibility.

We have seen time and time again houses built in Newfoundland from the money they made off the Churchill Falls, from the money they made off Wabush, and when the Americans were there. Lots of wealthy contractors are after making their money off Labrador.

So, Mr. Speaker, do not get on with this foolishness in this House when we suggest that Ottawa has to do everything.

Five years ago, since Mr. Trudeau has been in power in Ottawa, I was looking through the figures and finding out how much money actually was spent in the district of Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, \$37 million, whereas the other districts like St. John's had \$160 million and another one - it kept going on and on. I would go as far as, Mr. Speaker, that there is more money being spent down on the Labrador, in the Labrador district and in the district of Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador since Mr. Rompkey has been in the Cabinet than in all the twelve years. And it is not saying anything was not done in the past but particularly Ottawa, Ottawa is doing its share.

This Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement that is being done is a ninety/ten, \$47 million ninety/ten; agreed we are having problems and I would not be the last one to turn around and say we are not having problems, we are. But, Mr. Speaker, it is too easy for us to turn around and blame it in a politically partisan way. I want it signed and I would love to have it signed now. The people in my district are totally fed up from the point of view that they want to go with Quebec. But the crux of the matter comes, Mr. Speaker, if Ottawa signs that agreement, signs

MR. HISCOCK: the ninety/ten on the Trans-Labrador Highway, would that mean that this provincial government would take other money and build a library in Wabush, do the Arts and Culture Centre in Goose Bay?

I had a road done in my district last year, \$100,000 in Charlottetown. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) said, "That is it, \$100,000." We had to get the Minister of Rural Development to get some extra money so we could connect up the dump. We had to get extra money so we could connect up the two schools. We had to get extra money to connect up the clinic. \$100,000, and here we turn around and ask Ottawa to do the Trans-Labrador Highway.

I would go so far as to say if we had a government that had less confrontation we would turn around and end up getting a ninety/ten, as the government here did get on the Trans-Canada Highway. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) probably may disagree with that and I would expect him to.

MR. NEARY: You have to negotiate first.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, it has yet to be proved. Like that road in Charlottetown, this

MR. HISCOCK:

Winter when we had a washout because of mild weather, what happened to the person down in Charlottetown? His house was flooded, two feet of water, still a solid block of ice. And here we have a provincial government who wants Ottawa to do everything. Mr. Speaker, the root of the problem of this resolution is not asking Ottawa to do it or not asking our own provincial government to do it, but it is the way Labrador is generally being treated and, whether we like it or not and whether the media likes it or not the Labrador people feel, and I think rightly so, that they are not being treated equally. I had a person visit with me today with regard to getting a phone installed in Ship Harbour. This day and age we still have communities that go out there and fish and still do not have any contact with the outside world, Fair Harbour and Sandy Hook and other places. We still have place down there that do not even have a road. Cartwright does not even have a road, does not even have a road, and the community has probably a population of seventy or eighty people. Are we expecting Ottawa to do that road? Are we going to expect Ottawa to do the road in Paradise River?

MR. HANCOCK: If they do not it will never get done.

MR. HISCOCK: There is a road from Mary's Harbour to Lodge Bay and if I am correct, I believe, any of the agreements that we have with Ottawa is done on the basis we will look after major trunk roads and you, the provincial government, look after by-roads. Is that not the reason why your district is not being looked after, because it is not a trunk road?

MR. HANCOCK: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: I asked the question, how come this six miles in my district, which is in Labrador, that the provincial government wants the federal government to do that six miles? I would even go as far as to say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to separatism or the feeling of going with Quebec - and I said it and I will say this again - if there was any feeling in Labrador the way this government is going I think Labrador would be better off if it had territorial status. Because this government wants Ottawa to do everything in Labrador. Number one, the Lower Churchill, Ottawa built it. The Trans-Labrador highway, Ottawa built it. The airstrips, Ottawa built them. If Ottawa is going to do all these things down in Labrador and we are only going to give 10 per cent, why go through a middle man, why go through a broker? And that is why, Mr. Speaker, and the sincerity of my convictions are saying it is not important enough, Mr. Speaker, or the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), it is not important enough to go and do the money from the federal government. The crux of the problem

MR. HISCOCK: is that we have to integrate, make Labrador feel an equal part of this Province and we do that, Mr. Speaker, by keeping the craft centre open down in Goose Bay, by turning around and building more airstrips, by looking at the schools. The Minister of Education (L.Verge) went and toured the schools in Labrador, and particularly in my district. She came back and she said they were sub-standard. Now, that is not Ottawa. But what is our government doing about the sub-standard schools. I ask her? 'Oh, that is the responsibility of DEC; we gave them \$12 million last year and we gave them \$12 million this year.' That is not doing anything for the sub-standard schools.

We have communities down there Norman Bay and Pinsent's Arm, that should have another teacher but because there are no accommodations there for them, what is happening? Those teachers are in St. Anthony teaching. So here we want Ottawa to build a road and Ottawa to do this and the Provincial Government will not even face their responsibility.

So, Ottawa, when I had meetings with the DREE minister and I talked about the school in Williams Harbour and schools on the Labrador coast and tried to get it put back into DREE and tried to get Ottawa to do the schools because our government is not going to do it, the minister of DREE said to me, 'We will do the Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement on a ninety-ten and obviously if we are going to do it on a ninety-ten, what is going to happen is that the Province will have more money to go and do the schools.'

So, I am asking the President of the Privy Council (W.Marshall) and the Premier if Ottawa does do the Trans-Labrador Highway and we are doing the ninety-ten which is for \$47 million, and a native agreement which is



MR. HISCOCK: for \$40 million and an expansion to the airport and industrial park in Goose Bay. The bridge across Goose Bay in the Northwest River area, which was supposed to cost \$2.5 million is up to something now like \$6 or \$7 or \$8 million. That is what the Public Accounts Committee should look at and find out why that cost of the bridge jumped up that much.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I could be assured and the Federal Government could be assured by taking this money and putting extra money in that the Province would turn around and do its responsibilities and its legal obligations in Labrador, then fine. But when you look at this and condemn Ottawa for not signing it, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is good enough to turn around and condemn. I do not think we are going to get ahead in this Province by being political and asking Ottawa one minute, condemning them because they are not doing this, and then turning around and saying 'Will you give us \$300 million for this and give us this.'

