



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 28

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

7 May 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
On a matter of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, last evening the Premier pointed out in an interview carried on both television stations -

MR. PATTERSON:
What kind of television shows do you watch?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), as the Premier pointed out yesterday, will not be listened to on the railway or on any other significant matter; none of the government backbenchers will, including the member for Placentia. We can understand why the member for Placentia would not be listened to on anything.

MR. PATTERSON:
Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier stated in his television interview that he had been politically posturing and had been deceiving the people of the Province and the Government of Canada in the position which he had been taking until a few days ago in stating that there was a Constitutional obligation on the

part of the Government of Canada to maintain and operate the Newfoundland Railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the matter of privilege is that in light of this admission and in light of the statements that the Premier has supplied to this House, and I would I refer Your Honour to the document A Programme for the Rehabilitation of the Newfoundland Railway which was tabled in this House, I believe it was November 18, 1980. On November 18, 1980 in Hansard, page 5781 the Premier said, "Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce and table the policy of the Newfoundland Government as it relates to the Newfoundland Railway and to release the report on which the policy is based. Mr. Speaker, in this report, on page 3 of the introduction, the following is carried:"

'It was also felt that the onus was clearly on the federal government to demonstrate why the Province's insistence on its rights under the Terms of Union would place a grossly unfair burden on that government.' So we have here a statement supplied to the House that there are rights under the Terms of Union with respect to the maintenance of the Newfoundland Railway.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if we could turn to page 10 of the Conclusions and Recommendations section - the report is numbered a little oddly - towards the end of the report the following is carried: 'It is the Province's intention to hold the federal government to the undertakings that were entered into at the time of Confederation. The Province will not allow the prospect of decreased federal funding for other modes to influence its

position with respect to the Newfoundland Railway. The Province takes this position not only because the promises made at the time of Confederation were solemn ones and should not be repudiated by the federal government merely because their present impact is, in their view, more onerous than anticipated in 1949. The Province's position is also based on the fact that the people of the Province are entitled to both a good rail as well as a good highway system, as is the case in all other provinces.'

Now there are other times, Mr. Speaker, and we are having these researched now, but these are clear examples of where the Premier has stated, has informed this House that it was his position, it was his administration's position that there was a constitutional obligation. Indeed, in the comments that were supplied with the tabling of the report the Premier says, page 5817 in Hansard, November 18, 1980, in responding to a question that had been tabled, I believe by Mr. Neary: "'Is the Government of Newfoundland going to put any money into the Newfoundland Railway?' Well, under Term 31 of the Terms of Union, of course, this is a federal matter, this is a division of powers under the Terms of Union, and this is one matter which both governments agreed would continue to be the responsibility of the federal government. So they will have to bear the cost of this revitalization, obviously, because this is their commitment."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that the Premier has deliberately misled this House.

Consistently, in a systematic fashion since 1979, the Premier has come before this House, gone before the people of the Province, gone to the Government of Canada and has put forth a position which, last evening, the Premier's own admission was that this was incorrect, this was political posturing, this was bluffing, this was deceit, deception and falsehood. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that on the record, as submitted, we have established a prima facie case of a breach of privilege and I would ask that Your Honour rule on that before making the appropriate motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council, to the point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

We see, Mr. Speaker, the reason why the hon. gentleman is so low in the polls and why his style is that of a lack luster leader. The hon. gentleman gets up and takes ten minutes of the time of this House in legalistic constitutional arguments that would be better fitting Dalhousie Law School, from whence the hon. gentleman came and where I hope they will take him back, although I do not know whether they will or not, in the future.

MR. TOBIN:

Steve has that taken over.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman wants to construe things as he always does when he wants to, as he wishes to interpret them. He refers to deceit, that the Premier has deceived, he has bluffed and all the rest of it. I can tell the hon. gentleman this, and the hon. gentleman will not get the opportunity to do this, this Premier is quite capable of using every, single tool that is available to further the interests of the people of Newfoundland at every time and at every corner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The only rights the hon. gentleman can see are legal rights and his rights. There are two categories of rights, there are legal rights and his rights. But there are other categories, Mr. Speaker. There are all sorts of rights in this world. There are legal rights and there are moral rights, there are political rights and social rights, there are rights of Newfoundlanders, there are rights of Canadians, there are rights of Ontarians, there are rights of Quebecers, etc. Before this Premier came to power, there was a distinction between the political rights and he has worked very hard to make sure that Newfoundlanders get an even break with the rest of the country.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, sure he has.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman refers to what the Premier has said. The Premier used the Terms of Union and he has used the Terms of Union very, very skillfully. Because ingrained in that Term of Union is a reference to the Newfoundland Railway, and

he used it and he will continue to use it to the benefit of the people of the Province of Newfoundland in the Canadian Confederation. Now, the hon. gentleman says he has researched it and what have you. He has not researched it, his staff has researched it. Now, what a consummate waste of public money, for him to put his staff down to research statements made by the Premier one, two, three or four years ago.

