

VOL NO. 1

NO. 6

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MAY 17, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Pursuant to Section 29, subsection 1 of the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act, the Seventh annual report of the Parliamentary Commissioner was received in my office a few days ago and I now table this report and will arrange for all hon. members to receive a copy.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make. It is an oral statement and it is a statement with respect to the meeting that occurred on Friday with the hon. Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) in Ottawa. And I make this statement from the point of view of informing the House as to the course of the meeting and as to the result of the meeting itself.

The meeting was held in Montreal with Mr. Lalonde, myself and various officials. At that meeting the position of this Province was reiterated to Mr. Lalonde which is, briefly, that we wish negotiations to recommence, but negotiations on the offshore cannot recommence until the federal government is prepared, as we are, to set the issue of ownership aside during the course of the negotiations and permanently in the event that an agreement is reached.

And secondly, that once that step has been taken, a step, by the way, which this Province took when it entered into the negotiations, but once the federal government is prepared to take that step we would then expect the federal government to respond to the proposal that has been placed before the federal government on January 25th last which very specifically addresses itself

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 247

SD-2

MR. MARSHALL:

to the issues of joint management and meaningful revenue sharing. As I say, that position was put before the federal government and Mr. Lalonde indicated that he understood the position and that he would take it to his colleagues. The fact of the matter is that the ball, with respect to the resumption of negotiations on the offshore, is now in the federal court. It is with the federal government and when the federal government is prepared to indicate that it is prepared to negotiate on that basis negotiations can recommence. I also made the minister aware, which I feel in fairness to him that he was already aware of as well, that I was speaking from the point of view of the government of this province but I was also quite clearly speaking from the point of view of the people

MR. MARSHALL: of the Province who passed on this particular proposal on April 6th., and had given an overwhelming mandate to this government and in so doing gave their overwhelming approval to it. That particular proposal, Mr. Speaker, we feel is an agreement which gives a reasonable resolution to the issue of the offshore. It is one that should be seriously addressed by the federal government but we require first of all, as I said, that ownership be set aside because we could never be party to entering into an agreement where that agreement could be torn up by either party at will.

So that is the situation.

We are prepared to renegotiate but not, Mr. Speaker, at any price, not at the price of the cost of the future of Newfoundland and the heritage to which the people of Newfoundland are entitled.

We fervently hope, the people of this Province and the government of this Province fervently hopes that the federal government will address itself to this proposal, that they will be prepared to put ownership aside on the basis that we have indicated, and that they will address themselves in a realistic way to this reasonable proposal which I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, has been greeted very positively by the business community throughout Canada.

So that is the situation. That is the sum total of the result of those discussions. They were beneficial in a sense. I would not wish the people of this Province to have any impression that negotiations are going to recommence because it would be irresponsible of the government, or any party, to raise the hopes of the people of this Province and have them dashed in the future.

MR. MARSHALL:

We wish negotiations to re-commence, but if they commence it will depend upon the federal government and will depend upon them entering into, not just giving lip-service to the premise that ownership would be set aside, but also approaching it in a meaningful way with this in their minds because both parties have to enter into a permanent agreement, one that cannot be torn up at will by one of the parties. We are prepared to do this and I would certainly hope as a result of the discussions on Friday that the federal government will as well. But I have to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that whether or not that occurs will depend upon the way in which the federal government addresses itself to the position that was put forth by myself as a representative of the government, and I feel

MR. MARSHALL:

certainly in this case that I can say with a great deal of confidence as a result of the mandate which the government received on behalf of the people of the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the proposal to which he keeps referring has ever been tabled in the House? I do not ever recall seeing a copy tabled in this hon. House. And if it has not been tabled, would the hon. gentleman undertake to table the proposal so that all members on both sides of the House could have a copy so that we can go over it in greater detail?

PREMIER PECKFORD It has all been gone over during the election.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I have never, ever laid my eyes on the proposal.

MR. ROBERTS

We saw the Premier putting it off for this year.

MR.NEARY:

So I think in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, the proposal should be tabled. Is the Premier saying that they will not table the proposal?

AN HON MEMBER:

I hope not.

MR. NEARY:

As far as the meeting in Montreal is concerned, Mr. Speaker, there is not much that we can say about it except that I am rather concerned about the way that the Minister of Energy (Mr.Marshall) makes his presentation in this house. He talks in such a way that it looks like he is trying to intimidate Ottawa, like 'no way will we agree to an agreement,' he says, 'that will be torn up at will by one of the parties.' That 'they are just not providing lip service! 'We are not going to negotiate at any price.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon.

Premier says right. Well it may be right, but in the interest of getting negotiations on the rails would it not be far better to ask the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to restrain himself until such time as they sit down in good faith around the table?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: The Premier says no. Well maybe they do not want an agreement. I do not know. Maybe they do not want a negotiated agreement. I asked the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) the other day what would happen in the event that an agreement was negotiated, would they withdraw their case from the Appeal's Court, and I did not get an answer. But we are hoping, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are hoping that the federal government will agree to set aside the ownership question in the interest of getting negotiations started. Both sides, I think, believe in a negotiated settlement. But I do not think - and, Mr. Speaker, another thing, the hon. gentleman did not indicate whether or not there was a favourable response from Mr. Lalonde. The meeting, as I understand it, only lasted one hour and I am sure that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) from this Province did not do all the talking. I am sure there must have been suggestions and proposals and ideas put forward by the federal minister. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what reaction he got from the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde)? And is there any hope that the minister may agree to this?

MR. NEARY: He certainly did not come to the table at that meeting empty-handed. He must have made some overtures or some indication to the hon. gentleman whether or not it was possible.

MR. MARSHALL: Do you want to ask during Question Period?

MR. NEARY: No, I am asking now and I would like to get the answers now if I could. Was there any indication that this might happen so we can get the negotiations started again?

PREMIER PECKFORD: This is abuse of the Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. minister

MR. MARSHALL: If I might say, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of maintaining the normal practices in this House, which are the normal practices of the British Parliamentary system, I would be quite prepared to respond to those questions if the hon. gentleman wishes to put them in Question Period. My statement was for the purpose of informing hon. members. He has asked a number of questions there and if the hon. gentleman wishes a response, I would be delighted to respond to him in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Are there any other statements by Ministers?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Education

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 14th, I reported to this hon. House that there had been some irregularities in the payment of substitute teachers and that a police investigation has been requested into the matter. This information was given by me during a discussion on the Auditor General's report. There now appears to be confusion and misinformation surrounding this whole matter. Various news media have indicated that millions of dollars

MS VERGE: have been misappropriated.

For example, the Evening Telegram on Saturday carried a headline stating that 'Missing funds total \$19 million.' This is untrue. The amount in question is closer to \$19,000. In order to set the matter straight and clear up any misunderstanding that might still exist, I would like to repeat what I said in the House on Friday and what I later elaborated on to news reporters. Early this Winter the Department of Education teacher payroll officials discovered that some irregularities were taking place in the payment of substitute teachers. Pay for substitute teachers is processed separately from the regular teachers' payroll. After further examination of the problem and appropriate disciplinary action, officials of my department requested the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary to make an official investigation. I have been informed that the police assignment is now completed and the report will be submitted to the Department of Justice soon, possibly later this week. In the meantime, my department's detailed internal audit of payroll accounts for the last two years indicates that the amount of funds affected is actually \$19,703.25. It is my understanding that all of this amount except for \$1,349 is being returned by banks that cashed unauthorized cheques. Depending on the contents of the police report, possible legal action may lead to the recovery of the

MS. L. VERGE:

balance of \$1,349. It is hoped that no funds whatsoever will be lost to government. Available information indicates that no teacher is owed money as a result of this incident. I would also like to report, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with the recommendations of the Auditor General, a number of steps have been taken to tighten internal control of the teachers' payroll system and reduce the possibility of further incidents of this nature. Furthermore, the Department of Education, assisted by the Department of Finance and Treasury Board, is working with Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services in developing an improved computer payroll system.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Energy (Mr. W. Marshall) today in the House and the secret meeting that took place in Montreal on Friday, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there was any indication from Mr. Lalonde that the Government of Canada would accede to the proposal to set aside the ownership question while negotiations are being carried on and, you know, were the meetings carried out in a generally friendly atmosphere and what the possibility is of getting the negotiations started again?

MR. SPEAKER:

Council.

The hon. the President of the

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it

MR. W. MARSHALL: quite clear that there was no indication that the federal government would accept the position except that the hon. gentleman indicated that he would take our premise to his colleagues and that is where the matter now stands. That is why I say the ball now rests in the federal court. As to whether or not there is any possibility of agreement, I do not know whether there is any possibility; we certainly hope there would, But whether or not there is to be any agreement, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any possibility of any negotiations re-commencing it is going to depend entirely and absolutely on the federal government indicating that they are prepared to enter into an agreement that cannot be torn up at will by either party.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if Mr. Lalonde made any counter proposals? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is aware, as are all members of this House, that the matter that the hon. gentleman raised about setting aside the offshore ownership question, I presume that has been raised in the federal cabinet and in the federal caucus on a number of occasions previously, but did the Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde) for the Government of Canada make any counter proposals to the hon. gentleman?

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

MR. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Speaker. He made no direct counterproposal. The only reference that the hon. gentleman made was with respect to the Nova Scotian agreement. And I advised him, as the government has advised the federal government from time to time, that Doomsday will come and go before this government will considering entering into an agreement -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right. Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - on the basis of which Nova Scotia entered an agreement. Because, Mr. Speaker, that agreement does not address joint management. It gives the management to the entire offshore of Nova Scotia to the federal government. It does not address in a meaningful way the revenue question, because what it does it tags it to equalization payments, and in that respect in a very ineffective manner. So it is the type of agreement that we do not presume to tell the Government of Nova Scotia what it should sign and what it should not sign. But we do know that that particular agreement is totally unpalatable and totally unsuitable to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure listening to the hon. gentleman if the conversation that we were told by the press lasted an hour with Mr. LaLonde if it was a one-sided conversation, the minister making his proposals and no reaction from the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. LaLonde). Was there any discussion, for instance, at this meeting, the importance now of Hibernia, now that the Alsands

MR. NEARY: mega-project is being scrapped?
Did the two ministers talk about now the importance of getting
Hibernia developed as quickly as possible? Did that matter
come up?

MR. MARSHALL: Not directly, Mr. Speaker.
But I assume that that was within the mind of the federal
minister himself when he initiated the meeting in the first
place. We have done, and I think we are doing, a very good job
in this Province in looking after the interests of the
people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We are also very concerned
about the interest of the people of Canada. But the problems
with the interest of the people of Canada and the Province
with Alsands are not really matters with which we can deal
and deal effectively. They lie within the bailiwick of
Mr. LaLonde and the federal government.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon.
gentleman optimistic that as a result of this secret meeting
in Montreal that negotiations in fact now will again start
up? Or is the hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY:

I am not sure if he is optimistic or pessimistic - would the hon. gentleman give us the general feeling that he got? I mean he must have gotten some feel from the meeting with Mr. Lalonde. Was he stubborn and unwilling to move? , You know, give us some idea. The hon. gentleman should be able to give us some idea, without building up hopes, of whether or not he is optimistic now that the initial meeting has taken place. Has there been any future meetings arranged, for instance? Have the two ministers now agreed to allow the officials to get back as it again and start negotiating again? Was there any talk about that?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I avoid saying whether I am optimistic or not, to tell you the truth. But hope springs eternal even when one is considering what can possibly emanate from the federal government. What has emanated from the federal government in recent times does not give one any grounds to be optimistic.

I cannot say that I am optimistic.

I cannot say really that I am pessimistic. All I can do is advise the House that this government has put its position again, reiterated its position to the federal government with respect to these basic matters. There are no future meetings planned. We are quite prepared to address ourselves and attend any future meetings at any time if the federal government is prepared to get back to the basis upon which negotiations started in the first place. But I can only say this, Mr. Speaker, that we view it in the government as a rather unfortunate situation in this Province, that it seems that in order to get your rights within the Canadian Confederation, whether it be on the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill, or whether it be with respect

MR. MARSHALL: to the offshore resources, that it seems that we must resort to court on every occasion. While we have great faith in the strength of our court cases we would prefer to be able to resolve these differences by way of negotiation. But whether or not this negotiation is going to take place, solely, entirely depends now on the federal government's attitude with respect to it. We, Mr. Speaker, will not be entering into negotiations unless there is an agreement that ownership is going to be set aside during the period of negotiations, and permanently in the event that an agreement is reached and unless the federal government agrees to address itself to the very reasonable proposal with respect to offshore resources, with respect to joint management and revenue sharing. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we would be selling out the interest of the people of Newfoundland and I can guarantee the hon. gentlemen there opposite, as well as the guarantee has been given to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) if in fact he is interested in that guarantee, that

MR. MARSHALL: this government has no intention whatsoever of selling the people of Newfoundland down the river.