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), for example, with the Minister of Transport for Ottawa, Jean-Luc Pepin, yesterday, \$50 million was given for the railway. Did he thank him? Did he say anything about thanking him for the \$50 million? Not that you had to go on your hands and knees or anything, but did he give a genuine courteous thank-you? No!

MR. HISCOCK: He turned around and said, well it was almost useless. He said, we did not get anything for the Trans-Canada Highway. Why did we not get anything for the Trans-Canada Highway? The Minister of Transport in Ottawa, Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin, turned around and said, Ottawa will be making an initial grant to this Province, it will be almost \$300 million, and it is up to this Province to decide how that \$300 million is going to be spent.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: Did the Minister for Transportation (Mr. Brett) here tell him that? No. We never got the 90-10, or we never got this.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact, the Minister for Transportation could not even tell the minister from Ottawa what the government's priorities are here.

MR. HISCOCK: And, Mr. Speaker, with regard to priorities in this government, we have this five year plan and now we are going to have - how many million dollars did he say in the five years they were going to get, \$37 million or \$56 million? \$37 million, I think I heard, - \$37 million that we are actually going to be putting into Labrador now - after Labrador putting how many into the Treasury of the provincial government? And we are clapping now -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: With the 90-10, with the Trans-Labrador Highway, if they -

MR. NEARY: There is no agreement for the Trans-Labrador Highway.

MR. HISCOCK: That is their imagination, if there was, they said.

MR. NEARY: I just checked with DREE, there is no agreement.

MR. HISCOCK: Of course there is no agreement because again our provincial government always go with the fact that if you want anything done say Ottawa will do it, and DREE will do it, and automatically it causes the provincial government to say it should be done and then there is an agreement.

MR. NEARY: They are calling a wish list an agreement.

MR. HISCOCK: Well again, as we were saying, a wish list or whatever.

But, Mr. Speaker, my main concern is here, and I really believe this to the bottom of my emotion, that Labrador has to be addressed and the problems of Labrador, and Mr. Burgess of Labrador West said it, and the Labrador South member, Mr. Martin, said it.

MR. NEARY: Before them Charlie Devine said it.

MR. HISCOCK: And Mr. Devine said it, and before and before and before, and I suppose it will be continued.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) got up and stated that Labrador should be doing this, I would ask the member for Menihek when they do do this will that mean that will free money and Labrador City will have its library? Will that mean that I can expect schools down in my district? Will that mean I can expect better communication down there? Will that mean I can get a health clinic in Black Tickle? Will that mean that I can get another clinic in Fox Harbour? So, Mr. Speaker, I think these are the questions that have to come back. And the other one that I am extremely upset with, here we have the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), and I hope if there is anyone from the press listening

March 25, 1981

Tape 645

PK - 3

MR. HISCOCK: they should pay attention, here is the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) glorifying our hiring Newfoundland people for the oil rigs - what odds about the Canadian, what odds about the Americans, hire Newfoundlanders first - here are our people

MR. HISCOCK: now, out on the coast of Labrador who want to get into Goose Bay for interviews. No advertising was done on the coast to say that the Provincial Department of Manpower was going to be coming down there. They contacted the Federal Department of Manpower after they arrived. Now, when the people want to go in for the jobs, they either have to get on a 6:15 flight here in St. John's - those who are going to the Trades School - and get on down to Labrador -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): One minute.

MR. HISCOCK: - as well as people on the coast, and there will not be time for them.

So I would ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier if they are concerned about the inequality of it? Can the President of the Privy Council and the Premier assure the residents of Labrador that they will have interviews for these jobs? Because if they do not, Mr. Speaker, they will not live this one down.

So, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for getting so emotional in this debate at this time, but as I said, when you have a Premier getting up and stating that Ottawa should do this, and his own department will not even allow people down in my district to go for interviews - not saying they are going to get the jobs - I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a lot of hypocrisy and a lot of politics, and I, for one, have had enough politics with the coastal Labrador DREE agreement, I have had enough of politics with regards to this confrontation between Ottawa and Newfoundland and Labrador. And we, Mr. Speaker, on this side, and the people in my district are concerned with the roads, and are concerned with the schools, and are concerned with other problems. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you kindly and my hope for these jobs is that the people in my district will have the opportunity to apply for these jobs. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I had not  
really intended to get into the debate until the hon.  
gentleman who is now -

MR. NEARY: A quorum call. A quorum  
call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, how  
foolish, how spurious is that?

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.

MR. MARSHALL: I cannot help it if the  
hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr.Hiscock) drove everyone  
out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum.  
The hon. the President of  
the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I might point out in  
beginning my remarks that the hon. member who just spoke,  
who just sat down - he is not in the Chamber now - the  
hon. the member for Eagle River, while he was here, the  
whole time, I do not think there was a quorum in the House.  
A quorum is fourteen and there were about ten or eleven  
maintained on this side and one or two on the other side.  
The hon. gentlemen here opposite are more interested in the  
affairs of government rather than playing silly little games  
that the Opposition is about.

Mr. Speaker, I am on my  
feet really at the invitation, not that I need one, from  
the hon. the member for Eagle River about this particular  
matter. Because there are young people in the galleries  
this afternoon and I do not think, really, that the hon.

MR. MARSHALL: member for Eagle River has been putting this particular resolution and explaining the import of this resolution that has been brought in by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) who represents Labrador West, in Labrador. And the hon. the member for Menihek, being mainly concerned with his district and Labrador in total, has brought a resolution for members of this House to debate to the effect that 'The House urge the federal government to live up to its responsibility and sign certain agreements for the development of Labrador'.