It shows just how obsessed the hon. gentleman is. The hon. gentleman would be much better in trying to style himself and his party as an alternative government to the present administration, and the Legislature would be much more effective.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should not be so foolish - 'constitutional issues and 'legal issues'. As we have said, he wants to be the Premier!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

So he gets up, Mr. Speaker, in the House, and he makes statements of this nature and wastes the time of the House on a matter of privilege.

I will say once again that the Premier of this Province, on the railway, on the offshore, on the fishery and on every right that is basic to the people of Newfoundland, will use every tool that is available to this Province in order to gain equality. He has done this in this issue. The statements he made were not inconsistent with what he said before. The fact of the matter is, it was not this Premier who gained the Terms of Union. I can

guarantee you, if this administration had, we would have a very firm and full constitutional right that is not subject to interpretation.

So I suggest the hon. gentleman grow up, and I suggest the hon. gentleman not be wasting time with such foolish points of privilege as this.

MR. TULK:

A big sook, Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I am quite clear in my mind on the point that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has made. I am going to take the matter under advisement, but I do not mind hearing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Just listen. Just sit down and listen.

MR. TULK:

Oh, sorry!

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not mind hearing brief views from members on each side.

I now recognize the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen an example of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) trying to hide behind innuendo, insults, personal attacks to cover up something that he knows the Premier of this Province is guilty of, that the Premier of this Province admitted yesterday evening on television that he was

doing, namely, that for the last seven years in this Province he has been bluffing the people of Newfoundland, he has been bluffing the members of this Legislature. He announced yesterday evening on television that it was political posturing. Mr. Speaker, not only has he misled this House, he has thrown some feeling of whether there is any credibility left in the highest office in Newfoundland or not.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I have heard what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has said and I am trying to make up my mind whether there is in fact a prima facie case. This is not the time for debate. If the hon. member has something to add to that, I would be very pleased to hear it.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the whole point is that the Premier admitted it, and we have pointed out to Your Honour that yesterday the Premier was deliberately misleading this House. I would point out to you, Your Honour, that this is not an excuse. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) says that the Premier will use the tools of office, any tools he can find, for the good of the people of this Province. That is not a good enough excuse for the Premier to deliberately mislead members of this House, and the people of this Province through this House. I suggest to you, Your Honour, that what we have seen here is a case where the Premier has misled this House. The precedents point out in this House, and I will bring that to Your Honour's attention, that ministers of the Crown have been asked to resign for less than what the Premier has been doing

for the last seven years in this House. As a matter of fact, the Premier has asked a member of his own Cabinet to resign for less, I would suggest to you, in degree than what the Premier did yesterday.

The truth of the matter is, the Premier has used this House, and that is not parliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down. Sit him down, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The Premier has used this House, this Legislature for his own partisan politics, to make himself a hero in Newfoundland and to make himself an enemy of a federal, at that time Liberal, Government.

MR. PATTERSON:

Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to rule and to rule that the Premier has deliberately misled this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think one could be fairly brief on this, because the allegation of the Opposition is that the Premier has deliberately

misled the House. That is essentially what they are saying. It takes them a long time and a fair amount of abuse to say it, but that essentially is what they are saying and that is all they are saying.

Really what is before the Chair is, What did the Premier do? The Premier negotiated as he must, as he has a duty to and he must negotiate in the most effective way possible in order to protect and enhance the rights of the Province of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is his duty. He has negotiated both now and, if we are speaking of things which were said in 1980, a position in 1980. Really what the Opposition is saying is that the Premier in negotiating in the most effective manner possible is misleading the House, and that it totally absurd. They may not like the way he negotiates, they may not like the fruitful results which usually come from his negotiations, but to confuse that or to try to confuse the people by saying that is deliberately misleading, is totally without ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we heard the gentleman for St. John's East and

I say to him he can abuse, he can vilify, he can obfuscate all he wants, the Speaker and members here are treating this as the serious matter it is. It is up to the Speaker to decide whether there is a prima facie case, it is up to us to raise the concern.