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

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

MR. NEARY: I thought the hon. gentleman introduced a new thing into his last comments about court action. Did I gather from the hon. gentleman's remarks that there is a possibility now that the matter may just break off and go to the courts? Because the hon. gentleman brought it up.

He said, I think, something like this, that the only way we seem to be able to get things settled in this Province is through the court. Did that matter come up of whether or not, if there are no negotiations, to go directly to the Supreme Court of Canada?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it never came up whether this matter would go directly before the Supreme Court of Canada because this would be unthinkable. It would be the most hostile act towards the people of this Province that had ever been perpetrated by a central Canadian Government. Because the fact of the matter is that this is a constitutional issue that has arisen between the federal and provincial government. Within the history of this nation, there has never been an instance where there has been a direct reference unless there had been an agreement between the federal and the provincial governments. The Supreme Court of the Province concern is usually the one of original jurisdiction. So certainly that never came up, that situation never came up.

Now the position that we are in now is that we are prepared to negotiate if there is agreement, as I say, from the federal government on these points which constitute the basic foundations. In the meantime, we have the matter before the Supreme Court of

MR. MARSHALL: Newfoundland. We have a great deal of confidence in the court case, in the strength of the court case of this Province. And I believe really, although this was not said, that as a result of the initiative of the government, as a result once again of this government taking the initiative and asserting the rights of the people of Newfoundland through court, that to one degree or another that has tempered a little bit perhaps the attitude of the federal government. Because heretofore, for reasons I cannot comprehend, they have had an idea that our court case has not been as strong as the court case of the federal government. It is stronger in our view and it is a very strong case. So we are operating from the point of view of the court case, number one; but I can tell the hon. gentlemen there opposite if the federal government wishes to sit down and negotiate in what we style as good faith, we are prepared to do it as in any instance it is possible to negotiate a settlement between people of good will short of court. We have the good will; we now wait to see whether the federal government has equal good will towards us and the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALLAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) I want to ask the Premier a question coming out of the Auditor General's report which was tabled last week. Just to give the Premier some background, on page 48 the Auditor General refers to a gratuitous payment of public funds and deficiencies in engineering design estimates.

MR. CALLAN: With regard to the \$12,500 overpayment, out of court settlement really, this gratuitous payment, as the Auditor General calls it, let me ask the Premier, and in leading up to it let me refer the Premier to the departmental observations which was also tabled on Friday. It says, 'Many factors can come into play in changing quantities on unit price contracts' this was a unit price contract and even with the best of planning significant over runs or under runs can occur. In this case there was an under run and an out of court settlement. The departmental observation says this: "Most jurisdictions tendering unit price contracts allow for renegotiation of unit prices if any item is 15 per cent of the estimated bid quantity. Although there has been significant pressure from the construction industry to introduce this renegotiation clause in our contracts, the department has consistently refused." Let me ask the Premier then quite simply why has the Department of Transportation, or his administration or whatever, why have they consistently refused to use this sort of renegotiation system?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Primarily, Mr. Speaker, because very often it will lead to a lot of companies taking advantage of that particular procedure and the way we try to operate is to keep them within the bounds of whatever the contract was. But if from time to time, as in this case, it does occur and it seems in our best judgement, both from the Department of Transportation, in this case, and the Department of Justice, that there is a case to be made from the contractor's point of view, then if you can get a reasonable settlement out of court, fine and dandy. But once you establish that as a practice you might be encouraging less attention to detail and additional kinds of requests coming forward from contractors looking for that 15 per cent. So up until this point in time we have stuck to our guns and said no, but if

PREMIER PECKFORD: some contractor, as in this case, came forward with that was perceived to be a legitimate case after it was fully viewed, well, then you could try to do an out of court settlement. But to establish that as policy might encourage a lot more out of court settlements than is presently the case.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier has essentially said that there is still no thought given to implementing this plus or minus fifteen per cent item. In my supplementary, and referring again to page 48 of the Auditor General's Report, it says, 'The department acknowledged that the design work was inadequate on this project.' The design work was inadequate. 'The estimate for the project was made up simply by an engineer driving to and looking at the location,' an example of lack of design planning. Let me ask the Premier then is his administration, now or since this occurred, is the Premier's administration ensuring that design work is done adequately and properly so that there will not be any more of these out of court or in court settlements?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, absolutely.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Well, okay then. If the Premier is so quick to answer yes to that one, let me move to the top of page 49 of the Auditor General's Report where it says, "Certain road projects"- here is a second reason, by the way, for this out of court settlement-"Certain road projects for their ridings were selected by members of the House of Assembly." Obviously they were PC members since -

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I can guarantee that.

MR. CALLAN: - I or no one on this side had a chance. They were selected by members of the House of Assembly "on a moments's notice" and estimates and tenders' - estimates and tenders' had to be compiled on extremely short notice. It was also indicated that

MR. CALLAN: most of the work selected by the members to be undertaken was not projects that the Department of Transportation had anticipated and, hence, no design work had been completed.' So let me ask the Premier then, when he answers, yes, so quickly, is he also insuring that MHAs on the government benches will not continue this practice or, if it is going to be continued, will members on both sides of the House be given the same opportunity?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, members of the House of Assembly write, I take it, to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) from time to time, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) makes recommendations to Cabinet, and Cabinet finally decides on what the road's programme is going to be for the Province, what the water and sewer programme is going to be for the Province, and that is where the decisions are made. They are made by Cabinet after the minister and the officials take into consideration the representations from the members of the House of Assembly. Now I do not know how good a job the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) does in representing his district. All I know is that there are members on this side that do a heck of a job in representing their districts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

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

MR. WARREN: He is doing better than Bas Jamieson would do.

MR. CALLAN: A final supplementary. Mr. Speaker, the Premier wants to know what kind of a job the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is doing.

MR. CALLAN: The Premier knows that he already has two letters coming out of the last episode that we had in the district of Bellevue, the last election there, regarding a bridge in Chapel Arm, for example, which design work has been finished and completed on for years and years. So let me ask the Premier once again - the Premier says that the members, you know, go to Cabinet and they make representations. The Auditor General does not say that. The Auditor General says that it was selections made by members of the House of Assembly 'on a moment's notice'. Let me ask the Premier again, is he going to include us on the Opposition benches? Are we going to be allowed as well?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, what happens is that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) makes representation to Cabinet and it is only after a Cabinet order is issued that projects are begun and that is the procedure that is followed. That is done after there has been a fair amount of representation from members of the House of Assembly, from people in the local area and so on. But there is no roads project started unless Cabinet has decided that the roads project should go ahead. And that is the way it is supposed to be.

I know the hon. member has problems in his district with that bridge, also with other roads in his district. That is not the only problem the hon. member has with that bridge. The hon. member has many, many problems in his district and has had them for some time, I think.

MR. CALLAN: I know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we will try as best we can over the next few years -

MR. CALLAN: Another problem is the Markland Hospital where the Premier was born in 1942.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am very happy that the hon. member takes note of my birth. It is something that I did not want to bring up in the House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I did not want to bring up in the House today that I was born in Markland, in the great district of Bellevue, in 1942 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - but if the hon. member wants to raise that as an issue in this House, well, so be it. I do not know if the sun was shining that day or whether it was thunder and lightening or whatever. But I am more interested right now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member is more interested in my birth date, I am not. I am more interested in his bridge in Chapel Arm. I am more interested in the other roads. I am more interested in the Markland Hospital and all the other problems that the hon. member has on his plate. I know he is driven crazy by his constituents.

MR. CALLAN: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. member wants to ensure that the gradual slide in popularity -

MR. CALLAN: Yes or no on the bridge.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the hon. member wants to ensure that the gradual slide in popularity and that great majority that he started off with a few years ago does not continue to go down so that next time he is no longer the member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am completely
amazed. I might point out that whenever the Premier goes on
with that little tirade it means that he is trying to divert
attention.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, I am completely
amazed that the Premier would get up and defend the action of
MHAs going directly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - Mr. Speaker, that

MR. HODDER: the Premier would defend the action of members going directly to the minister, because the Auditor General clearly says that these particular roads were done at a moment's notice without proper design.

MR. NEARY: Pork barrelling! Pork barrelling!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to ask the Premier: How does the government decide priorities in road building? And if there are priorities, would the Premier make them available to the Province? Because obviously there are roads that need to be done worse than others in the Province. And so therefore if the government does have priorities they should let the House of Assembly know what they are.

MR. NEARY: Partisan politics.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is disappointed that I defend the right of every member of this House to contact the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), I am going to continue to defend it. I think the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has every right in this world to make representation to the Minister of Transportation.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I do not think that should ever be flaunted. That is a very good right. What is the member for Port au Port going to do if he cannot go and speak to the Minister of Transportation about roads in Port au Port?

MR. BAIRD: Demand the right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will stand up for the member for Port au Port, and that is what I will. I will stand up for the member for Fogo and defend his right to go and sit down in the minister's office and say to the Minister of Transportation, 'I have a bad road in my district and I want

PREMIER PECKFORD: something done on this road!

So to preface my answer I must say to the hon. member that I will continue to defend the right of every member of this House to be able to go and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - speak to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) about problems on roads in his district. That is number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, obviously there are many factors that go into establishing the roads programme or all programmes. If there is a need had the need is in the area, how bad the road is: how much traffic goes over the road and how much fish goes over the road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: All the business spinoffs, the number of people that are involved in it. And, of course, the active and aggressive way in which the members make representation to the minister. Because obviously these members over here think it is wrong to make representation to the Minister of Transportation. I do not think -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the members over here feel that way at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The arrogance of that government. Bring in the television cameras.

May 17, 1982

Tape 258

PK - 3

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister has only been in that position for the past few days, but concerning the Auditor General's report, again on page 45, 3,210 complimentary tickets from the Arts and Culture Centre -

MR. TULK: What?

MR. WARREN: 3,210. I would just like to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth

MR. WARREN: who were those complimentary tickets issued to?

MR. CALLAN: I got one.

MR. BARRETT: Ah, you will never be able to respond to that one.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, obviously I would need a bit of notice, so maybe I should take the question as notice. I do not know who they were issued to, that is the answer.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister: The minister said he would take it as notice. Is the minister telling me that maybe tomorrow or in the next day or so he will come back with an itemized list of 3,210 names -

MR. BARRETT: Yes. (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: You are a secretary now. Do not forget it.

MR. WARREN: - of to whom those tickets were issued to?

MR. CALLAN: You are a \$14,000 secretary now, do not forget that.

MR. BARRETT: What a waste of time.

MR. WARREN: And if it is -

MR. CALLAN: Behave yourself.

MR. WARREN: Well, it may be a waste of time, but it also includes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Were they ministers or members on the government side?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, we are concerned because it is over \$20,000 of the taxpayers' money of this Province.

Now, there were some for the Lieutenant-Governor and for dignitaries visiting the Province, I see nothing wrong with it at all. I am just wondering how many members of the House of Assembly have been given complimentary tickets to attend features at the Arts and Culture Centre.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member wants me to provide a list of all the ones; now he has narrowed it down, he wants to know the names of the members of the House of Assembly who have received them, on both sides, I presume.

MR. CALLAN: Oh, yes.

MR. SIMMS: He wants to know on both sides. Well, I would have to take notice of that. But let me say this first of all, we do not particularly agree with the recommendation of the Auditor General and his comments regarding complimentary tickets. And I welcome the support of the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), because he has just said basically the same thing. However, what we have said we will do is try to put in place a specific policy specifying the circumstances under which tickets can be given and who will have the authority to issue those tickets. We will be looking at that as per the recommendation of the Auditor General. With respect to the other question, I will take it as notice.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):
of the Opposition.

The hon. the Leader

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice(Mr. Ottenheimer) - and I am glad to see he is back in his seat after a prolonged absence from the House on official business, I presume.