Now, we all know how important Labrador is to this Province, and what an integral part it is to this Province. We also know of the financial condition of this Province, and we have heard the hon. the Premier, in his address today, indicate to this House, and indicate quite clearly, that this government has proposed, made certain proposals to the federal government with respect to agreements that have been in the federal government's hands for many, many months and there has been

MR. MARSHALL:

absolutely no action on it and without the money there is no way-obviously you need money to provide services. Now, I am not interested really in ascribing the fault as such, but just to point out that as far as this government is concerned, this government has done its duty. What more can this government do than to provide and to propose proposals and make up agreements and give them to the federal government and say to the federal government 'We are willing to pay our share, where is your share?' And we have heard nothing since. I was rather interested when the hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) wanted to talk about politics and politics playing a part in this. He represents the Coastal part of Labrador and, of course, the comments that he makes are to be received by this House with more interest than perhaps-in a way he has more, not more interest but you can assume that he has more knowledge of the situation perhaps than other members representing other districts on the Island of the Province, but no more than other members in Labrador. I was rather surprised the hon. member wants to get up and say, you know, 'stop the confrontation' and 'it is the Provincial government's fault.' Well, unfortunately the hon. gentleman is not in accord with the views of his own constituents. Within the district of Eagle River is the community of Forteau and within his district there is a very active development association. It was not, Mr. Speaker, any more than a week ago that this particular association made a statement, and I am quoting from the Evening Telegram, a release of March 19th, 1981. Now, significantly I have not got the one that appeared in the Daily News but I have no doubt it did appear in the Daily News. But this



MR. MARSHALL: happens to be one in the Evening Telegram. "The Tourist Industry Association of Labrador Straits has joined three other groups in calling for the resignation of National Revenue Minister Mr. William Rompkey."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This is within his own district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: "The Tourist Association along with the Forteau Community Council, Southern Labrador Development Association and the Labrador Straits Chamber of Commerce all want Rompkey out."

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. MARSHALL: "A spokesman for the Tourist Association has said it is greatly dissatisfied and displeased with the minister's obvious lack of concern in seeing that the Coastal Labrador DREE proposal is signed promptly. By his perennial delays in signing this proposal, construction of many projects, including the Labrador Straits Highway, will no doubt be impossible for the 1981 season." Now, who said that Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL: Not the members on this side of the House, not politicians but constituents of the hon. member from Eagle River.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: The spokesman went on to say that Mr. Rompkey's favourite practice of putting the of signing the agreement ahead has become a joke in Labrador and he no longer has any credibility there. Now, they are very patent words, they are very potent words for people who have suffered for a long period of time

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 647 RA-3

MR. MARSHALL: and you can understand their frustrations, And it is very, very difficult, Mr. Speaker, when these things occur, for John Q Citizen to realize, what is a federal responsibility and what is a provincial responsibility. And the natural tendency when people are deprived the basic services, such as the people of Southern Labrador are, is they hit out against everyone. But this group of people, the leaders of the community up there now in Southern Labrador, have made that particular statement that the federal government - I put the federal government instead of Mr. Rompkey, although he is the member up there - the federal member for the area, that he is a joke because of his practice of putting off the signing. He went on to say, "For four years we have listened to these empty promises and hold him fully responsible for the highways deplorable condition."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: As a local Tourist Association

MR. W. MARSHALL:

we are deeply committed to an expanded Tourist Association and without the improved Labrador Straits Highway we see all other efforts going for naught. And then it went later on, Mr. Speaker, "The Association expressed dissatisfaction with the federal governments' recent announcement concerning the funding of a nine hole golf club in Terra Nova National Park." Now, Terra Nova National Park, I believe, is in the district of the hon. member for Terra Nova. (Mr. Lush). And the hon. member for Terra Nova is getting a nine hole golf course from the federal government in his district and the people from Labrador South, in Forteau and all up and down Coastal Labrador, are being denied basic services while these same people point to their federal member and say, 'He is a joke'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know people if I get up and make my particular pitch people will say 'Oh, he is a Tory, he is a PC, it is all politics'. But I emphasize that this is not a statement made by the politician but this is a statement made by the residents of the district of Eagle River, the residents of a very important part of Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador who are today suffering, and suffering very, very greatly because of the inability of the present Newfoundland representative in the Cabinet to bring basic and essential services not just to this Province, and admittedly a long neglected part of this Province, but also to his own district. And very rarely, Mr. Speaker, do the people in this area speak up so strongly as they have spoken up in this particular case and I think it merits a great deal of consideration. Now, as I say, the issue and the member from Menihek (Mr. Walsh) in bringing up this resolution-was, I think, very, very

MR. MARSHALL: well taken. As the member from Menihek (Mr. Walsh) knows, and the member from Naskoupi (Mr. Goudie) knows, there have been proposals, that these agreements have gone to Ottawa and they have been up there for many moons. The people on the Labrador know, on Coastal Labrador know, as witnessed by what I quoted there, where the fault lies and the response by the two members on the other side from Labrador is to bring in an amendment to the motion to try to get - you talk about policians-to try to get cheap political hay by saying the fault is not just the federal government, the fault is the provincial government.

MR. CARTER: Scandalous.

MR. MARSHALL: And we are not going to accept that amendment, Mr. Speaker, we are going to vote down the amendment and we are going to vote with the member from Menihek in congratulating him for the way in which he is representing his district and reflecting the concerns of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is -

MR. HISCOCK: The hon. member is not (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - this is - the hon. member there opposite is - it is too bad he went downstairs or wherever he went -

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: - the hon. gentleman there opposite invited this particular comment. He has gotten up - he is representing the people of Labrador. His own people in the important community of Forteau, and I assume that he assumes the people in Forteau are important and he values their views, have come out four square and

MR. MARSHALL: said his colleague in the federal government in Ottawa, that he is a joke, he keeps telling them the agreement is going to be signed but is not going to be signed. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that if the former Leader of the Opposition were up there - we had co-operation at that period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Obviously we have unfortunately in the Cabinet right now, somebody who has not been able to get the same pull for the people of this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Did Mr. Crosbie (inaudible)?

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to draw issue with what the hon. -

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: NOW, Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman, I am not interested in entering into debate with -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important motion and the hon. gentleman there opposite gets up and with a great deal - I know he does not mean it but it sounds very cynical when he gets up and he says, 'Oh, the provincial government got to put in the money.' Or, 'I do not care where the money comes from'. The provincial government; NOW where is the provincial government to get this money?