Now, I am with the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) when he says it is the Premier's obligation to negotiate in the most effective manner. We do not argue that point at all. What we do say to the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount and everybody else in this Chamber, is that the Premier, however effectively or ineffectively he negotiates, cannot in the process flaunt the Rules of this House, and that is what he has clearly done in this case. He did it back in 1979, 1980 and 1981, as was cited by my colleague for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

We suspected it but we did not have it confirmed on the public record until last evening when the Premier, in that despicable contortion on T.V., one of the most despicable interviews I have ever witnessed, admitted what we suspected for a long time and so now we put it to you, Mr. Speaker. They can squirm and they can scream all they want, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that T.V. interview gives all the evidence he needs. He does not have to trust a word that I say, a word that the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says, a word that the gentleman for Mount Scio says, he only has to look at the script of that interview, because the Premier said in that interview that he had misled. That is the net result of what that interview adds up to. The statement he made

yesterday evening and the statements that were read back from Hansard by my colleague for Mount Scio are mutually exclusive, they are both not correct. Either he was lying yesterday evening on T.V. or he was lying to this House, one or the other, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier, to that point of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I find it very fascinating and almost amusing. What I said yesterday and what I said in 1980, there is a position that can be taken if one wants to take it on the railway, a constitutional position. What we are saying is that our best legal advice says that it does not have that great a chance of success. We used whatever means we could in 1980 and 1981 to get the best deal we could for the railway at that time; we used the constitutional position however strong or weak it would be. However strong or weak it would be, it is not an airtight situation. Nobody, no lawyer, no person who reads the Terms of Union would say that we have 100 per cent guarantee on the railway as it relates to the Terms of Union, but we as a government and I, as Leader of the Government at the time, used what was said in the constitution and in the Terms of Union, what was said in the letter from the Prime Minister to Mr. Walsh of that day, who was the head of the Newfoundland delegation, to use every single piece of evidence I could to get the best deal for Newfoundland and Labrador, and we were highly

successful, Mr. Speaker, in doing that. That is the job that a government and a leader has to do, use everything at your disposal. You are not going to come out when you think you have an opportunity to persuade another partner or another government or somebody that you are negotiating with at that point in time. So there is no point of privilege.

The government was about doing Her Majesty's work in the most effective way possible to do that, and if this kind of argument can be used, then you better go back, Mr. Speaker, you better not only look at this, you better look at about 10,000 other issues that have come up since 1949, and every government in Canada had better look back over what each minister and premier said. You use what you can at the time to get the best deal for the people you serve. That is what we did, Mr. Speaker. I know it grates the Opposition to think that we would fight so hard for Newfoundland and Labrador, but that is why they are over there and we are over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
We are dealing with a point of privilege now.

MR. MARSHALL:
If Your Honour wishes to have a debate all afternoon, very good.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, I will

take that matter under advisement and have more to say about it at a later date.

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will make it very brief, Mr. Speaker. During the making of the point of privilege the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) used the words 'deceit' and 'deceive' in relation to the Premier, the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) made the statement that the Premier was deliberately deceiving the House, and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) made the statement that the hon. the Premier was lying.

MR. FLIGHT:
Huh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL:
Now, I am making a point of privilege.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, keep quiet.

MR. SIMMONS:
You can make your point of privilege, but (inaudible)

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I just refer you to Beauchesne. Because points of privilege are not to be made and not invented in a person's mind, I refer the hon. gentlemen, Your Honour, to page 107: It is unparliamentary to use the word 'LIE, deliberately mis-stated the truth, not telling the truth,

lie'. There is a whole page of references that Your Honour can see in the debates of the House of Commons. On page 109, 'deliberately misleading, deliberately misled', there is a half page of references with respect to that. On page 106, 'deceive', there are references with respect to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one is making a point of privilege in the House, it is surely not permissible for one to infringe the privileges of this House by the types of wording that one uses when one makes it. So I raise this point of privilege and I ask Your Honour, when Your Honour is considering the points of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition, to consider the point of privilege that I am now raising against the three members of the Opposition who brought this up, and I would ask that the hon. gentlemen be asked to retract those words as, in my opinion, they ought to have been immediately they were uttered.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, to save Your Honour time, to avoid diverting attention from the main issue here, which the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is trying to have Your Honour do, I unequivocally withdraw the use of the word deceit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

It is time for you.