Would the hon.

gentleman tell the House if he has ever given the Minister of Finance(Dr. Collins) or the Cabinet a valid legal opinion on whether or not it is legal for the provincial government to borrow from the sinking fund, from the Consolidated sinking fund, as was reported in the Auditor General's Report tabled in the House on Friday? Is there a valid

MR. NEARY: legal opinion available?
and if there is would the hon. gentleman undertake to
table it in the House?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, my memory is
that the Department of Justice was asked for an opinion
on this and gave a verbal opinion to the effect that it
was legal, that it was something which could legally be
done.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon.
the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General, who gives
the advice to the Cabinet, if there was a valid legal
opinion given and the hon. gentleman answered me by
saying that there was an oral opinion given. Now in
my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is not a valid legal
opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now when we are dealing with
such a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, would the hon.
gentleman tell us whether or not it would be preferable
to have an opinion in writing and can the hon. gentleman
get an opinion for this House? Because I think it is a
very important matter, Mr. Speaker, when you have money
being put into the consolidated sinking fund out of
consolidated revenue and then borrowed back by the same
government that put it into the consolidated sinking fund.
That seems to me to be highly improper. I do not know
whether it is illegal or not, I can only take the hon.
gentleman's word for the oral legal opinion that was

MR. NEARY: given. But surely in a matter as important as this, will the hon. gentleman undertake to get a legal opinion for this House?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly there was a legal opinion given to the Department of Finance by the Department of Justice to the effect that it was legal to borrow from the sinking fund. It was an oral opinion, not a written one. I would suggest that that would not affect its validity, I mean the fact that it would be oral rather than written. Also, certainly a factor to bear in mind is that it is consistent with previous practice. If my memory is correct, in 1966, which would have been under a Liberal administration, and in 1972, which would have been under a Progressive Conservative administration, a similar practice was followed and I would think that probably part of the reason that it was oral rather than verbal is the fact that it was quite straightforward a matter on the part of the solicitors in the Department of Justice who were

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 261

MJ - 1

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: asked to give that opinion and of course they were aware that it was consistent with practice. Now I do not think on the second part of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. S. Neary) question, probably I would have to think about that, but it probably would not be appropriate to offer legal advice to the House as such. I think that would be - you know, if there were a committee, say a Public Accounts Committee or this or that they would have their own legal officer who could you know give legal advice to a Committee of the House. But I do not think it would be appropriate. Obviously it is largely hypothetical because the hon. gentlemen opposite know that the advice given to the government was that it was legal to borrow from the sinking fund, so naturally that advice would be the same to anybody, including the House of Assembly, although strictly speaking it probably would not be appropriate to give legal advice to the House of Assembly as such.

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

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

MR. NEARY: It seems to be highly irregular. in a matter as important as this, for the government not to have a legal opinion in writing. That is most unusual and irregular. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman now if he will tell us- the hon. gentleman obviously does not have it in writing- will he tell us who gave the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) the legal opinion?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, two matters there; one, I certainly would have a quite different opinion than the hon. Leader of the Opposition on the fact that it would be inappropriate if it not be in writing. There is a great deal of bureaucracy, there is a great deal of paper floating around from various

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: government departments and, you know, if a person is asked an opinion, and in the opinion of the person who was asked the opinion it is quite straightforward and there has been previous practice behind it and it is very straightforward, well it would appear to me that the most expeditious way is to say, 'Yes, in our opinion this is quite legal and it happened in 1966 and it happened in 1972 and there is the act and there is nothing contrary to the act.' Well, I suppose that is a matter of opinion but I do not really think having it on paper alters the fact. Now with respect to - would I indicate who gave that legal advice, that might be inappropriate. There is sort of a principle I think, to the anonymity of the public service. It was the Department of Justice and certainly as Minister of Justice, as indeed all ministers, I am responsible for those on my staff, just as the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) or Education (Ms. L. Verge) is for theirs. So to identify which of the, let us say, twenty lawyers or more, who

MR. OTTENHEIMER: worked with the Department of Justice, you know, may have articulated that opinion would, I think, be inappropriate. It was the Department of Justice and as minister of the department certainly the principle of ministerial responsibility is operative and I certainly fully recognize it and fully accept it.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well, we will get back at this one again tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with other business -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries twenty-seven Grade X students and two teachers from Cape John Collegiate in La Scie, White Bay, with their teachers Mr. Brett and Mr. Thoms from the district represented by the hon. member from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit is most interesting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Health Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. O'PENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act", and "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act".

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I have answers to two questions which were contained in Friday's Order Paper asked by the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

The Detailed answer to one of the questions is here and the answer to the other question having to do with the cost of renovations to the minister's office for the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981, is there was no cost, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Address in Reply.
The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege today to lead off in this motion of reply.
And, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: I want at this point to congratulate you, Sir - a little late, but somehow you get to do these things in the Throne Speech. Because of the way things went I did not get that opportunity. So I want to congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment to the Chair. I am sure that you are going to carry on the job, the great job that has been carried on by Speakers of this House and by yourself, Sir, when you were a Speaker sometime previous. I want to congratulate as well the Deputy Speaker and the other people who have been given appointments in the House, the Chairman of Committees, and I suppose, congratulate all members who have managed to get themselves elected or re-elected, whatever the case might be, in the last election.

Mr. Speaker, in the last week government members have spent considerable time gloating over their recent victory at the polls, and I suppose that is understandable. They have missed few opportunities to do so and also, of course, to remind hon. members on this side of the House of what happened to us, the substantial reduction, if you will, in our numbers. And allow me to say, Sir, that though we are only eight, we are proud, very proud that we were able to stem the tide -

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: - that we were able to fight against the current, that we were each individually strong enough to ward off or to overcome, if you will, the infectiousness and the contagiousness of the Premier's cause. It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to go along with the tide, to be swept along with the tide, to be swept along with the current, but we on this side of the House,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, were able to ward off, as I said, the contagiousness of the cause and for that reason we are very proud, Mr. Speaker. There must be something about the eight members over here that we were able to stem that tide, that we were able to stem that current and each go in with overwhelming majorities. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of that. We are proud, Mr. Speaker, that we were able to resist the emotion, if you will, which the Premier created before and during the election. Although we are only eight, we are proud we were each able to resist this

MR. LUSH:

emotion and to come in here to be the Opposition. And we are proud, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of democracy and for democratic government. We are glad that the eight districts, that the people of these eight districts voted for an Opposition. I am not sure that they knew they were voting for an Opposition at the time that they voted but, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those of us with any experience running elections can certainly sense a certain kind of feeling when it boils down to an overwhelming majority of forty-four to eight, or of thirty-nine to three, whatever the situation is. But, Mr. Speaker, I have always been told that our form of government, that our form of democratic government to be effective needs an Opposition, it needs a two party system. I suppose we could have more than that but I do not advocate more than the two parties Mr. Speaker I am a great believer in that, but generally we refer to our form of government as the two party system and in order for that to be effective, in order for that to be effective and efficient we must have an Opposition. And whether that is right or wrong, Mr. Speaker, is not for me to say but it seems to be a fair way. I think it was Sir Winston Churchill who, in talking about our form of government, made some suggestion that it was the worst form of government with the exception of all the others. So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, it has been my feeling and from what I have heard and read by experts in the field on government that it is rather axiomatic, I suppose, that a good government requires a good Opposition. And though, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I necessarily agree with the hon. the House Leader when he mentioned the fact that quality is not always contingent upon quantity. Mr. Speaker, that is true for many situations

MR. LUSH: but the truth of the matter is that in politics numbers are very important, they are very important for the practical practice and execution of politics. Numbers are indeed very important. And forty-four, Mr. Speaker, can beat eight any day. And that is the stark reality of the situation, that forty-four can beat eight any day.

MR. TULK): But you are not scared.

MR. LUSH: I think there are some forms of cards where that is not true, but just about in every other situation that I know of, particularly in politics, forty-four beats eight every day.

MR. TULK: But you are not scared.

MR. LUSH: And I do not think - as I said there are cards, there is a game of Eights I think where that does not apply. There is another game called School where that does not apply, but in politics, Mr. Speaker, forty-four beats eight any day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, we are exceptionally proud that the constituents, the voters of eight districts decided to vote for us, decided to put us in as the Official Opposition to at least give us some semblance of democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that despite the current and despite the issues and despite the tactics used by hon. gentlemen opposite that we were able to stem that tide to give us, as I said, some semblance of democracy.

It was difficult, Mr. Speaker, it was very difficult, as I said, stemming the tide. It was very difficult to fight the kind of literature and the kinds of techniques, I was going to say 'tactics', Mr.

MR. LUSH: Speaker, I will not say that, the kind of techniques used by the P.C. Party. I do not know what happened in the other districts, Mr. Speaker, but I know in my own that the big issue was to put a member in on the government side with the understanding, of course, that the Progressive Conservative Party was going to form the government, and there was this strong urging, if you will, by the P.C. Party to vote for the person on the government side because if you put a person on the government side then your district would get more, they would get more in terms of public services, they would get more development, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: They were going to get roads, and water and sewer.

MR. LUSH: I remember one poor lady telling me that if the P.C. Government got in she was told that the economy would pick up by 100 per cent in the Terra Nova district. So, Mr. Speaker, that was pretty strong stuff to overcome. But there is nothing illegal about it, I suppose. I do not know of anything illegal about saying that kind of a thing.

MR. LUSH: It is certainly not ethical, I do not believe. It is certainly not ethical. I did not ask the people to vote for me, in three elections that I ran in, because I was going to be on the government side. I asked the people to vote for me on the basis of my own merits and of the party that I stood for. Regardless of whether I was going to be in government or opposition, that I was going to serve them well. So, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an approach, I believe, is something that has got to be wiped out of the electoral process to give people the free choice, Mr. Speaker, that they deserve.

But these were the kind of tactics, Mr. Speaker, that were used, and I would certainly hope that that is not the kind of government that we have, a government which would punish people for the way they voted. Surely each and every district of this Province is entitled to fair, just and equal treatment. They are not entitled, Mr. Speaker, to all of the monies granted by this Province, they are not entitled to some other district's monies, and they are not entitled to more than some other districts, but, Mr. Speaker, entitled to fair and an equal share.

Surely there is no district, no provincial constituency in the entire Province, irrespective of how it votes, or if it does not vote at all, there is no district, Mr. Speaker, that should be penalized for the way it votes. And I cannot for one see any connection between how a person votes and that district getting fair and just and equal treatment from its government. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that that will not be the case. And I hope that that will not be the case, and I hope that when the budget comes down that we will be able to say that that was not the case. If it is, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an approach is offensive, not in accordance with democratic principles. As I said, I do not say that kind of a thing is illegal, but it is certainly not -

MR. ROBERTS: It is certainly not untrue.

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 266

NM - 2

MR. LUSH:

It is not ethical, Mr. Speaker,
and not in accordance with democratic principles as we perceive
them today. As a matter of fact I find it rather abhorrent and

MR. LUSH:

insulting to people's intelligence; But we will see, Mr. Speaker, we will see how this government plans to operate very shortly, we will see. And we will see, Mr. Speaker, what will happen with the allocations of funds for paving of roads in this district very shortly; upgrading, reconstruction and paving of roads, we will see. And as I have said, with this large number now, with this overwhelming majority, there is an onerous responsibility on the government to see that every district in this Province is treated justly, fairly and equally.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the numbers over here, the group of eight. I do not think it is the smallest Opposition that has been in this House since Confederation, I do not think it is. I believe maybe the smallest Opposition might have been in 1966 - I could be corrected on that - I think it was in 1966 when there were forty-two seats and the government of the day won thirty-nine and the Opposition of the day had three. So it was thirty-nine to three, or a ratio or a proportion of thirteen to one. That is for every thirteen members on the government side there was one on the Opposition side. Today we have forty-four versus eight and my mathematics make that to be eleven to two. So for every eleven members on the government side there are two members on this side, Overwhelming, mind you.

MR. TULK: Five and a half to one.

MR. LUSH: Five and a half to one, my hon. colleague says and that sounds reasonable -

MR. TULK: There are a lot of halves over there.

MR. LUSH: - five and a half to one. So there is no question, Mr. Speaker, that that certainly demonstrates the size of the government and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think demonstrates the onerous responsibility

MR. LUSH: placed on this government, Mr. Speaker, to treat the people of this Province fairly, justly and equally.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that there was no great - probably it has not been the smallest percentage of the popular vote - I do not believe that that was the case either. This time we on this side of the House got approximately 35 per cent of the popular vote. I believe the case in question where I referred to 1966 when it was thirty-nine to three, that the popular vote at that time for the Opposition was approximately 33 per cent. So we are not the smallest Opposition that has ever been in this House, neither have we obtained the smallest percentage of the popular vote. But, Mr. Speaker, there is an important point to be made, an important point to be repeated and realized, I believe, and

MR. LUSH:

that is although we are only eight members, and though we are delighted and proud to represent the eight constituencies, the constituency of Bellevue, of Fogo, Port au Port, LaPoile, Strait of Belle Isle, Torngat Mountains, Eagle River and Terra Nova, we also, Mr. Speaker, from a certain point of view, and in my opinion from a real point of view, have an obligation towards approximately the 35 per cent of the people throughout the Province who voted Liberal. We have an obligation, Mr. Speaker, to that 35 per cent, the people who exercised their franchise to vote Liberal in the last election Province-wide, not only for these hon. members here present but for members, for Liberal candidates right throughout the Province. Certainly, our greatest responsibility of all though is toward all the people, all of the people in this Province. Because, Mr. Speaker, each and every member of this House of Assembly represents not only the constituency from which he or she is elected but, Mr. Speaker, from a certain point of view, as I said before, represents all of the people. We are not merely members from a particular district, not merely a member from Stephenville or a member from Fogo, but, Mr. Speaker, we are members of the House of Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, these are not my ideas, that is the idea of many experts in the field of politics and parliamentary democracy, that as a member of a Parliament, a Parliament is an association of a nation, and this situation we are talking about, an association of the Province. So from that point of view, Mr. Speaker, we are not merely members for a particular district but we are members, we represent

MR. LUSH: all of the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and are trying to bring in policies and programmes for the general good of the total population with no prejudices and no malice against any district. That is parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker. And that is an important point, I think. I wanted to make that today. In view of the fact that we sit over here as eight members, I wanted to make that important point.