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman knows the financial position of this Province and paradoxically the hon. gentlemen there opposite will turn around and say we should supply all the money for these services and at the same time, they will side with those people in Ottawa who will deny us the means to provide these particular services, and get these monies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: They have consistently, Mr. Speaker, not spoken up on matters with respect to - you talk about Labrador and you talk about community services - our rights to transmit freely hydro power throughout Canada, our rights to be treated as full Canadian citizens instead of not even half Canadian citizens, quarter Canadian citizens.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is engaged in a conversation while I am in debate and I believe that I do not have to tolerate being interrupted by a conversation going on on my right hand side.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!  
Since there is a legitimate point of order there I would ask the hon. member if he has something to say to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they could probably go out to the common room.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the same time as the hon. gentleman there opposite will get up - and, as I say, I know the member, I will not say he is cynical, he is not cynical, he just does not understand, the hon. gentleman gets up in this House and

MR. MARSHALL: says that the people of Newfoundland, the Government of Newfoundland should pay for these services. Now, at the same time he joins, and he is a party with people who are operating against the interests of this Province in denying us the right as Canadian citizens to transmit our power through Labrador, he joins and he is a party with the people in the federal government, the party in the federal government who deny us our basic human rights for our offshore ownership and control of our offshore resources. Mr. Speaker, he joins with the people of the present government who deny us the right to build the shipyard here in St. John's, for political reasons. So you cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the hon. gentlemen there opposite that what they might choose to do is come up with a policy and decide whether they are going to stand for the people of Newfoundland or whether they are going to stand for their friends up in Ottawa, who only care for Central Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, these issues, Mr. Speaker, are far, far too grave for hon. gentlemen there opposite to be playing politics with. If the hon. gentlemen there opposite wished to be acting in the interest of the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, they would disassociate themselves from the five quizlings from this Province who occupy seats on the government side up in Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and they would stand four square, Mr. Speaker, with this government and with the people of Newfoundland and indicate that they are supporting the people of Newfoundland 150 per cent in their quest for the free transmission of power, for their ownership and control of offshore, and for their fishery jurisdictions.

MR. MARSHALL: and for the other thrusts of development. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, and that is the way the hon. gentlemen there wish it.

This Province right now has the greatest potential of any province in Canada but the potential can only be realized if we get our basic human rights as Canadians - not just as Canadians, but as human beings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And if we are continually denied the right to transmit our power, if we are Mr. Speaker, continually denied the right for our offshore resources, instead of this being a promising potential for this Province, this Province is going to find itself strapped and being unable for years to come to provide basic services not just for the people of Labrador, but certainly including them, not just for the people of coastal Labrador but for the people of Western Labrador and for the people on the Island itself.

So if the hon. gentleman wants to get up in this House and he wants to stand up as a Newfoundlander and make constructive suggestions as to how these things can come about, what the hon. gentleman will do is he will get up and he will disassociate himself from statements made by the Leader of his party to the effect, in effect, that he is against Newfoundland getting its rights to the offshore and that he will not co-operate with the transmission of electrical power. If the hon. gentleman wants to do something, that is what the hon. gentleman can do. But when he gets up in this House -



MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) misleading the House.

MR. MARSHALL: - and he makes, Mr. Speaker, statements like he has made in the House with respect to these matters - let me re-emphasize; The hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) in Labrador has brought before this House a resolution and that resolution quite simply says, 'That the hon. House urge the federal government to live up to its responsibilities and sign certain agreements for the development of Labrador at the earliest possible moment'.

The hon. the Premier has stood in his place today and he has indicated that these agreements have been up, Mr. Speaker, in Ottawa for nearly a year.

MR. NEARY: One, one agreement.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, there were none a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, when he went out and he talked to his friends in Ottawa there were none, now there is one.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) signed.

MR. MARSHALL: So if the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. the Premier has shown that these agreements are up there, Mr. Speaker. The people from Forteau, in the hon. member's district, have indicated that they are so dissatisfied with the federal government's reaction and lack of signing of these agreements, that they think the federal minister is a joke.

Now, is the hon. gentleman, when this vote is called, going to get up and vote against his constituents in Forteau or is he going to stand up and vote for them? And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, when other votes come, then maybe the hon. gentlemen there opposite will be getting up in their seats, and standing up in their seats and voting for the provincial government rather than siding with our five quiet quislings up in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this debate has been somewhat livened up by my colleague the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to a topic that I touched on briefly in this debate last Wednesday when, because of the disruptions from the Opposition members which caused an uproar in the House of Assembly to the point that there was disorder and the Speaker had to leave the Chair, in this case Your Honour in the Chair, I am hoping today to bring forward the information and to indicate why -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. POWER: Tut, tut, 'Steve'. Stop that foolishness, 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just heard the hon. gentleman say that last week when he participated in this debate he raised certain matters. In my understanding of the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, you are only allowed to participate in the debate once on a Private Member's resolution and if the hon. gentleman has already spoken he is completely out of order. He cannot speak the second time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do not think the hon. the minister has spoken in this debate on the Private Member's motion.

MR. NEARY: Will you check it, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I will check with the table.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Look, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing before I get to the point of order: that last week we saw these kinds of examples of spurious points of order, trivialous points of order raised by members of the Opposition to stop me from bringing forward a matter which is going to embarrass them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in the debate regarding a motion that was put forward by the hon. gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Walsh) and I am speaking on that motion.

MR. NEARY: Can we have a ruling, Your Honour?

MR. MORGAN: And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

I am informed by the table that the hon. the minister has spoken in the debate on this motion.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that last Wednesday I spoke on the main motion put forward by my friend from Menihek. I am now speaking, Mr. Speaker, on -

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

MR. POWER: He is speaking on a point of order, 'Steve'. sit down.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think I can clarify the situation for all hon. members. I refer to Standing Order 53, 'Not withstanding the provisions of Standing Order 49, no member may speak for more than twenty minutes in the debate on a Private Member's motion'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. SPEAKER: So just to clarify that a little

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 650

SD -4

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): further, in the amendment and the main  
motion any member is allowed to speak for twenty minutes only.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has spoken to the main motion and the only thing that I have to check is his time. I will take just a brief minute to check his time. He is allowed to speak for twenty minutes. If the hon. minister spoke for fifteen minutes to the main motion, then he will have five minutes left on the amendment. May I check that, please?

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. minister has spoken to the amendment on a previous occasion and according to the rules of the House he is not allowed further debate on that motion.

MR. J. MORGAN: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: My point of privilege is this, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that it be clarified that my speaking and the right to speak in the House on certain debates - and I want to make clear to Your Honour and the Chair that when I spoke last Wednesday I spoke on the amendment made by the hon. gentleman from Labrador, the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the amendment to the motion. And I spoke on that amendment last Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to speak on the main motion, itself, put forward by my colleague, my friend for Menihek (Mr. Walsh).