MR. BARRY:
- and I substitute the word falsehood which Your Honour has ruled is parliamentary acceptable. Instead of deceit, I substitute the word falsehood and I stand by that and I ask that Your Honour look at that television interview, look at what the Premier has said to the House before yesterday, and look what he said yesterday, and he has admitted publicly to engaging in falsehoods in this House and outside this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, if I may, in response to the Leader of the Opposition. There are clear rules set down in Beauchesne - it is not Barrychesne it is Beauchesne - which say you cannot say indirectly what you cannot say directly, and that is what the hon. gentleman is doing.

MR. BARRY:
'Falsehood' has been ruled parliamentary.

MR. MARSHALL:
There is nothing that is parliamentary when one says indirectly what one cannot say directly. I ask Your Honour to take this under advisement, because these are the rules on which the parliamentary process is governed and the hon. gentleman there opposite cannot infringe those rules, and they cannot do

indirectly what they cannot do directly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is 'falsehood', on page 107.

MR. BARRY:

Well, it has been overruled by the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You do not know the rules.

MR. BARRY:

It was the Speaker's ruling, which overrules Beauchesne.

MR. TOBIN:

You know the rules all right. That is like the night you were in the Chair of Committee and could not see a member cross the floor.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

It seems to the Chair that it is purely a matter of looking up and seeing what was said and to determine whether these words were unparliamentary. I would like to -

MR. BARRY:

I have withdrawn the unparliamentary one, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, I would like to just look into the matter to see exactly. I do not think that I need to have any submissions on that matter. If the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) wants to have a brief word, that is fine.

MR. SIMMONS:

First I am concerned that the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) quote me correctly. What I said was either or, either he lied yesterday afternoon or he lied on the earlier occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit - and here I might be differing slightly from what my colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has said - that the gentleman for St. John's East misses the entire point in raising his point of privilege. I put it to you, Sir, how can a member of this House allege that another member has deliberately misled the House without alleging he has deliberately misled the House? How can I at any time as a member of this House draw to the attention of the House and the Chair that somebody in my view has deliberately misled if I cannot use the words to convey my view? It has to be said. That is the whole point of a matter of privilege like this, that if it never gets said, the Chair and the House never realizes what my concern is as a member. Now having said it, as my friend from Mount Scio has done, then the onus is on the Chair to adjudicate as to whether there is a prime facie case. It stands to reason that if there is no prime facie case, then the charge made by the gentleman for Mount Scio is not substantiated by the House and the matter has been resolved in that manner. If there is a prime facie case, then the House deals with it. But how it can even articulate the issue without using the words that in the mind of the member are the offensive action, i.e., 'deliberately misleading', I cannot see for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, how you can ever pursue a matter like that in this Chamber.

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible) deal will you?

MR. SIMMONS:

I know you do not want to hear it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Just one final word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Just one final word.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, look, I mean, the hon. gentleman talked about contortion. His whole logic that he has shown in this is an exercise that indicates that he is a master at contortion. There are unparliamentary rules here. You are not allowed to say 'deliberately misleading', you are not allowed to say somebody is 'malicious', you are not allowed to say somebody is 'mental', you are not allowed to say somebody is 'unstable'.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, you can say all these things that are unparliamentary purely by getting up and saying 'I rise on a point of privilege. The hon. gentleman is a jackass, the hon. gentleman is stunned,' some such things like that. You know, you get up on a point of privilege and you can infringe the rules. That is not an argument at all. The very fact of the matter is you cannot say 'deliberately misleading', you cannot say 'deceiving', you cannot call a person a liar, and that is what is being done in his House today.

MR. BARRY:
On a prima facie case you can say 'deliberately misled'.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
No, you cannot.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, you cannot.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
One final comment.

MR. SIMMS:
How long is this going to go on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

MR. TOBIN:
You have not been recognized, boy. Sit down.