MR. LUSH:

So, Sir, approximately thirty-five per cent of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who exercised their franchise in the last election voted for various Liberal candidates throughout Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not a minority, thirty-five per cent, it is not a splinter group. It is a substantial and considerable majority, thirty-five per cent of those people who voted. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that our great obligations, from the point of view expressed, is that we represent all of the people of this Province, that we do not merely represent just a district but that we represent all of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. As a member of the House of Assembly, we have that obligation towards the well-being, Mr. Speaker, and the good of the entire Province and its people. Clearly, then, clearly, an onerous responsibility has fallen on this government as a result of this overwhelming victory in the last election.

But, Mr. Speaker, all of that is not said on this side to indicate that we are going to be timid. As an Opposition we intend to perform to the best of our ability.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: We intend, Mr. Speaker, to be an Opposition. Certainly we will oppose government. And I think it was Sir Winston Churchill who said that that was the role of an Opposition, to oppose. We certainly plan to do that, Mr. Speaker. We do not plan to oppose for the sake of opposing. We will also be supportive of government policy. We will also be supportive of government legislation. We will also be supportive of programmes designed for the benefit of the people of this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, we intend to be an Opposition. We intend to fulfill the duties that are ours because we are the

MR. LUSH: official Opposition. And, Mr. Speaker, we intend to support the government on its mandate. We intend to support the government, Mr. Speaker, on its offshore issue. We intend to support them on that. We have done so in the past. Every major piece of legislation that went through this House in the last two or three years relating to the offshore, we on this side of the House supported it, wholeheartedly we have supported it.

MR. TULK: We did not play politics with it.

MR. LUSH: We did not play politics with it. We supported it because we believed in the ownership, we believed in the development of our offshore resources and we still believe in them and we believe that we own them. And, Mr. Speaker, we will support the government on any initiatives in this area. We will support them on the mandate that they have gotten from the people of Newfoundland in that respect. And we support the government with respect to its hydro electric resources to getting transmission rights through Quebec. We have supported them on that. Why there was a major piece of legislation that went through the last session on that and we supported that, Mr. Speaker. We will support them. We will support them on initiatives with respect to the development of the fishery. We will support them on that. And if this means, Mr. Speaker, opposing the federal government, so be it.

MR. TULK: Right.

MR. LUSH: We will oppose the federal government. But, Sir, we will not oppose the federal government for the sake of opposing any more than we will oppose the provincial government for the sake of opposing or to make cheap political points. We will

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 269

ah-3

MR. LUSH:
not do that, Sir.

not do that. We will

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. T. LUSH Mr. Speaker, we will not be like a bull in a china shop. We will select our own issues on which we will oppose the federal government. We will oppose the government discriminately. We will oppose the federal government on selective issues. And, Mr. Speaker, throughout this Throne Speech - I have now come to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, after these gem remarks, after these preliminary remarks - one can see a defeatist attitude has been accepted by this government. A defeatist's attitude. If we do not get the offshore, Mr. Speaker, it is all over. We have no confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the development of the traditional resources of this Province. If the offshore does not come and we do not get it in the way that the provincial government wants it, it is all over. Everything is on hold. And, Mr. Speaker, as one goes through the Throne Speech we can see that that is the tune, that is the line, that is the song the whole way through, that without the offshore that this Province is doomed to poverty. All of a sudden we have come to the end of the line. All of a sudden the traditional resources that have been the main reasons for the development of this Province, all of a sudden that is gone. No more can we develop the forestry, no more can we develop agriculture, no more can we develop mining, no more can we develop tourism, unless, Mr. Speaker, we get revenues from the offshore. And everything is on hold until that magic time, until that time in history when we start getting revenues from the offshore, which will be 1992 or 1994, I am told in ten to twelve years. Now that do we do in the meantime, Mr. Speaker? But that is the attitude expressed through this whole Throne Speech, that is we do not get down to business and get this offshore developed then we are doomed to poverty. This is our last chance. Well, Mr. Speaker,

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 270

MJ -2

MR. T. LUSH: we do not happen to believe that it is our last chance. Certainly it is very important and we want to see the offshore development, we want to see it develop in a way that will give maxium returns to this Province. But we do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are doomed to poverty, that everything is all over if we do not

MR. LUSH: get that done now. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about now. We are concerned about now. We are concerned about how the people of this Province are going to live in the interim. We are concerned about that. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I want to move an amendment to the Throne Speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not cry.

MR. LUSH: I want to make an amendment to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I move that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "that", and replace them with the following; "This House reaffirms its faith in the future of Newfoundland and Labrador and calls upon the ministry to present to the House and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador a detailed and specific outline of their goals for the development of this Province and the means by which they plan to achieve them."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: This is an amendment, Mr. Speaker, that has been passed time and time again, for Your Honour's information, in terms of ruling in favour of the motion; it has been placed time and time again but possibly more fluently and more effectively this time.

MR. TULK: That is right, Never read like that before.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): I will adjourn the House for five minutes while I consider this.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I have reviewed the motion put forward by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and it is in order, and being an amendment to the Throne Speech it is considered to be a motion of non-confidence and the hon. member shall have another thirty minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: It is in order, Mr. Speaker, but very unwise.

MR. SPEAKER: According to Standing Orders, the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, a minister moving a government order, a member replying thereto immediately after such minister, a member moving a motion of non-confidence and a minister replying thereto shall not speak for more than sixty minutes at any time in any debate. The hon. gentleman has spoken for thirty minutes now and he has another thirty.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know Your Honour would not want to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you questioning the Speaker?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not questioning,

I am just asking for direction from the Chair.

As Your Honour knows, the rule is that my hon. colleague was speaking on the main motion and he has sixty minutes over and above that. If he moves a vote of non-confidence he has sixty minutes over and above that, and each member who speaks after can speak for two half-hour periods, one on the amendment and one on the main motion itself. My hon. colleague can carry on, but I believe, Your Honour, if you would check with the table, he has an extra hour, one hour more.

MR. SPEAKER: This point was questioned in the Speaker's Office when we were discussing this and

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): it was recommended that the Speaker, as ruled on Page 17 of our Standing Orders 49.(2) says that "a member moving a motion of non-confidence and the Minister replying thereto, shall not speak for more than sixty minutes at a time in any debate", and 'any' was underlined. Sixty minutes of any debate, so he has thirty -

MR. NEARY: That is sixty minutes on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: It does not say sixty minutes, it says sixty minutes in any debate.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps Your Honour would like to take a few more minutes. It is very important.

MR. SPEAKER: We will allow the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) to continue with his debate and I will have this checked as he is speaking.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: As Mr. Speaker indicated, this is a vote of no confidence and we were very hesitant and very reluctant to do this because we want to clarify the situation, Mr. Speaker, we want to make things crystal clear here, that in view of the fact that the government just received an overwhelming mandate from the people of this Province on certain issues we want to name and identify and delineate these issues to make it crystal clear to hon. members and the people of this Province on what it is that we agree with the government.

Mr. Speaker, we agree with the government on the offshore issue. We agree with the government on that. I mentioned that earlier, Mr. Speaker. We agree with the government on that and we support them on that. Mr. Speaker, we agree with them on trying to reopen, re-negotiate the Upper Churchill contract. We agree with them on that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, let it be crystal clear, we agree with them on getting a corridor through Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. LUSH: We agree with that, Mr. Speaker, a corridor for the transmission of hydro power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: On these three issues, Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake. Let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, that we agree on these issues. The government fought them in an election, Mr. Speaker. They got a mandate from the people of this Province. And far be it from us to disagree but, Mr. Speaker, we agreed long before the government were given the mandate. We agreed long before this election on these three major

MR. LUSH: issues. But, Mr. Speaker, very importantly, we do not think that the Province should be put on hold, Mr. Speaker, while these issues and while these developments are being initiated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: We do not think that the Province should be put on hold, Mr. Speaker. We do not think that the Province should close down. We do not

MR. LUSH: think the government should close its doors while these items are being negotiated. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, that is why the amendment. And though I have said, Mr. Speaker, we agree with the government on these three major issues, it does not necessarily follow that we agree with the approach by the government. For example, Mr. Speaker, we did not agree today with the approach by the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to try and intimidate the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, we will not be intimidated, we will not be bamboozled, we are going to do our job, Mr. Speaker, as an Opposition. So we may not agree with the approaches -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. LUSH: - but, Mr. Speaker, we agree with the policies. We agree with these three policies and we are going to be supportive of the government, we are going to be supportive, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBES: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we have come to a - Mr. Speaker, I can see it all, what the procedures are going to be in this session.

MR. TULK: That is true.

MR. LUSH: In this session, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a case of blaming everything on Ottawa all the way through, fed-bashing the whole way through. We just have to take a look at the resolutions, Mr. Speaker, the resolutions for Private Members' Day, I do not know whether hon. members have taken a look at them but look at them, Mr. Speaker, 90 per cent of them -

MR. NEARY: Every one of them.

MR. LUSH: - 90 per cent of them and the hon. the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) says, 'All of them'. And I have not looked at all of them but if he says all of them I will agree with him.

MR. NEARY: All on the other side.

MR. LUSH: All of them are anti-Ottawa, anti-federal government. And, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be the approach. And there is a real method in this policy, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: In this madness.

MR. LUSH: - a real method to this and the idea of it, of course, is to take attention from what is really happening in this Province and to blame everything on Ottawa. It is just a smoke screen, Mr. Speaker. Now there is nobody on this side of the House naive enough to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government's input into this Province is not important, but certainly this provincial government have certain responsibilities and in many fashion they should acknowledge what their responsibilities are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. LUSH: They should acknowledge what their responsibilities are instead of, Mr. Speaker, shifting and laying the blame on the federal government to say that this Province must be put on hold, that nothing can happen in this Province anymore, nothing can happen in forestry, nothing can happen in agriculture, nothing can take place with respect to the further development of the expansion of our traditional natural resources, Mr. Speaker, without, again, getting the offshore, getting revenues from that. And however long it takes to get that, we must sit back and wait and starve, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime. We do not happen to believe in that approach, we do not happen to believe in that policy. We have confidence in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, we have confidence in our people and we have confidence in the traditional resource base of this Province and we believe that we can develop it until such time as the three items that I have talked about the government is trying to negotiate, we can develop

MR. LUSH:

our natural resources to provide jobs and the standard of living that is acceptable and satisfactory to the people of our Province in the meanwhile.

So, Mr. Speaker, that I hope clearly enunciates and articulates and delineates our position with respect to the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we acknowledge the importance of the federal government, but we also realize that the provincial government have a responsibility. Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of years the provincial government have reduced themselves to a municipality. They may as well have put a sign on the door and said 'Out of business . We are not here any more.'

MR. TULK: Municipal Government of Newfoundland.

MR. LUSH: They have eroded, Mr. Speaker, the power, the authority and the influence of a provincial government. That is what they have done. So much so now that our people do not expect anything from our government practically. They do not expect anything from them. It is a wise move, mind you, but it is not the reality of the situation. It is not the reality of the situation, Mr. Speaker, This provincial government clearly have a responsibility in many areas of this Province, many areas which come under their direct control for the development of this Province.

What about our forestry, Mr. Speaker? And before getting into that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to allude to some of the items in the Throne Speech to demonstrate what it is that I have been saying, how they have been trying to slough off their total responsibility on the federal government.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech starts off with "Since my last address to this hon. House the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador have passed judgment on the performance and policies of my government". Mr. Speaker, I think that was taking great liberty with the results of the election. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - to say that the people of Newfoundland were passing a judgment on their performance. I would like to see this government go to the people on their performance and on their record. Mr. Speaker, that was not the issue in the election, and hon. members opposite know very well that that is certainly taking a great degree of liberty with the results of the election when we say that the people of this Province were passing a judgment on their performance.

Mr. Speaker, just to go through a couple of points. Page 2 it says, talking about the new constitution, "The new constitution recognizes the importance of resource management and control as the principal instrument of provincial policy".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, again the suggestion, the subtle suggestion is to imply that the federal government is preventing this Province from developing its resources. There is no pinpointing, there is no emphasizing of the resources to which they are referring, no pinpointing of the resources to which they are alluding, but Mr. Speaker, trying to give the impression that the federal government is responsible for the total development of all the resources in this Province, a misrepresentation to say the least, Mr. Speaker. A misrepresentation of the facts to say that the Constitution recognizes the importance of resource management and control as the principle instrument of provincial policies.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, that is the case, but the inference is that the federal government is preventing us from developing our natural resources in totality. Page three it says, "My government is extremely pleased that the new Constitution accepts and reaffirms provincial natural resource ownership and control." Again suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that that always was not the case, assuming that that was not always the case, that the resources, the implication is, that the resources were owned by the federal government. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a misrepresentation of the reality of the situation and this is again a deliberate attempt, Mr. Speaker, a deliberate attempt to undermine the federal government, and by so doing to exonerate the provincial government for all its shortcomings and its failings. But, Mr. Speaker, that will not wash, that will not wash, Mr. Speaker.