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege -

MR. S. NEARY: It is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I can clarify it by saying that we are speaking on the amendment right now. So the hon. minister has already spoken on the amendment, therefore, he

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): cannot participate in the debate further because the amendment is still before the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question. Is the House ready for the question on the amendment? All those in favour of the amendment 'aye', contrary 'nay'.

In my opinion the 'nay's' have it.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I now want to speak on the main motion.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not understand the ruling that, Your Honour, just gave. Your Honour, just told the House and told the hon. gentleman that on a private member's resolution, whether there is an amendment or a sub-amendment or a dozen amendments, that an hon. member is only entitled to speak once on the resolution. The hon. gentleman has spoken, he is out of order, he is defying Your Honour's ruling, and I would submit to Your Honour that if he continues that conduct in this House that Your Honour name the minister.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, look there is not much point in anybody getting up in this House and saying, you know, according to the writ of whoever it may be, 'Steve or Jim or John or Jack or whoever it may be ' but the Standing Orders are here. The hon. member either cannot read or he does not read the Standing Orders.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where do you find it?

MR. W. MARSHALL: It is Standing Order 53, Mr. Speaker, page 19; 'Every private member's motion shall be debated for not more than two sitting days'- okay? Sub-section two; 'Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 49' - now Standing Order 49, Mr. Speaker, names the time when people may speak in ordinary debate, thirty minutes for most members - 'no member may speak for more than twenty minutes in the debate on a private member's motion'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my contention would be , my contention is-and those are the Standing Orders- that what the hon. gentleman was speaking on last Wednesday- he was speaking on, in effect, the motion of the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): On the amendment.

MR. W. MARSHALL: He was speaking on the amendment.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, that question is disposed of and, obviously, the hon. member could not speak twice and on that everyone agrees. But just like in any other amendment- non-confidence motion that we have before the House in Address in Reply - the hon. gentleman is now speaking on the -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. member's motion.

MR. MARSHALL: - on the motion. Now, I believe, Your Honour, that the precedents or what precedents -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): - have occurred, that I believe that it would bear it out. But I just refer Your Honour to the Standing Orders because that is what we have to comply with, not what I say or anybody else says.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am just taking a brief recess to check this.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapcile.

MR. NEARY: Can I make a submission, Your Honour?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just quoted from the Standing Rules of this House compared the new rules that were brought in a couple of years ago by the government to try to muzzle the Opposition, he compared these new rules to the Address in Reply. There is no comparison, Mr. Speaker. There is ample precedent in this House. The matter has come up on two or three previous occasions and Your Honour has ruled - not Your Honour - but the Chair has ruled that you can only speak on a Private Member's resolution -

AN HON. MEMBER: Once.



MR. NEARY: - once. It has already been tested, the precedent is there. And I would say that before Your Honour makes a ruling on this particular matter he might want to take two or three minutes but I just want to say that it is not like the Throne Speech where you can speak to the amendment or the sub-amendment and then go back to the main motion. It is not like that at all, Mr. Speaker. Once you speak in - and you cannot - by the way, Mr. Speaker, somebody raised the point before that if you did not use up your twenty minutes you could come back and speak again. That, in fact, is not so either, Mr. Speaker. Once you stand and you have spoken, that is it. You have used your turn whether you only went ten minutes, fifteen minutes or twenty minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! I thank all hon. members for their contribution to this. I will take a brief, very brief, recess and then come back.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did have twenty minutes debating the Private Member's motion and according to my interpretation he has used up his time. We now have two days to debate a Private Member's motion. Each member has twenty minutes whether there are one or a number of amendments to the main motion. The hon. minister has spoken for twenty minutes so I will now recognize another member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 652

GS - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

A good ruling, Mr. Speaker.

An excellent ruling, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member

for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard a number of  
submissions this afternoon by hon. members opposite on this  
very,

MR. R. MOORES: very important resolution by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh). And this is, Mr. Speaker, without question a very important resolution, so important, in fact, that one of the very few times that the Premier of the Province takes the opportunity to speak to a private member's motion was today. You do not often see that. It is an unusual occurrence in this House, that the Premier, particularly, feels obligated to speak on a topic of such a serious nature. But he did so today and this is a very important resolution in that fact and because of other factors. But more important, certainly more important to the Opposition, is the amendment to that resolution by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). And essentially what that amendment tried to impress upon the House, Mr. Speaker, was that the government of this Province is again—and it was borne out even further by comments by the Premier — trying to bluff this Province and bluff the people of this Province into believing that it is the federal government and not the Province who is holding up the DREE agreements for Coastal Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: It is a shame!

MR. MOORES: And they have been, for the most part, Mr. Speaker, the government has been getting away with this, has been doing a good job at manipulating, at semantic manipulation, of trying to impress upon the people that all of the shortcomings relating to DREE agreements, and all of the shortcomings relating to any involvement of the federal government in this Province, is totally the fault of Ottawa. Without question, never any question about it, Ottawa is to blame, no one else, We are innocent, we are clean, we are honest, we have all the integrity in the world and it is Ottawa who is the culprit, Ottawa who is the one who is so down on Newfoundland, so down on development in Newfoundland, so down on progress in this Province, so down on the promotion of public services in

MR. MOORES: this Province that every year they give \$1.3 billion to this Province so that we can survive. And this same government - my hon. colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) mentioned only yesterday in this House, the hundreds of millions of dollars that pour into this Province over and above our transfer payments just to help us survive - and this is the same government, the same, callous, biased, subjective government in Ottawa that is holding up the DREE agreements in Coastal Labrador and, as the Premier tried to bluff again, the Trans-Labrador Highway agreement which we know, of course, does not exist. It never has existed. All the government of this Province has done is submit a proposal to federal officials for the phase by phase development of the Trans-Labrador Highway and that is it. The federal government does not know anymore about it. They do not know what priority this has in the scheme of things in Newfoundland or in the scheme of the future of Labrador. All they have is a wish list. the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) in this Province wishing that Ottawa would accept his list of highway and other development priorities in this Province.

MR. FLIGHT: And he cannot even get that list up to them.