MR. TULK:
I have been recognized, I think.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
The hon. gentleman has said that I used the words - I think he said 'deliberately deceitful' first. I did use the words 'deliberately misleading'. I will withdraw that and in place of that I will say that for the last seven years the Premier has been carrying on a trickery in this House, that he has not been telling the truth and, Mr. Speaker, in so doing he has breached the privileges of this House.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I am making a

submission now with respect to the so-called substitutions that hon. gentlemen opposite are engaging in. In other words, they are saying we withdraw this, but we will say that. Then there was an attempt even to trick Your Honour by saying, "Oh, under one occasion you allowed 'falsehood'" -

MR. BARRY:
Right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
- "therefore I can call 'falsehood'." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a specific reference to this in Beauchesne. What it relates to, those lists -

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
If the hon. gentleman will control himself for a moment and hear me in the same silence in which I heard him, then we will all proceed in a more civilized manner, and hopefully in a more lucid manner, as well. On page 114 of Beauchesne, paragraph 324, this is very important with respect to those lists. Those lists a few pages before are examples, they are not gospel. They did not come down from Mount Sina, or even from Mount Scio. Paragraph 324 states in part "It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention." 'Intention'! I submit to Your Honour that here it is necessary to focus in on

'intention' because the intention was clearly to take out a word which perhaps they regarded as unparliamentary to be able to allude or impute the same thing, so I would think that Your Honour will want to have some reference to that.

Further down, in paragraph 326, page 115 Beauchesne, subparagraph (2) "Words may not be used hypothetically or conditionally, if they are plainly intended to convey a direct imputation. Putting a hypothetical case is not the way to evade what would be in itself disorderly." I draw this to Your Honour's attention and also, and probably most especially, to the question of 'intention', and then it is quite clear that by the substitution of words, what the hon. member intends to effect.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I will take all of these comments into consideration and I will rule on the matter at a later date.

MR. BARRY:
A point of order, Your Honour, because there seems to be some confusion coming up.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
It is not appropriate, Your Honour, for members in this House in the course of a speech, in the course of asking a question and so forth, to say that a member has deliberately misled the House. However, Mr. Speaker, when you have a situation where there is raised a matter of privilege and the very essence of the privilege

which relates to contempt of parliament has to do with a deliberate misleading of the House, there is no other way but to state what is the essence of that matter of privilege. I think that was the point the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was dealing with. I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne pages 24 to 25 where it deals with that and I will just leave that for Your Honour to look at and rule on subsequently, I do not need a ruling right now.

The point is that it is raised, the point is established as to what is alleged to be a contempt of parliament, of the Legislature, and what we are submitting in this case is that the deliberate, systematic misleading of parliament over a number of years is the contempt of parliament referred to. Your Honour's authority then is limited to deciding whether or not a prima facie case has been established and, if the prima facie case is established, then Your Honour makes a ruling - sorry - then a motion is proposed.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is a fairly simple one. If one takes a look at the Standing Orders in our House, they refer to the procedures for Private Member's Day, Wednesday. Standing Order 53.1(4) clearly states, "On Wednesdays the question period

shall commence not later than 3:30 p.m." I notice it is now almost 3:40 p.m. The second portion of that states, "the ordinary daily routine of business shall end not later than 4:00 p.m." In other words, the private member's motion must be called by 4:00 p.m. Now, I can understand if Your Honour were to say that a question of privilege would interrupt that procedure, however, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) just rose on a point of order not on a point of privilege, and I submit that all our privileges are being violated and being questioned. Because we are here, ministers in particular, anxious to answer questions to be put forth by the Opposition and here they are wasting the time of the House, thirty-five minutes on a point that is really silly and foolish. I submit that Your Honour should call them to order and call them to task. I hope Your Honour would be prepared to hear some more debate on this point of privilege that I have just raised.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege the time actually went over 3:30 p.m. when we were discussing the point of privilege. I should not have accepted a point of order after that time, but I will consider the matter that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did try to raise.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, a very brief submission on the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

This was a point of order and it would have to be by leave of the House.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if it was agreed to stop the clock so we could get to questions, we would agree.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are now running late and there are a number of people I would like to welcome to the galleries, if you would spare the time. I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery twenty-three Grade eight students from St. Joseph's School, Ferryland, with their teacher, Mr. James Dinn, and I would like to welcome to the galleries Mayor Colin Chaytor and Councillors Francis MacNiel, Aloysuis Corcoran, Thomas Goulding, Mary Pennell, Rita Pennell, Terry Follett and Town Manager, Yvonne Power, from Trepassey Town Council, and I would like to welcome Reverend Leslie Robertson and Reverend Hunter from the Moravian Church in Labrador.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the Premier's admission -

MR. WINDSOR:

Are we going to have Statements By Ministers?