And look at the third paragraph, Mr. Speaker, on page three. I am sure Your Honour will not agree with the inference and the implications in this paragraph. It says, "My Government has responded to the basic requirement to recapture control of our natural resources by taking bold initiatives in all sectors." Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to

MR. LUSH: regain control of our natural resources by taking bold initiatives in all sectors not just the offshore, not just the fisheries, but the forestry. They are going to recapture control of the forestry, of mining, recapture control of agriculture - I did not know we had it lost, Mr. Speaker, I did not know that we lost control of agriculture. I knew the government was not doing anything about it, I knew that.

MR. NEARY: He thought it was the root maggot.

MR. LUSH: I knew that. I did not know that we lost control of our forestry. I knew that the spruce budworm was infesting it pretty badly

MR. T. LUSH: and it had practically won the battle but the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. C. Power) he has told me that he is winning the battle now. He mentioned that he is winning the battle. But, Mr. Speaker, note the implications, note the unsavory inferences. Note them, Mr. Speaker. My Government has responded to the basic requirement to recapture control of our natural resources by taking bold initiatives in all sectors, offshore, fisheries, forestry, mining, agriculture and hydro electricity.' Mr. Speaker, it was not good enough to identify the areas. It was not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to be frank, it was not good enough to be candid but to give the implication to our people that this Province had no control of any of its resources. None! And it is the big, bad federal government that controls all of that and is preventing this Province from developing. What a cop-out, Mr. Speaker. What a cop-out. A cop-out, Mr. Speaker, of the highest order. So, Mr. Speaker, going through the whole bit you can see a deliberate attempt to lay blame on the federal government for the shortcomings and the failures of this provincial government.

MR. B. TULK: They do not care where it is at as long as they have a scapegoat.

MR. LUSH: Another line it said, Mr. Speaker, talking about how the Constitution embodies the principles of ownership to our resources but it says we thought we thought we were protected. 'We always thought we were protected by the BNA Act, but, alas, in the terms of union this was not so. The federal government owned all our resources.' The federal government of today, however not the federal government of yesterday or federal governments past but the federal government of today.

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 277

MJ - 2

MR. TULK:

Trudeau.

MR. LUSH:

However, have either lost sight of those sacred covenants or conscientiously choses to ignore them. Mr. Speaker, the federal government has unilaterally declared that it has the right to control our offshore resources, and that is the only part is correct, Mr. Speaker. But again the implication that they have authority and jurisdiction over all

MR. LUSH: the resources of this Province, a deliberate attempt, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, to undermine the federal government and to exonerate the provincial government from any of its responsibilities in the development of our Province's natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, if one wanted to read through the Throne Speech he would see that it is full of that kind of statement, too, as I said before, without belabouring the point, of blaming and putting responsibility on the federal government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the notion put forward there, right throughout the Throne Speech is that we have come to a standstill, that this Province has come to an economic halt, and the agency responsible for it all is the federal government. The provincial government: 'Our hands are tied. Our hands are tied'. The problem is, Mr. Speaker, that they have become intellectually bankrupt. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, they have become intellectually bankrupt in terms of developing this Province. In terms of developing the resources of this Province, in terms of economic development for this Province, they have become intellectually bankrupt; no ideas, no innovative ideas, Mr. Speaker, to get this Province moving. Why, Mr. Speaker, when the oil comes and when we get the corridor across Quebec, we are not going to need any great administrators, we are not going to need any people with any great skill once the money starts coming. This is the time, Mr. Speaker, in our history when we need innovative ideas.

MR. T. LUSH:

The oil is going to come. Regardless of what the Premier and his colleagues do, the oil is going to come.

And I would say that the demand for the corridor across Quebec is not going to lessen with our people. The people of our Province have seen the injustice in that and, again, regardless of who is over there, that is going to have to be followed.

And, Mr. Speaker, the contract with the Upper Churchill, that is going to have to be renegotiated regardless of who sits on the other side, regardless. That is the attitude of the times, Mr. Speaker. I am not suggesting either that the

MR. LUSH:

Premier was not responsible for developing that kind of attitude among our people. I am not going to take away that credit from him. I am not going to take away that credit from him, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the Premier has done that. I believe the Premier has done that. But somebody has started the ball rolling and it will continue to roll and it will continue to roll until these things comes to a successful completion or successful fruition. They are not going to stop, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to stop. And as I said, the Premier may have been the one to start, to give the initial start to these items, he may have been the one, but, Mr. Speaker, there is no stopping him and I have to give the hon.gentleman that credit. But there is no stopping now in these issues.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are not the points with which we have difference with this government or these are not the points with which we find difference in this Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, it is the attitude, the defeatist attitude, the attitude of doing nothing in the interim, the attitude of doing nothing to provide a satisfactory or half decent standard of living for the ordinary people of this Province. The people, Mr. Speaker, who are frustrated, the people, Mr. Speaker, who do not know where to turn to put bread on the table tomorrow, the people without a job. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier feels for those people, and hon. members opposite, as much as I do. I am not the only person with any sensitivity. I am not the only person with any sensitivity for the needs and the wants of our people. I am not the only person concerned that our people should have a job. Mr. Speaker, the policies, the policies developed by this government

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 279

ah-2

MR. LUSH: show, the policies show that
we are not getting anywhere, that we are not doing anything
and we have not

MR. LUSH:

done anything for a couple of years to improve the lot, to improve the standard of living of the decent people of this Province. And they deserve more, Mr. Speaker, they deserve more.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want to see in this session clearly outlined the programmes and the policies that this government is going to initiate to provide jobs for our people. We want to see the programmes and the policies that this government is going to initiate to get the construction industry moving.

I am sure the Premier must agree the five initiatives, the five steps that were announced in the Throne Speech are hardly the kind of measures that are going to get the construction industry moving in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the pre-tendering policy. Mind you Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with them, Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with them. Do not disagree with the - what is the terminology? The pre-tendering or getting the tendering out for public services, water and sewer and road construction earlier than we have in the past. Good policy, Mr. Speaker. Nothing wrong with that, but hardly the kind of thing that is going to provide any employment for the people of this Province, hardly the kind of thing that is going to stimulate the economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Premier, when he announced these in the Budget Speech, I would certainly welcome some of these in the district of Terra Nova. I would be remiss if I did not say that. I would welcome some. In the

MR. LUSH: pre-tendering I do not have any so far, but I am not giving up hope. I do not think the Premier and the Government are going to deny the district of Terra Nova some water and sewer, some good drinking water, Mr. Speaker, an inalienable right to the people of this Province, to be provided with good drinking water. And I do not think the Premier and his government are going to deny the people of Terra Nova water and sewer. I would not be surprised but the Minister of Municipal Affairs - she is writing now - I would not be surprised but that is some letters of approval to the various councils in the Terra Nova district, that they are going to get water and sewer.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do not disagree with these initiatives, but they are hardly the kind of innovative ideas, the innovative programmes to which I have been referring, the kind of stimulative programmes that I have been asking the government to get underway.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I have some pronouncement on how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Yes. After checking precedents I find that the precedent is that the hon. member moving the amendment would have sixty minutes from the time that he moves the amendment. The hon. member has approximately thirty-five minutes remaining.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Would the hon. member yield for a moment?

MR. LUSH: Sure.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. gentleman for yielding.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: In answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) today with respect to whether the Department of Justice had given legal advice to the Department of Finance with respect to borrowing from the sinking fund, I indicated that the Department of Justice had advised the Department of Finance that this was legal.

And in answer to a further question, whether that opinion was oral or written, I said that it was oral. I have checked on the matter since and wish to give more complete information to the House. There was oral opinion to that effect, but there is also written opinion from the Department of Justice, from American counsel to

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the government and from the government's fiscal agents. In other words, apart from oral there was also written opinion with respect to the legality of borrowing from the sinking fund.

MR. NEARY: Of course we will be able to get copies of these written opinions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is a matter which I would have to take under advisement. But there is a written opinion from the Department of Justice, from American counsel to the government, from the fiscal agents to the effect that it is legal for the government to borrow from the sinking fund.

I thank the hon. gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) for yielding as I wished to make complete information available to the House as soon as I was aware of it.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I have been saying, we do not necessarily subscribe to the notion that the federal government have to wash their hands of this Province by no way. And, Mr. Speaker, I think I have demonstrated that in my Private Member's resolution. I have never been the one, Mr. Speaker, to make political points on that issue. My Private Member's resolution states that in trying to develop the resources of this Province, I have asked for joint co-operation between the federal government and the provincial government. Mr. Speaker, I have been spokesman on Labour and Manpower for three or four years. Practically every time that I have made any kind of reference to the unemployment situation in this Province I have always practically invariably

MR. LUSH: referred to the responsibility of the federal government in this matter. But, Mr. Speaker, what I find offensive, what I find abhorrent is the total abdication by this government of any responsibility related to the economic development of this Province, the total abdication of responsibility, the continuous effort by the government, Mr. Speaker, to blame everything on Ottawa. That has been my bone of contention, if you will, with this provincial government. Clearly, this provincial government has responsibilities in the

MR. LUSH:

areas of forestry, mining, agriculture, and tourism.

The provincial government spoke about tourism in the Throne Speech. It spoke of its confidence in the tourist industry in Newfoundland, spoke highly of the potential of tourism in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, it would appear again that any development in this area is contingent upon revenue from the offshore oil and gas. Any development in tourism is, of course, as is any development in any other of the resources, contingent upon revenue from the offshore.

So, Mr. Speaker, one must find - Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must wonder what their fate is going to be while they are waiting for the revenue to come to this Province from the offshore oil and gas. They are wondering what their fate is going to be. What is going to happen to the unemployed people in the Terra Nova district, the unemployed people in Fogo district, the unemployed people right throughout this Province, the identified 36,000? I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to be happy and contented to wait ten and twelve and fifteen years. And is that what the Premier is saying? Maybe we are misunderstanding the Premier. But I clearly remember watching the Premier on television during the election, in a certain district. I do not know what district it was, but he reluctantly went over a gravel road, a muddy road, a road full of potholes. I thought it was Terra Nova district, but I learned after that it was not. I forget which district it was, maybe the Premier can tell me. I would like to know which district it was. The road that he went over reluctantly -

MR. TULK:

Fortune-Hermitage, was it?

MR. LUSH: Fortune, was it? Fortune-Hermitage?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not go over any roads reluctantly.

MR. NEARY: In White Bay South, from Jackson's Arm to Sops Arm.

MR. LUSH: Anyway, he went over the road - well, if that is offensive to the Premier, I will take out the word reluctantly. The Premier went over a road, a gravel road, willingly, gladly. Gladly -

MR. TULK: What road was it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: English Harbour East.

MR. LUSH: - ecstaticly. English Harbour West. East, I am sorry, English Harbour East. He went over the road there.

MR. TULK: He went reluctantly, that is for sure.

MR. LUSH: It was interesting what he told the people, and my recollection of that interview, the Premier, that night on television, because I -

MR. TULK: You thought it was reluctant.

MR. LUSH: Well, I thought so yes, but his answer I found -

PREMIER PECKFORD: He thought wrong as he did about the election results.

MR. LUSH: His answer I thought most interesting because I was looking forward to getting the roads paved in the Terra Nova district. But the people got their answer that night. The Premier said in order to pave these roads, he needed the revenue from the offshore oil and gas. In fact, and I do not think I am not quoting the Premier incorrectly, I do not believe -

PREMIER PECKFORD: They only carried part of the speech. The hon. member really wanted to hear the answers to his questions.

MR. T. LUSH

Well, that is all I heard, I could not say what they did not carry. I did not know what they did not carry.

PREMIER PECKFORD

What was said was we need additional and there are a number of resources from which those revenues can come. One of them is the offshore oil and gas.