MR. BARRY: No negotiations.

MR. MOORES: No negotiations, Mr. Speaker. Do not talk so foolish. Negotiation; if there is anybody awake in this Province at all, if there is anyone who has not been asleep in this Province at all in the last two years. negotiation went out when this government came to power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: There has been no negotiation with Ottawa. I will tell you what this government and this Premier particularly - and this is not a personal attack, this is an attack on the office of the Premier and the way

MR. MOORES: a certain individual is performing in that office, and that is a very clear distinction to illustrate my point that there is a difference in 'Brian Peckford' and a difference in the Premier. They are not one and the same, in terms of debate in this House. I could not care less about 'Brian Peckford' and what he does in his personal life, but once he sits in the office of Premier then he must answer for the characteristics, for the behaviour, for the idiosyncrasies of that office.

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on, boy!

MR. MOORES: And what is happening here, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier of this Province has totally thrown responsibility and temperate negotiation out the window in favour of confrontation and old foolishness that he is getting on with.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Childishness!

MR. MOORES: Childishness, childishness that is causing and costing this Province millions of dollars and thousands of jobs -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. MOORES: - not to mention a continued decline and deterioration in our public services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MOORES: All because this anti-Confederate government, this government that wants to separate, that wants to take this Province out of Confederation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: The Premier tried to deny it.

MR. FLIGHT: He is in the hands of the (inaudible) he is being manipulated -

MR. MOORES: He tried to deny that he said it to a Toronto newspaper.

MR. FLIGHT: - by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. NEARY: The Marshall Plan.

MR. MOORES: But he said it.

MR. HOLLETT: And the Minister of Savoury.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Savoury. The Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: The Premier did say it, and he tried it here in this House this afternoon if anyone was listening, he tried to explain to this House, he tried to rebutt my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and my colleague for LaPoile said, I have information that there is no Trans-Labrador agreement.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. MOORES: And he proved it.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. MOORES: And the Premier of this Province got up in his usual bluff fashion and tried to tell this House, tried to weasel and squirm his way out of it.

MR. NEARY: That is right. He could not.

MR. MOORES: But he would not table the documents.

MR. NEARY: He does not have the documents to table.

MR. MOORES: He would not table them so that we could scurtinize them and peruse them, and he is getting away with it. There is what angers me. There is what aggrevates me is that he is getting away with this day in and day out in this House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the people of Newfoundland are (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: Less and less though.

MR. MOORES: You should have heard -

MR. FLIGHT: The press is getting after him.  
The blush is coming off the rose.

MR. MOORES: - you should have heard, Mr. Speaker,  
when my hon. colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had him trapped  
in the rat trap this afternoon about the Minister of  
Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) on the flat bed  
affair, you should have heard the weaseling and the squirming -

MR. MORGAN: Speaking of rat traps, Rooney is  
in one right now, I would say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: You should know you are into  
it with him, 'Jim:

MR. MORGAN: He is laughing, he loves that.  
I am sure he loves that.

MR. MOORES: If you -

MR. LUSH: Leave him alone, 'Rod'.

MR. NEARY: Leave him alone, 'Rod'.

MR. LUSH: Just say, he is best left alone.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister should know who  
is in a rat trap.

MR. MOORES: I would point out though if the  
minister wants to debate -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) off his feet.

MR. NEARY: Put it on the Order Paper  
(inaudible).

MR. MOORES: If the minister would just  
listen for a minute -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Cabot Martin (inaudible)

MR. MOORES: - in all fairness to Mr. Rooney  
he has done quite a bit for you in your district.

MR. NEARY: Yes that is right. You should  
get down on your knees, boy.

MR. MOORES: I remember -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: I remember when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) sat on a Canada Works Board, it was then called Local Initiatives in Harbour Grace, he was pretty close -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) my district.

MR. LUSH: He made a fool of himself.

MR. MOORES: - to Mr. Rooney's behind then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Making a fool of himself and apologizing.

MR. MOORES: I think, Mr. Speaker, the topic is best left alone, because -

AN HON. MEMBER: Especially while (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: - I think the hon. member for Carbonear is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): Order, please! We have a motion on the floor.

MR. LUSH: Not another MHA was ever allowed to sit on a committee after that.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) behind in the next election, boy.

MR. MOORES: And to get on to the point -

MR. MORGAN: We will give him a good swift in the behind in the next election.

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

MR. LUSH: The proper thing.

MR. FLIGHT: Who is he referring to? The Minister of Fisheries, who he is referring to.

MR. MOORES: To get on, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the



MR. R. MOORES: Premier of this Province and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) like all members opposite throw red herrings. When they have no defense they start going for personal attacks.

MR. S. NEARY: Do you know what the Premier said? 'It is the way you asked the question. I am not going to answer you because of the way you asked the question. (Inaudible).'

MR. R. MOORES: My hon. colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is accurate. The favourite reply of the Premier when he has no defense is that the hon. member opposite does not know what he is talking about. He does not understand the procedure or the manoeuvrable way that he asks the question. What a defense of government policy! What a defense for stand of the Premier and Cabinet on issues of major importance in this Province.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Shameful! It is just shameful!

MR. R. MOORES: We know, Mr. Speaker, to get back, to become more germane to the issue before the House this afternoon, we know exactly what is going on with the Labrador Coastal agreements, DREE agreements. We know exactly what is going on. The same is going on with these agreements that is going on with all agreements relative to Ottawa. The Premier of this Province and his government have taken a course in confrontation, in opposition to Ottawa and it is costing us dearly in this Province, a disaster course for the development of this Province and for the future of its thousands of unemployed people.

MR. CARTER: Rubbish! Pure rubbish.

MR. R. MOORES: And that is not rubbish, Mr. Speaker. It certainly is not rubbish.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And the member knows it too.

MR. R. MOORES: It is certainly is not rubbish. If I could only be half as certain of this government getting re-elected to power as I am that the confrontation that you are pursuing with Ottawa is going to destroy this Province, if I could be only half as certain, I guarantee you there would not be many members on the opposite side sitting in their ministerial offices after the next election.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: That is a joke, too. The Premier came in last week and he casually slid a remark across the House about - he said to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), 'If you only knew the results of the polls that I just read'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: You would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, about polls. I remember the former Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Moores, getting up in his seat about three months before he resigned and gave up the leadership, about this grandiose poll that was held in the Province and how his government and his party were never in better condition. And bang, three months after he was gone. Three months after he left the sinking ship and got out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, we cannot hear.