MR. BARRY:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is Private Members' Day.

MR. WINDSOR:

What about after Oral Questions, by leave?

MR. BARRY:

After Question Period, by leave, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, why should the people of the Province believe anything that the Premier says from now on in light of his admission that he was engaging in falsehoods with respect to the constitutional obligations on the railway?

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, here again the hon. gentleman is making allegations of lying and falsehoods of the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not need to take time out to determine whether or not that is unparliamentary. It is here on page 106 of Beauchesne; 'false,' 'falsehood,' 'lie' you are not allowed to say and the hon. gentleman cannot usurp Question Period by infringing the rules of the House.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, briefly to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

This came up, Your Honour, when a series of members on the other side of the House stood up and accused members of the Opposition

earlier in this session of engaging in falsehoods. There was a ruling made in this House that that was acceptable, that that was parliamentary language, and I would submit, Your Honour, what is sauce for the Tory goose is sauce for the Opposition gander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
A great one to talk about geese, Mr. Speaker. Look, the hon. gentleman is a stuffed goose.

Mr. Speaker, it is there, and it is plainly there, that the word 'false' is unparliamentary, 'deceit' is unparliamentary, 'deliberately misleading' is unparliamentary. It is there. Now if the House is going to allow Question Period and the whole proceedings of the House to descend to depths that was not intended, to anarchy in the House itself, where the only purpose of Question Period or the House itself is to get up and hurl insults from one side against the other, well, that is the way it will have to be. But the fact of the matter is in order to control the House I suggest, Your Honour, that these words have to be ruled unparliamentary right on the spot, immediately.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I must draw the hon. member's attention to Beauchesne, Page 106, and that the terms 'false' and 'false representations' and 'false

statements' have been ruled as unparliamentary.

MR. BARRY:
The Speaker's ruling in this House overrides Beauchesne, Your Honour. Precedents of this House override Beauchesne.

MR. FUREY:
You ruled it in order.

MR. BAKER:
It is alright for the Tories to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Now do rulings in this House override Beauchesne? Can they use a word that we cannot use? Is there one word for that side and not a word for this side?

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Something that the hon. gentleman does not understand is the Office of the Speaker, and it has been quoted time after time here again in Beauchesne. The Speaker is to be respected and his position is not to be denigrated in the way that the Leader of the Opposition is doing it now.

Now the fact of the matter is the rulings on the Standing Orders are there. It is the Speaker's ruling that applies. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman is referring. All I know is I refer

to Beauchesne. All I know is in any decent parliamentary forum you are not allowed to get up and call people false, say they are liars, say they are deceivers or what have you. As for the hon. gentleman saying it was ruled in order once before, the circumstances may differ. But even if the circumstances did not differ, Your Honour is the person who enforces the rules of this House, and if Your Honour wishes to overrule what Your Honour said five minutes ago, he can. If Your Honour wishes to overrule a previous Speaker, he can. But the fact of the matter, I would suggest to Your Honour, is that it is very, very serious if the Leader of the Opposition, or any member, is going to be able to get up and use words like that without being called to order immediately and required to retract.

Now, Your Honour has asked the Leader of the Opposition to retract and withdraw and he has not done it. He should be made to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already quoted from Beauchesne, Page 106, that using the word 'false' is unparliamentary. I call on the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, I, of course, abide by Your Honour's ruling and unequivocally withdraw. I substitute the word 'bluff', but I wonder if Your Honour at some stage would establish which terms can be used by members on that side of the House and which terms we cannot use.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman's words are impugning Your Honour's impartiality in this House. The hon. gentleman cannot say indirectly what he cannot say directly. The hon. gentleman wants to say in context that it is a bluff, he is doing it in the context of what he said before, that the hon. the Premier was stating a falsehood, and he cannot do it. The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) has already quoted to Your Honour from Beauchesne: "It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention, of the person speaking;" - the tone and intention. The hon. gentleman was asked to withdraw 'falsehood' and he said, 'Okay, we will substitute 'bluff' - "sometimes upon the person to whom the words are addressed, as, whether he is a public officer" of the House; "all these considerations must be attended to at the moment, as they are infinitely various and cannot possibly be foreseen".