MR. LUSH

I clearly read into the Premier's remarks that we had to wait, Mr. Speaker, the people of the English Harbour had to wait for some revenues from the offshore oil and gas to get their roads reconstructed, upgraded, paved whatever it was that they were looking for. I am sure they wanted their roads paved so we just sat back in Terra Nova knowing that we have to wait a long time. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is saying that that was not the case. I am glad that was not the case, Mr. Speaker, because the people of this province cannot just sit back and wait and wait for revenues to come from the offshore oil and gas, they want action now. They want immediate action, Mr. Speaker, they want action that's going to stimulate the economy now. The Premier, I believe said again in the Throne Speech that the Government was going to take action that was going to stimulate the economy. Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe that is so, maybe that is so. We will have to wait and see. There is certainly no indication of this kind of action, certainly no indication in the most nebulous form, Mr. Speaker, no indication at all, or no indication of what the Premier's going to do or what the Government is going to do to stimulate the economy. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Throne Speech doesn't give that kind of detail. I realize that. I realize that the Throne Speech is not a statement like the State of the Union Address given by the President of the United States. I realize it's not that kind of a detailed document, I realize that it just gives the general intention of the Government. I realize that, Mr. Speaker. But still within these general intentions, one would have thought there would have been some reference to, if you will, the general approaches of the government

MR. LUSH: to stimulate the economy. The only thing specific mentioned in the Throne Speech was the Five Point Plan, the five steps that the government was going to take. Included - I named a couple of them - was the pre-tendering of roads and water and sewer systems and some other references there to building lots. Hon. members are familiar with the five items. And I have gone through these to indicate that hon. members certainly do not believe that these are the kinds of measures that we need to stimulate the economy of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion - I do not intend to take up my full hour, I just simply wanted to make a few points and introduce my amendment, if you will. In cluing up I know that the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is just over there itching, Mr. Speaker, to get on his feet to talk about, again, how important it is for the federal government to take certain initiatives to get this Province moving. I know that the hon. member is going to say that. I can give his speech now. Probably not as fluently, probably not as effectively but in terms of its ideas and its concepts. I can now tell hon. members what he is going to say, Mr. Speaker, that we need the federal government. If the federal government would only adopt the programme that he suggested for long-term jobs that he referred to here a couple of days ago, if that had only been adopted by the federal government, these initiatives, then, Mr. Speaker, it would be a different picture today. I can hear the hon. member now and I can hear hon. members talking about, you know, how we do not support them on these three initiatives. But, Mr. Speaker, we do support them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the point must be made that we cannot accept

MR. LUSH: this continuous laying blame on the federal government for the lack of performance on behalf of the provincial government. And, Mr. Speaker, the point must be made again - and this must say something - that in Newfoundland we have the highest unemployment rate in Canada. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the needs of Nova Scotia, the needs of New Brunswick and the needs of P.E.I. are certainly similiar to the needs of this Province. There must be similiarities in their economies somewhere along the line of these three Maritime Provinces.

I have always been under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the Atlantic Provinces had much in common. But why is it then, Mr. Speaker, that our provincial government cannot do better

MR. LUSH in terms of raising the level of employment in this province? Why is it that we are four percentage points higher than the highest province in the Atlantic Region? Why is it that our unemployment rate is higher, is constantly higher than New Brunswick? Why is it that it is constantly higher than Nova Scotia? Why is it that it is constantly higher than P.E.I.? Hon. members will notice I make no reference to Ontario, I make no reference to Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I make reference to these Atlantic Provinces which I have been led to believe have similar economies to the province of Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, that must say something, that must say something.

MR. STAGG: You are getting yourself upset.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be upset by the pattering and the nattering and the sabre rattling of the member for Stephenville. He can carry on all he likes, Mr. Speaker. The prating and the prattling and the saber rattling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG You talked about me on the 31st.

MR. TULK: That's the reason why all you got was a parliamentary assistant's job.

MR. STAGG - and Ottawa being (inaudible).

MR. TULK You cannot do anything with your brain, just your mouth.

MR. STAGG: I dare you to deal with it.

MR. TULK: Deal with what?

MR. STAGG: Deal with that.

MR. LUSH: What?

MR. STAGG: You are talking about unemployment, deal with that issue (inaudible) -

MR. HISCOCK: Never mind, I will look after that. I got the -

MR. STAGG: -LeBlanc gave the Russians last year. Tell us about that.

MR. TULK: You fellows do not mind so much-

MR. STAGG: Come on.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, that is a
great thing to deal with, it is a game.

MR. STAGG: It is a red herring, is it?

MR. LUSH: It is a game, Mr. Speaker,
it is sloughing off responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: No one on this side, Mr.
Speaker, agrees with that. Nobody agrees with it. We
do not agree with it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is an
abdication of responsibility again. It is an
abdication, a complete abdication of responsibility.
Only going after the federal government shows that
hon. members opposite have no will power, Mr. Speaker,
no political will.

MR. T. LUSH: Governing this province means more than that, means more than that, Mr. Speaker. Let the government show us, Mr. Speaker, let them show us their initiative, let them show us their creativity. Let them show us their initiative, Mr. Speaker their creativity and innovativeness. So, Mr. Speaker, let them show us, let hon. members opposite show us their creativity, let them show us their originality in getting the economy of this province moving. Let them show us some new programmes, Mr. Speaker. We will support them on those issues of the establishment of quotas. Yes, we will support them on that.

MR. TULK: No problem

MR. T. LUSH: No problem, Mr. Speaker

MR. TULK: The Liberal Party (inaud).

MR. T. LUSH: But has the minister, has the Premier, have all the ministers lost confidence-

MR. TULK: We got a good party today-

MR. T. LUSH: -lost confidence in the viability of the natural resources of this province, the traditional natural resources? Maybe the forestry is gone. Maybe there is something they are not telling us. Maybe it is all spruce bud worm infested. Maybe there is no future in forestry, maybe there is not. Tell us! Tell us! Maybe there is nothing we can do to promote the small sawmill industry in this province. Maybe there is nothing we can do to support the one hundred and fifty small sawmill operators throughout the province. Maybe there is nothing we can do.

MR. TULK: That is what they want us to believe.

I refuse to believe that. I refuse to believe that.

MR. T. LUSH: A hundred and fifty or two hundred? There are a hundred and fifty in my own district, but there is-

MR. TULK: The minister believes that.

MR. T. LUSH: -there is a-what shall I say? That needs to be qualified. There are one hundred and fifty licences

May 17, 1982

Tape 286

JC-2

MR. T. LUSH:

but I do not think we can call them one hundred and fifty small sawmill operators. I am talking about bona fide, small sawmill operators. So, is there nothing we can do for these people? Is there nothing we can do to promote that industry in this province? Is there nothing further we can do to promote agriculture in this province? Are we getting maximum performance from these industries? Are we getting maximum performance?

MR. TULK:

There is nothing wrong with the Agricultural Minister now.

MR. LUSH: Are we getting maximum performance from the Forestry and from Agriculture, Mr. Speaker? I know the potential in my own district, two major industries in my own district, two major resources in my own district, forestry and agriculture, and, Mr. Speaker, it hurts me to know that both industries are not performing the way that they should. Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is declining, the production is declining. I do not know if the minister responsible knows why. I do not know if he has met with the farmers to talk about it. I do not know why. Some of the best agricultural land in the Province.

And what has that got to do with--developing the agricultural land in Newfoundland? what has that got to do with the offshore oil and gas? What has it got to do with it?

MR. NEARY: They are getting ninety cents of every dollar from Ottawa to do it and are not spending it.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker --

MR. TULK: They have wasted it driving around.

MR. LUSH: - there is one area in which this government has a lot of creativity. There is one area in which this government has a lot of originality with respect to creating jobs.

MR. NEARY: Making appointments, yes.

MR. LUSH: Making appointments, Mr. Speaker. I believe they made four today.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Four today, Mr. Speaker, four parliamentary assistants today. That makes a total of five now, is it?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: Five parliamentary assistants and eighteen Cabinet Ministers, Mr. Speaker. That is

MR. LUSH: economizing. That is pulling in the belt. That is retrenchment, Mr. Speaker. Eighteen Cabinet Ministers, five parliamentary assistants for a total of twenty-three. Counting the Speaker there are twenty-four. Counting the Deputy Speaker, twenty-five. Counting the Chairman of Committees that is twenty-six. Counting the Party Whip that is twenty-seven, twenty-seven paid positions in addition, Mr. Speaker, to the forty-four. So, Mr. Speaker, that is creating jobs. I suppose there will be some more commissions set up in the next couple of weeks.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to wrap up my few remarks by saying again that I want to make it crystal clear that we on this side of the House support the government in their major initiatives on which they received

MR. LUSH: a mandate from the people of this Province.

MR. TULK: The member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was supposed to be a minister 'Brian'.

MR. PATTERSON: - offshore resource development, a corridor through Quebec and the opening up of the Upper Churchill contract, the renegotiating of the contract, whatever the terminology is. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not about to let this government, to let this Provincial Government escape from its responsibilities, its task to develop this Province, to develop its natural resources, to provide jobs for our people, to provide jobs for our people, Mr. Speaker. That is our concern, That is our concern, Mr. Speaker, that this government is going to sit back for the next little while, still blaming the lack of development on Ottawa, as if they had no responsibility whatsoever in the development of this Province.

MR. CARTER: Very boring.

MR. LUSH: I can understand why I am boring to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), he does not understand Newfoundland enough to know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: You tell him. We were telling him that all last Winter and took him around a bit.

MR. LUSH: I can understand that, Mr. Speaker, But that is where we stand, Mr. Speaker, that is where we stand. We want to see this government getting down to brass tacks and developing the natural resources of this Province which fall under their jurisdiction. That is not to say that we do not expect some financial incentives from the federal government, which they have been doing, Mr. Speaker, which they have been doing. I do not know the figure on the grants they we have been getting from Ottawa for agriculture,

MR. LUSH: but I know it has been rather substantial. I do not know the amount of money that we have been getting for the forestry in this Province from the federal government, but I know it has been substantial. So what is the reason, Mr. Speaker? It is not because they have not been getting sufficient monies to develop these. Why do we now have to put everything on hold and wait for the development and wait for the revenues to come from offshore oil and gas? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. And are we to sit down here in this House and just go on again for another two months of nothing, Mr. Speaker, but fed bashing? Is that what we are to expect in this hon. House or are members going to get down to brass tacks and develop what we have, what is under our control, to the best of our ability? That is the question, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas) The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. G. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, after listening to such a luscious speech may I say that I have come to the conclusion that anything you want to say to this House must be relative. First, may I

MR. TOBIN: start off by saying I congratulate the member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) on his election as Speaker, and also my colleague from Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) on his election as Deputy Speaker and, to you, on your election as Chairman of Committees. I would also like to congratulate my good friend and colleague from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) who represents that great district, and, may I be permitted to say, that great town of Trepassy where I was born and so proudly lived for the first twenty-odd years of my life, on his excellent speech on moving the motion for the Address in Reply. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite evident, Sir, that he will give his district the type of representation that it deserves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: To my hon. colleague from Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) who seconded the motion my sincere congratulations. And I am sure that she left no doubt in anyone's mind as to the type of representation the district of Twillingate will receive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: To the Premier, my leader, I commend on him on his astounding victory at the polls and I am indeed proud to be part of this great team. And I thank him for the support and help that he gave me in getting elected to this hon. House and I look forward to his guidance and assistance as I go forward to represent the great and historic district of Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: May I also commend all hon. members on their election to the House. And, as a new member, let me say that I look forward to the, hopefully, good example that you will set for me and other new members in this House.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning I was asked if I would lead off our debate on the Speech from the Throne and now I see that I am into speaking on the amendment to the Speech from the Throne. And, as I look at this here, and I am not that familiar with the rules and the regulations of the House, however, I believe that this is a vote of non-confidence in the government. And I believe that if I did vote for it the government would probably be defeated. Well, Sir, that would mean an election. I will vote against this amendment because I believe that an election could be a bad thing right now, because I believe that every Parliament in Canada has the right to an Opposition. And after what happened on April 6th, where we turned around districts that had in excess of 2,000 majority in 1979, we can only imagine what could happen to districts which now sit with a majority of forty-one votes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, as I get into the Speech from the Throne I am particularly happy, Sir, that this government will indeed commence the planning for the new hospital to serve the people of the Burin Peninsula

MR. G. TOBIN this year, this facility, Sir, is badly needed, and I know the people of my district welcomes this news. And it is this type of commitment, this type of leadership by this Government that has caused the people of Newfoundland to once again start believing in Governments. The people of my district demonstrated that very much in my election, and, Sir, I certainly would like to thank the people from Burin Placentia West for the vote of confidence they have placed in me. I can assure them that I will give them the type of representation that they deserve, and by doing that I will work to the best of my ability to ensure that the district is well represented and receives a fair share.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. TOBIN

Mr. Speaker, my district, like many other districts in this province, has needs. Now let me start off by going into Monkstown where, through the efforts of conservative government since nineteen and seventy two, and through the efforts of my colleague from Mount Scio who once represented the District of Placentia West, they gave these people the great freedom from isolation. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this road should be further upgraded and paved. The isolated communities in my district, Petit Forte, Southeast Bight and Little Paradise are now being discriminated against in the highest respect, or the highest regard by Transport Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. TOBIN