MR. FLIGHT: I do not want to rise on a point of order, but I have to.

MR. CARTER: Do you have something to say?

MR. MOORES: I am sorry but it appears that there are a number of dialogues going on within the House and

MR. R. MOORES:

the hon member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is fully aware of the rules governing debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: So, Mr. Speaker, if I can get on with the debate. One of the most serious intrusions into the courtesy aspect of this House is when the Premier of this Province ironically, almost hypocritically, gets up in this House on a private member's resolution and states categorically that his government has an agreement which it does not have, and is ready to sign an agreement which he is not ready to sign.

MR. NEARY: Does not exist.

MR. MOORES: Does not exist at all. When he gets up with all his heart and with all his emotion and with all his raving and says how concerned he is with the people of Labrador, so concerned, in fact, that they told the Premier last year that if he dared come up to Labrador to stick the Newfoundland flag on the Labrador-Quebec boundary they would fire him out.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. MOORES: That is how concerned the Premier is.

MR. NEARY: What about the library?

MR. MOORES: He is concerned with politicking. He is concerned with embarrassing the people of Labrador -

MR. FLIGHT: He is filled up with his own importance.

MR. NEARY: Did he give them the library they wanted down there?

MR. MOORES: - by putting the needs and the concerns of the people of Labrador secondary to his personal animosity and vengeance towards the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) -

MR. TULK: This is the last step towards a dictatorship (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: - and he is prepared to let progress and development in Labrador go down the drain because of constitutional issues and because of silly Hibernia issues.

MR. FLIGHT: And because he feels so inferior when he is in his presence, he cannot talk to him.

MR. MOORES: I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there will not be - the people of Labrador will guarantee that no members from the P.C. side of this House will come back to this House representing districts in Labrador. Down the drain the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), down the tubes now because of your acquiescence, because of your silence, consent by silence, as the Premier of this Province destroys Labrador, puts it ten years behind schedule in its development. You know it, the member for Menihek knows it to be true, knows what I am saying is true, that instead of hope and progress, instead of an enthusiastic, optimistic future for Labrador, what the people of Labrador are talking about is separation, of getting away from Newfoundland, of having their own flag and their own government. And what is the Premier of this Province doing? Fiddling, that is what he is doing, fiddling with extraneous issues while the people and the future of Labrador are in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this resolution because the resolution indicates something contrary to the facts. And the fact is that it is not the federal government holding up the DREE agreements but it is this provincial government, this Premier. I do not support it and, Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in saying that I do not support anything as frivolous as a resolution of this nature. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 656

IB-3

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
congratulate the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) and also  
the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on having devised a  
new method for filling in time in this House. If they  
have nothing to say

MR. CARTER:

they usually go through a list of districts and suggest how they are going to fare in the next election. So, we might as well follow their good example. For instance, I notice, looking at the list that was provided to all the members in the House - we will start with Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I will say the next election there is no hope for him whatsoever, partly because he is just no good. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), I am sure that he will not make it again because nobody in this House likes him and I presume very few people in his own district.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the hon. gentleman like to come and run against me and give (inaudible) the opportunity?

MR. CARTER: Well, that is a very intriguing thought, I must say. The only trouble with that is that I do not think that anything would be served by my -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: - I do not think anything would be served by my having a direct confrontation with the hon. gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the House would be rid of one of us.

MR. ROBERTS: And all hands will agree that is true.

MR. CARTER: Well, half of what the hon. gentleman has said is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Come on, 'John', you have eight more minutes.

MR. CARTER: Eight more minutes to go. Well the -

MR. ROBERTS: Do you want to sit down and agree to call it six o'clock (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: No, I do, Mr. Speaker, I do have a few serious points to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: You know, hon. gentlemen are very much mistaken if they think for one minute that Ottawa cares one iota about Newfoundland or how she fares. Ottawa just does not care and, in fact, I would go further, I would go further and say that probably the government in Ottawa deserves our compassion, deserves some sympathy.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) Crosbie too?

MR. CARTER: I would suggest - well, the administration in Ottawa - I would suggest that the government up there is entirely out of control. I do not think that they are able to function properly as a government. There has been so much talk about the Constitution, they seem to have forgotten everything else. To illustrate the point that I am trying to make, hon. gentlemen might remember a few years ago when there were some Canada Works projects -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is a conversation going on here. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) already raised the same point today when my colleague was over talking to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: - and it was ruled that there was a valid point of order and now the Government House Leader, who raised the point of order today, is now breaking the rule himself, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: What? On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I believe the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is over on this side of the House. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I will have to reserve judgement on it until I read Hansard. I did not hear the first part of it.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the federal government funded a number of very curious projects - they were make-work projects - including quite a large block of funds for a group of devil worshippers. Now, I could quite see that if the exercise was to worship the Opposition, that that might be an appropriate -

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: - the Department of Secretary of State, I believe it was. I believe that is the department that was handing out and -

MR. ROBERTS: The weird things.

MR. CARTER: - this was a -

MR. ROBERTS: Probably even gave out money to (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the federal government cares about Newfoundland. I do not think it cares about any of the Atlantic Provinces. We are small. We are very small in comparison to the large centres of Ontario and Quebec. We only have - what is it? - seven federal seats. A lot they could care about that. No matter what they do, we seem to send them three



MR. CARTER:

or four federal members, federal Liberal members. So I am sure they just do not care one bit. It does not seem to make any difference to them. They will never take St. John's East or St. John's West again. They may not even take all of the remaining five seats, but they can be reasonably confident of taking several of them, so they just do not care. The political gains to be made here in Newfoundland are very slight, so they are quite prepared to let us suffer. In fact, I do not think it is a conscious effort on their part, I just do not think we cross their mind at all. So I think it is very important that both sides of the House should make as much noise as possible. I am very concerned that hon. gentlemen over there, particularly the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, who knows, has quite a few counterparts in Ottawa and who is well known there and can pick up the phone and on a first name basis telephone and talk at length with a great many of the members up there who have a fair bit of influence, and he should right away, at this very moment - the time difference is about right - he could go into the office and start calling some of his friends and saying to them, 'Now, look, how about doing something for our Province down here. We realize that you do not really care much about us.' But he could sit down, perhaps, even with the Prime Minister - I believe he knows the present Prime Minister - and he could sit down and perhaps even have a meal with him and after desert he could say, 'Now look here, Mr. Trudeau, stop being such a pig, you know, do not be so rotten, how about sending a few crumbs down our way.'