For in excess, Mr. Speaker, of eight decades, these communities had contact to Argentinia on the East side of Placentia Bay and Marystown on the West side, and I would like to make it clear that they deserve no less. And I hope, Sir, that through their efforts, the efforts of these people who just caused Transport Canada to delay for one year the determination of service to Argentinia, and

MR. G. TOBIN: yet see fit, Sir, to terminate on Thursday past the contract these people had with the Burin Peninsula, I hope that these people and others can impress upon the federal government the importance for them to revert back to the system which existed in Placentia Bay for decades. And I also hope, Sir, that the day will come when these communities, like Monkstown, will be freed from isolation. Mr. Speaker, as I move through my district roads are certainly one of the greatest needs. We have Brookside, Boat Harbour, Baine Harbour, Parkers Cove, Rushoon; all need roads upgraded, paved and in some cases resurfaced. And Sir, on I can go to Red Harbour, Jean de Baie, Spanish Room, Rock Harbour and see the need for road improvements. However, Sir, I would like to make it very clear that I have met with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). He is very much aware of the conditions of the roads but very sympathetic to the cause. And I am sure, Sir, that we will see vast improvements in the road conditions in Burin-Placentia West over the next four years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. G. TOBIN: I am moving on to Marystown, Mr. Speaker, and having the honour to serve these great people on council for the past four to five years, I am indeed aware of the need for water and sewer in Mooring Cove, the road in Little Bay, the Causeway to Creston and others. Yet, Sir, I would like to make it quite clear that I am very much aware of the amount of government assistance that has gone into Marystown, the shipyard in Marystown, which can boast of having one of the greatest work forces seen anywhere in the world. Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe Sir, that every member in this House should have the opportunity to view or visit the ships that have been constructed in Marystown, just to see the super workmanship that was put into them by local hands. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker,

MR. G. TOBIN: and I think that everyone should have the opportunity to see this. However, Mr. Speaker, when work at the Marystown shipyard began to decline, this government has always come to their aid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. TOBIN: The construction of new supply vessels on speculation, the financing of new boats have all caused to sustain a healthy work force. This yard and, indeed, Mortier Bay has a bright and prosperous future which will no doubt benefit not only my district but the entire Burin Peninsula.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. TOBIN: The town of Burin, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TOBIN: is indeed a very historical and a very proud town which also has its needs. Roads need to be paved, particularly between the Salt Pond and Winterland area, the resurfacing of other roads, water and sewerage is needed. A swimming pool which is completed externally must and should be finished. New recreation facilities are needed. Sir, I would like to make it clear that this town has a very low unemployment rate and certainly a very bright and prosperous future.

As we move on, Mr. Speaker, to Winterland, Lewin's Cove and Epworth as well as Corbin, we see the need for roads upgraded, paved and repaved. And on, Sir, to Port au Bras, Fox Cove and Mortier the same needs are evident. Mr. Speaker, the district which I so proudly represent depends heavily on the fishery, both deep sea and inshore. Many people in Burin-Placentia West are employed in the fishery. And, Sir, after listening to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on Friday morning, and after having the opportunity to meet with many fishermen in my district over the weekend, people who are fishing alone in boats, to the longliner crews, to the dragger crews and captains, and having heard those people express the concern that they have expressed regarding the action of the federal government, yet, Sir, these people have told me that it could be one of the worst things to happen to the Newfoundland fishery in years.

Sir, I just heard the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) making reference to my colleague from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) about the fishing, trying to put it off again and blame it on the feds. Well, then, Sir, I would like to know how many phone calls or how many telegrams have the members of the Opposition sent to the silent five in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 292

IB-2

MR. TOBIN:

Sir, my district is represented by a member in Ottawa, a member on the government side in Ottawa, as is the district represented by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. G. TOBIN:

And I certainly have made my feelings known and known in no uncertain terms, that these people either better stand up and start fighting for the people they are representing or move aside and let someone else do the job that must be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe, sir, that we should probably all get on our knees and pray to God that the Federal government will stop giving away our resources, our fish to the foreign countries, as these resources are very important not only to my district but to all of Newfoundland and Labrador. If this practise is not stopped, Mr. Speaker, it could certainly bring a deep, adeep cloud over the very promising and bright future that the district of Burin-Placentia West holds.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, sir, that I am indeed proud that this government has already let a contract for water and sewer at Parkers Cove and are -

MR. PEACH:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

- soon to improve the water system at Rushoon. As well, Mr. Speaker, we will see the beginning of a new sewer system for Creston South, another phase or the water system at Lewin's Cove, a water and sewer project starting at Burin, a start being made this year on the major upgrading and resurfacing of the Little Bay Highway, the continuation of government support to the Marystown shipyard, tenders being called for the planning and design of a new hospital, renovations now under way to the tune of \$200,000 to the existing Burin Cottage Hospital, construction of a new school at Burin. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to these and other projects being carried out in my district this year.

Mr. Speaker, I have just listed many of the problems in my district, and certainly

MR. TOBIN: governments desire to correct them, but, sir, if the Federal government would today, or even tomorrow, be honest with Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and say " Yes, we will treat you people equally with other Canadians. That the mineral resources off our Continental Shelf do belong to you as do Quebec's, Ontario's, Maniatoba's as well as Alberta's and Saskatchewan's, that we will agree with the fair and reasonable proposal put forth by the

MR. TOBIN government of Newfoundland and together we will get on and do the job of developing these resources, then, Mr. Speaker, the district of Burin Peninsula West, the Province of Newfoundland, and certainly the entire nation would benefit. And, Sir, just let me bring it a little closer to home for a little. For each oil rig drilling offshore three supply vessels are needed. The projection then for the eighties should be approximately 45 to 50 supply vessels involved in the exploration off the east coast. Marystown, Mr. Speaker, may not construct them all, but I am sure that we will get our fair share. I believe that this is evident when you consider that in the past few months Petro-Canada has purchased a supply vessel that this government built at the Marystown Shipyard on speculation, at a cost of \$15 million dollars.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN That negotiations are now ongoing with Petro-Canada for the purchase of the second vessel, this means nearly a full work order for the Marystown Shipyard this year. I may also add, Sir, that this year, just recently as a matter of fact, the Minister of Development (Mr. Winsor) provided one of the best plans that Marystown and the Burin Peninsula could ever have.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN Sir, I was not able to - I would not even be surprised that if I heard someday that the shipyard union, local 20, made the hon. minister the member in good standing because of his desires, concerns, and his thoughtfulness and interest in the Marystown Shipyard.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN He announced, Sir, that Marystown Shipyard would assemble a blowout preventer for Petro-Canada. And as I understand it, this is being constructed at Houston and forwarded to Marystown to be assembled. Also, I would like to point out to this House that 1981 was the best year financially that the shipyard has ever experienced.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN

When you consider that 1981, was not noted for being as the best year for business or corporations, this proves what the development of oil and gas can mean to this Province. To further demonstrate the potential of my district, let me refer to Mortier Bay, Spanish Room Point area. Mortier Bay, Mr. Speaker

MR. TOBIN: can boast of being one of the best harbours in North America for petroleum related marine activities. Over the past year we have seen work carried out on the Zapata Uglund and the Sedco 706. And just recently they were both back for inspection. Mr. Speaker, the development of this area through the guidance and assistance of this government, I believe is inevitable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Premier of this Province (Mr. Peckford) has a vision, a vision of a Newfoundland in which I share, and together, along with others, I look forward to achieving that vision so that one day the sun will shine and have not will be no more. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate the hon. Speaker of this House (Mr. Russell) on the position which he was just recently elected to hold, as well as to offer my congratulations to you, Sir, as Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees and, indeed, to all members on their recent election.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to avail of this golden opportunity to, on behalf of all of the voters in the historic Carbonear district, offer our congratulations to the hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford) not only on his personal victory but for the tremendous victory he led this party to on April 6th. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I am pleased to be part of that great victory and to have been given the opportunity to represent the great district of Carbonear in this hon. House and for the first time since 1976, to let our Province know that my district, the district of

May 17, 1982

Tape No. 295

IB-2

MR. PEACH: Carbeneer, now has true, real representation in government and that I am here for real. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of just being a name or a number in the telephone directory.

MR. PEACH:

I look forward to serving the people of the entire Carbonear District, from the town of Carbonear to the community of Lower Island Cove and, of course, all the other towns and communities which lie between those two extremities. I am sure that the people of my district realized on April 6th that I could give them the representation that was deserving of them and in that regard, sir, I have to at this time thank every single worker, every single voter in the entire Carbonear District for giving me that opportunity and, for sure, for passing that challenge along to me. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see in the Throne Speech that many of the areas covered are those which relate to the many concerns in the Carbonear District. The reference made to the health care facilities in our Province is indeed pleasing to note as it directly mentions the regionalization of specialized services. This, Mr. Speaker, is indeed one, and has been one of the main concerns since our regional hospital in Carbonear was built and that, sir, was built during the term of a former Minister of Health in this province who was at the time the P.C. member for the Carbonear District, and I refer to Dr. Gus Rowe. This regional facility, Mr. Speaker, has the eighth floor left to be completed which will provide for specialized service and allow for the people in the area to have the type of service which they are entitled to without having to continually travel to our capital city for such medical care. I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House that the Carbonear General Hospital not only provides health care for my district, but it is a facility which directly serves three provincial districts, the district of Port de Grave represented by the hon. member Mr. Collins, the district of Harbour Grace represented by the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services Mr. Young, and also the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde represented by the hon. member Mr. Reid.

May 17, 1982

Tape 296

JC-2

MR. HAIG YOUNG:

To show what type of facility that hospital is, sir, I noted a few days ago in our local paper there was an article entitled "Carbonear Hospital up for Creditation Renewal".

MR. PEACH: And one of the sub-topics under that read that the tele-conference system, the telephone link with other sites through Memorial University, has revealed new potential and through this means the lab technologists at the Carbonear Hospital took part in three lectures and discussion periods recently. These sessions which originated in Chicago reached thirty main centres, one as far away as Hawaii.

I also noted, Mr. Speaker, in that same article that during the month of March the occupancy rate at the Carbonear Hospital was recorded at 87 per cent. There were fifty-two births, 122 out-patients visits, and 1,542 cases handled by the hospital's emergency department.

I was also told over the weekend, Sir, that of those fifty-two new babies that were born at Carbonear Hospital, fifty of them were P.Cs and the other two were undecided.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH: I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this government, of which I am proud to be a part, will look favourably to making the necessary funding available to ensure the final completion of that regional hospital so that that part of the Avalon Peninsula will have the type of health care services, and the quality, that they justly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to see reference made in the Throne Speech to early tendering of municipal water and sewerage projects. This action is necessary in those difficult

MR. PEACH: times of economic recession so that councils such as those in my own district, like the town of Carbonear, the town of Victoria, the town of Salmon Cove can progress and get on with these necessary services so that equality and equal opportunity of a reasonably high standard of living can be attained.

We all realize, I am sure, that most municipal councils in our Province are finding it extremely difficult to operate without capital funding, and mine therefore, Sir, are no exception.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made in the Throne Speech to the local roads programme. This is indeed pleasing as, again, the district of Carbonear

MR. PEACH: has many miles of local roads that need upgrading and paving, and I refer to the local roads in my district in Freshwater, Kingston, Small Point which happens to be my hometown, and I was quite often called, 'A North Shore Pork Eater' and I am proud to have been called that on many occasions, the communities of Broad Cove, Blackhead, Adam's Cove, Western Bay, Ochre Pit Cove, Northern Bay, Gull Island, Burnt Point and Lower Island Cove at the extreme end of my district.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward during my term here in this hon. House to working closely with the ministers and departments concerned to ensure that these basic needs become realities. While, Sir, on the topic of roads in my district, I have to make special mention of the need to complete the long awaited Carbonear bypass road. I also, at the same time, have to refer to the proposed construction of the new Conception Bay North bypass road. The Roaches Line which is presently being used to serve that entire part of the Avalon Peninsula, is the most widely used highway in our Province yet the narrowest, that is with the exception of the Trans Canada. It is not even close, Sir, to being adequate.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is contingent on our federal counterparts in Ottawa making the federal DREE funding available to make this desperately needed access even closer to becoming a reality. I recall, Sir, a few days ago hearing through the media that one of Newfoundland's Liberal members in Ottawa was even considering putting his political future on the line in order to obtain the funding for this proposed highway. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a clear indication of the lack of co-operation that we, as a government here in Newfoundland, have received from our

MR. PEACH: federal government in
Ottawa over the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative control over our fishery, so strongly referred to in the Throne Speech, is a crucial area of concern to all parts of our Province. And again the Carboner district is largely dependent on the fishery. I am pleased to say that the major fish plant located in my district, Earle Fisheries, has not experienced any great financial setbacks over the past few years that they have not been able to overcome.

MR. PEACH

and cultural well-being. Mr.

Speaker, this is very important as our province is quickly approaching the most important period of development in our history. We are at, I am sure, the turning point of our long and oftentimes troubled history and have a great challenge and responsibility before us. We have, Sir, the opportunity to build this Province to be one of the most productive and vibrant in our vast nation. I am proud Sir to have the opportunity to do my part, and I feel sure that together we can, and we will meet the challenge that lies ahead.

SOME HON MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL)

The hon. member of St. Barbe

MR. EVERETTE OSMOND:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate you on your appointment to the Chair and I would like to congratulate all the hon. members on their various appointments recently. I would also like to congratulate each member here on his appointment or his election to the house, and special congratulation to the Premier who has led Newfoundland to such a victory.

I feel very honoured myself to be representing the district of St. Barbe district that for many years, when I was growing up and as I became an adult, grew into adulthood, was forgotten, district which when the roads were being built and water and sewer programs were on the go was left out in the cold. But I was very pleased and the district was very pleased somewhere around 1972 our roads and our sewer programs came into being.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. OSMOND:

Mr. Speaker, the total length of my district by road is some 180 miles and there are some 30 communities along the route from trout river to plum point. And, as I say, we were very pleased to have those roads mostly paved and rebuilt a few years ago, and the National Park section of that road is being rebuilt at this moment. The contracts are let there now. And I will be working towards having the completion of our remaining branch roads done, working very close with this government in having those completed also. As in most districts, the main source of employment in St. Barbe is the fishing industry and, as in many other districts, there are problems in the fishing industry

MR. E. OSMOND: with many small fish plants not operating this year and many fishermen unable to obtain fishing license for various species of fish, this being controlled by our federal government. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and myself will be going into my district and taking a first-hand look at those problems and other problems in the fishery, in the near future. The Newfoundland zinc mine at Daniels Harbour contributes a great deal to the economy of my district, especially to the central part of the district. People in this area are also looking forward to the time when there will be exploration at Parson's Pond for oil. This will not be new, it was carried out there many years ago. It was very encouraging at that time, and it may be when it comes into being again. Since Newfoundland Forest Products closed down their sawmill operations at Hawkes Bay, some of the woodsmen in that area received contracts to cut pulpwood in this area. I am looking forward to more permits to extend this operation and employ more of the woodsmen. The South end of my district is also a timber end, a timber part of the district. Most of the timberland there was taken over by the Gros Morne National Park a few years ago, and I am looking forward to, and I have some encouragement, the forest access roads being extended further back into the woodland and more concessions from Bowaters for the small sawmill operators. First when I started travelling the St. Barbe Coast, very often I would have to stop my vehicle and wait for cattle or sheep to get off the road. Since then, it is now about fifteen or twenty years later, there are no cattle on the road, there are no sheep on the road. At that time every family there had their own domestic animals. They provided their own meat throughout the year and their wool stockings and whatever.

AN HON. MEMBER: Fresh butter.

MR. OSMOND: Fresh milk and butter.

MR. OSMOND: Mr. Speaker, there has been some progress to get that angle back, or get that little industry back, and it is an industry among each individual.

There has been a community pasture put into Parson's Pond. I am looking forward to, in the next year or so, getting community pastures in the North and South end of the district and one, particularly, at River of Ponds. And I will be working closely with the Minister of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) and the people in my district to this end.

MR. STAGG: Do not forget the oil in Parson's Pond.

MR. NEARY: You got to get in now with the member for Stephenville, too, if you want to get anything done about it.

MR. OSMOND: Dig for oil.
After I leave St. Barbe, maybe I will go to Stephenville.

St. Barbe district is very much lacking in recreation facilities. For example, there is only one covered rink in the entire district and the nearest stadiums are at Deer Lake and St. Anthony.

Students who graduate from high school and go on to universities or trade schools sometimes feel very embarrassed because they cannot take part in team sports.

Communities in my district are now willing to work together. As you know our district spreads over a long area and they are willing now to work together in groups of small communities to this end. With the government's help, and the help of the people in providing some of their

MR. OSMOND: own funds, I am sure that we can come up with some facilities in the next couple of years to take care of some of those needs.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things in my district that touches me very much is that there are some 1,200 senior citizens and when they become unable to care for themselves, especially through the long Winters, they have to move away from their own homes. If there is no son or daughter

MR. E. OSMOND: to take them in, they have to move away from their own communities to a home for the senior citizens, sometimes 400 or 500 miles away. Only last week I visited a man from my district who is now here near St. John's. Mr. Speaker, he is a very unhappy man. I look forward to seeing a home for the aged become a reality in my district in the next few years. I also look forward to seeing improvements in the medical facilities especially at Norris Point and Port Saunders.

Mr. Speaker, St. Barbe has some of the best fishing rivers and ponds in Newfoundland, and scenery unequalled this side of the Rocky Mountains. Maybe some of the Opposition should take a visit down to St. Barbe this summer. I know all the members on this side of House are going to try to get to St. Barbe this summer.

MR. STAGG: Hear, hear! Going down to the oilwells.

MR. OSMOND: Down to the oilwells. The tourist industry in St. Barbe has the potential, next to the fishing. Parks Canada are improving their facilities somewhat at this moment, with roads, and the Provincial Government have been improving the enclave areas with water and sewer and with branch roads. There are two bridges being constructed in the enclave areas this year by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will work along with the government to improve the unemployment and social problems in my district. With the control and ownership of our resources, my district, along with all the other districts in Newfoundland and Labrador, will reap the benefit.

Mr. Speaker, during the days ahead, I am hoping to have more to say about my district and about the improvements that we are experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to inform the members on the other side of this

MR. OSMOND: hon. House that the new members on this side of the House, they are not hanging on to coattails and they do not intend to hang on to coattails. And we will show them in the future that we will become very competent members in this hon. House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin also by congratulating you in being elected Speaker of this House.

MR. NEARY: You are speaking to the amendment.

MR. WARREN: I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. And I would also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Aylward), a good colleague of mine who, I believe, on the whole, won with the highest percentage of votes in the last election. I think the hon. member for Kilbride got 81.4 per cent of the popular vote and I got 81.2 per cent. So it was very, very close. And I only wish I had as many constituents as the hon. member for Kilbride, then. I would probably have had a bigger majority.

I also would like to congratulate the hon. member for St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas) in being elected Deputy Chairman of Committees. I am sure that he will do quite a job in that category. And I believe that he does really bring prestige to the position.

I was just listening to three of the hon. members making their maiden speeches in the House of Assembly. And I must say, in all due respect to the three hon. members, that they did much

MR. WARREN: better than I did on my first speech. However, Mr. Speaker, I did notice one thing, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) did say during his speech - in fact, he was the only one out of the three who did show a little bit of nastiness probably towards his predecessor - he did say that now Carbonear will get true, real representation. I think those were the three words that he used. And I believe in the past, that is from 1979 anyway - and I can say this in the absence of the former member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) - that as far as I can determine, he did speak up for Carbonear as much as I spoke up for Torngat Mountains.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. WARREN: And I believe the hon. member now for Carbonear is the same member who was and maybe still is the Mayor of Carbonear, who was sitting up here in the gallery when my hon. friend from Carbonear gave a fantastic speech, around a twenty minute speech, concerning Carbonear and concerning the action of that government that he is part of now and the way that this government was treating Carbonear. And at that time, in fact, the hon. member now for Carbonear was quite excited, was quite pleased

MR. WARREN: with it. He came down and almost embraced the former member and said, 'Boy, you really are fighting for Carbonear'. And all of a sudden, his first day in the House of Assembly, he really gets behind his back and puts a knife into him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that this Throne Speech - since 1979 I think this is the fifth or the sixth or something like that - the only thing different about this Throne Speech and the 1979 and the 1980 and the 1981 and the one there about six months ago or three months ago is -

MR. NEARY: The layout.

MR. WARREN: No, not necessarily the layout, but it is about twenty pages more of fighting Ottawa. That is the difference. It is about twenty pages longer, just fighting Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I noticed on page 7 in the Throne Speech that the Premier says: "My government has taken action to create jobs in the face of a difficult economic situation. And by doing that my government announced a Five Point Economic Recovery Programme". And the first point in that Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, was early tendering on transportation. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, and I know that hon. members realize that there are only roughly 35,000 people living in Labrador whereas there are something like 400,000 or 500,000 people living on the Island part of the Province. We all know that, Mr. Speaker. But if the Premier does announce in his Throne Speech early tendering on Transportation, I would presume and, I suppose, all members of the hon. House would presume, that he would mean transportation whether it is by air, sea or by road. You know, transportation is a broad term and surely goodness the Premier should realize that there are not too many roads or Trans-Canada highways from Red Bay down to

MR. WARREN:

Nain. Mr. Speaker,
yesterday during the Question Period I asked the Premier
a couple of questions and he said, if I gave advance
notice, he would probably give me a better answer. Well,
he could not have been in a very good mood. Because I have
here in front of me a memorandum of understanding. As the
Premier said, it was only a memorandum of understanding,
it was not anything concrete. But this memorandum of
understanding, for I can determine, was signed for the
whole Province and it did include - by the way, this
Province does include Labrador. The Premier and other
members do not realize that Labrador is a
part of this Province. So keep that in mind, okay.
It does include

MR. WARREN: air transportation.
So as a memorandum of understanding, Mr. Speaker, surely goodness the Premier could have found some reason why this understanding was signed on the 13th. day of January.

And the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) finally wrote a letter back to the federal Minister of Transportation (Mr. Pepin) on the 13th. day of April. Now, it took the Minister of Transportation three months to write back to Ottawa, and, you know, that was only after the Premier sent a telegram to the Chairman of the community council in Postville on election day saying, 'Look, we are going to do everything in our power to get the airstrips along the Labrador coast, the construction of the airstrips, in motion this Summer'. And that was on election day, 1982. Seven days later the Minister of Transportation writes a letter to the federal Minister of Transportation saying, 'Look, we want to talk about this some more'. And they are still talking about it.

And, Mr. Speaker, for the record I think I am going to get copies of this whole deal and lay them on the table of the House. Because it does say that Ottawa has agreed to pay 100 per cent of the cost.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. WARREN: One hundred per cent of the cost, and all they want the Province to do is call tenders.

MR. OTTAWA: That big bad wolf up in Ottawa?

MR. WARREN: Yes, that big bad wolf up there is only going to pay 100 per cent of the cost. And here is what it includes: It includes the airstrip,

MR. WARREN: the airstrip maintenance equipment, a shelter for the maintenance equipment, provision for a passenger waiting room, provision of electrical power, runway approach and suitable terminal electronic navigation aids. Now, this is all included. That is what Mr. Ottawa, the big bad guy up-along is planning to do for the airstrip programme along the Labrador coast.

MR. NEARY: And how much will this Province put into it?

MR. WARREN: Well, this Province - Oh, yes, this Province has to do something. Let us see what this Province has to do now. The Province will be responsible for the ownership.

MR. NEARY: Oh!

MR. WARREN: The Province will be responsible for the ownership, the management, the operation and the maintenance of the airstrip, the airstrip maintenance equipment. After Ottawa gives them the equipment, they have to look after it, you know. So, now, the Province will ensure that the navigation facility is maintained at all times.

Now that is not too much to ask the Province to do. 'Look, we will pay 100 per cent of the construction of airstrips along the Labrador coast'. One hundred per cent, not eighty, not ninety, not seventy. 'And we will put the snow clearing

MR. WARREN:

equipment in there, all the equipment that is necessary to keep that airstrip in operation, we will give you lights, we will give you shelter for the passengers, we will give you shelter for the equipment. We will do all that, and all you have to do is maintain it. And the Province, for some reason, is saying no. And what they are saying is 'Well, we are not going to do this if you are going to take the coastal boats out of it. And this is the excuse that the Premier and his minister are using, 'Well, you know, if you take the coastal boats out of it we are not going to sign it'. Apparently this is why it has been hung up.

Well, I also understand in this same agreement - it has been signed and I can see here on this last page it is signed by the Premier of Newfoundland, and it does say that Ottawa is allotting \$300,000 for an investigation into the Labrador Coastal Boat Services. And they are going to talk to the people before -

MR. NEARY: Oh ! (INAUDIBLE) An improvement.

MR. WARREN: That is right. Before they take anything out they are going to be talking to the people along the coast.

MR. NEARY: That is something new. That is a new twist.

MR. WARREN: There is money allotted and still in. If this government does not see fit to go along and give the people along the Labrador Coast some ways and means of getting out of Postville when they want to.

MR. NEARY: Move the adjournment.

MR. WARREN: As it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Let it be noted that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

MR. NEARY What is the order of business tomorrow?

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman opposite asked, Mr. Speaker, what the order of business is tomorrow. It is the Address in Reply. We will hear some other sterling addresses from the people on this side, the new members on this side of the House as we heard this afternoon.

SOME HON MEMBERS Oh! Oh!

MR. MARSHALL: No, we will not hear Stirling, you know.

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