So I think the government is out of control up there. I do not think they care about us. What about this power corridor that we have been requesting? What

MR. CARTER: do hon. gentlemen opposite think about that? I will gladly take my seat if an hon. gentleman would like to stand up and try and justify the federal government's refusal for giving us a power corridor through Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Have not refused it, what are hon. gentlemen thinking about.

MR. ROBERTS: I know. Does the hon. gentleman know what he is thinking about?

MR. CARTER: I well recall, and hon. gentlemen over there should recall, on television Prime Minister Trudeau said, "Oh, power corridor, who has ever asked for a power corridor? We have never heard of this before."

MR. FLIGHT: Well you had not asked.  
(Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Now, this was some months ago. By now he certainly knows. Whatever the distant past was like. He said, "Oh, I do not know anything about it, never heard of that. Oh no, we have never been asked." This is ridiculous.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: I am perfectly right. It is incredible that the federal government still refuses to even entertain the thought of providing us with a power corridor through Quebec. Now, I quite realize why they do it, it is no mystery to me, it is because they have seventy-five good reasons for refusing us.

MR. ROBERTS: Seventy-four.

MR. CARTER: Seventy-four good reasons and until that number of reasons is considerably lessened, they will refuse to give us -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sounds like (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Sure does. So I propose that hon. gentlemen over there talk to their federal counterparts.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What difference is that going to make?

MR. CARTER:

Well, it may not make any difference. In fact I do not think it will make much difference because I do not think hon. gentlemen have as much clout as they like to think they have. But I think the least they could do is try. But unfortunately, you know, we make these proposals to Ottawa and we get very little reaction. So I do not know what the answer is. I suppose all we can do is keep trying. I have not yet reached that stage of cynicism which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have become affected by, that we cannot do anything. I think that each one of us is able to do something. We can always do a little bit better.

Now, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - I am sorry he is not in the House - he seems to have a great deal of - ah, there he is - he seems to have a great deal of information and perfect sources. I would like to point out that he is not the only one who has good sources of information.

March 25, 1981

Tape No. 559

GS - 1

MR. CARTER: At eight o'clock - sorry - at seven-thirty -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! It being twenty minutes to six Standing Orders say Private Members' Day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks now he will close the debate. The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I agree with one of the members in the Opposition, the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and if we had started this issue back some twenty-seven years ago we would have been driving across Labrador today. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, when the Trans-Canada Highway, back in the 1950's was negotiated for this Island portion, that is when the Trans-Labrador Highway should have been negotiated on their 90-10. Because the Trans-Canada Highway in this Province is not completed until it does go across the Labrador section. Some of the members across the House, Mr. Speaker, seem to think it was fine to have a 90-10 agreement for the Trans-Canada Highway on the Island but only 50-50 in Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is nonsense.

MR. WALSH: Nonsense? It is being said, well, I have sat here in this House -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman knows very well (inaudible).

MR. WALSH: And, Mr. Speaker, another thing, since I have become a member of this House I have a habit of not interrupting the gentlemen across and I would ask that they respect my wishes.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: So that is - as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the federal government - in this particular case, there should not even necessarily have to be a proposal. It should have been done when the Liberal administration was in this House and in control. Then there would not be any need for me to be standing here or anyone else debating this subject.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: And that point, Mr. Speaker, the federal government - yes, the federal government has the responsibility of completing the Trans-Canada Highway across this Province on a 90-10 basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was another gentleman across the way last week debating this resolution who mentioned a trans-Labrador railway. I cannot agree with that, Mr. Speaker, but here again if we go back thirty years, when this Province allowed the mining companies, particularly the Iron Ore Company of Canada, to move into the Schefferville area, the town of Schefferville being in the Province of Quebec, the mines within the Province of Newfoundland in the Labrador section of it. At that time, Mr. Speaker, it was all mining in the Province of Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, before that ore was - the Labrador Agreement was set by the Liberal administration at the time - before that was allowed to happen, we suggest you can mine our ore if you can ship it out but ship it out to a port in Newfoundland, like the coast of Labrador! Then we would have had a railroad across Labrador thirty years ago. We would

MR. WALSH: also have a superport on the coast of Labrador, some 40,000 people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear! A superport, hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, Seven Islands in 1952, Seven Islands, Quebec, had -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. WALSH: - Seven Islands in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, is the major shipping point for the iron ore out of Newfoundland and, Mr. Speaker, the population at that time was approximately 5,000 people. It is now in the 40,000 mark. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that railroad and the port had been in Labrador we would have that same population in Newfoundland. How many more Newfoundlanders? So who is to blame for all these things, the neglect?

AN HON. MEMBER: Right!

MR. WALSH: Not this party, no. In this particular case it had nothing to do with it.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: It was the so-called great Liberal party of Newfoundland, the great Liberal party in Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been enough conflict of discussion across this House about something that I said earlier. It should have been solved years ago, and I cannot add much to it, as a matter of fact, because I think it has all been said by hon. members on both sides even if they are right or wrong. Mostly across the way they are wrong anyway.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will close the debate on this particular subject and hope that Ottawa

MR. WALSH: will listen to my remarks and live up to a commitment to build the Trans-Canada Highway across the Province of Newfoundland like they did across the whole nation of Canada.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have heard the motion then. Those in favour of the motion signify by saying 'aye', contrary 'nay'. In my opinion the 'ayes' have it. Is it agreed to call it six o'clock? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 25, 1981



Question 18  
order paper  
of March 4/8

COMPLAINTS

<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Total 10,283	Total 12,978

CASES BROUGHT TO COURT

<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Nil	41 (40 charges laid against one company under the Trade Practices Act. Results of these charges still pending)

CONVICTIONS

<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>
Nil	1

40 Charges laid against Norwood Kitchens Co. Ltd.,  
1 Charge laid against Nfld. Credit Co. Ltd. (Collection Agency)