Now, the hon. gentleman is denigrating Your Honour's ruling, he is challenging Your Honour, he is attacking Your Honour's position in this House when he is refusing, without any equivocation whatsoever, to withdraw what Your Honour has asked and demanded that

he withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I am satisfied that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition withdrew the term 'false'.

MR. BARRY:

The administration is trying to limit our time for questions.

I would like to ask the Premier, in light of the fact he has now publicly admitted to the people of this Province that he has been engaged in a colossal bluff for the last seven years, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the railway, why should the people of Newfoundland and Labrador believe the Premier in the future on anything? And has he not now severely damaged any future negotiations which he might go into with the Government of Canada? Will they not merely now say, 'You were bluffing on that, you are bluffing on this issue as well'?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, four or five years ago I said we had a constitutional position on the railway and today I say we have a constitutional position on the railway. But today I go further and say that the constitutional position on the railway is not so strong as to invest public funds for that purpose because our legal advisors tell us it is not a constitutional position which we can sustain in the courts. I am taking the same position as I took four or five years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sellout! Sellout!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, we do have a legal position because the railway is mentioned in the Terms of Union. I said that five years ago and I am saying it again now. But I am adding to what I said in 1980 and 1981, I am adding to it by saying that at this point in time, given the legal advice we have, to try to take the federal government to court to have the railway retained into perpetuity through that legal process, is one that our legal advisor says is not an air-tight case, it is not a case that we a very great chance in winning. Mr. Speaker, in 1980, as I will tomorrow, as I will next week, if there is some issue that comes up between us and the federal government, comes up between us and a company, comes up between us and somebody else outside this Province, where I can use, as I did, because there is a constitutional position although less than 50 per cent in our view right now, if I can use that to gain improvements for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, I will use those constitutional positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will use the constitutional position, I will use the moral position, I will use the social position, I will use whatever position I can to fight to get the best deal for Newfoundland and Labrador. If that upsets the Leader of the Opposition, tough.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Sullivan Commission has said it is a constitutional right, in light of the fact that the present Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) on April 22, 1981, said it is a constitutional right, in light of the fact that on March 12, 1986, the hon. Eric Nielsen said that it was a constitutional right, that the hon. Don Mazankowski said that it was a constitutional right, will the Premier now tell us why he is saying it is not a constitutional right? Is it because he has already sold out the railway?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
They did not say it was legally enforceable though, did they, Mr. Speaker? The federal government takes the view and has said publicly that they will do nothing with the railway unless the Government of Newfoundland agrees. That is what they have said. They agree that there is in the Terms of Union mention of the railway, but the railway is mentioned in the same light as the lighthouses are, in exactly the same way, where lighthouses have come and gone, and Hotel Newfoundland in the same context.

Our legal advisors tell us from a legal point of view in a court of law of the country Canada that we

would not be able to sustain a legal argument that the federal government was obligated legally to keep the railway of Newfoundland in perpetuity. However, Mr. Speaker, unlike the Liberal government of the past of which the hon. members were a part, they have said that they will do nothing with the railway of Newfoundland unless the Government of Newfoundland agrees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I refer the Premier to the House of Commons Debates, 12 March, 1986, page 11453. Is the Premier aware that when the hon. Edward Broadbent, so familiar to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), in questioning the credibility of the federal government, said that in his Halifax statement of August 2, 1984, the Prime Minister said a Progressive Conservative Government will support and continue to operate the Newfoundland Railway, and that the hon. Eric Nielsen got up and said, 'Clearly all that the Prime Minister was saying in his speech was a reaffirmation that this government intends to honour the Terms of Union between Canada and Newfoundland,' and that this is one of them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY:

Is the Premier aware that the present Government of Canada has accepted that it is a constitutional right, under the Terms of Union, to continue to operate the railway? And is not the Premier now trying to weasel out because he sold out?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I remained silent while the Leader of the Opposition gave his speech, so I hope I can have silence from the Leader of the Opposition while I try to answer his speech.

The position of the Government of Newfoundland has been and is today before the federal government, which is we do not want to do what the Liberals did, say keep the railway while you downgrade it all the while. We have put a position before the federal government which says retain the railway with hundreds of millions of dollars of improvements. Otherwise, if you just try to hookwink us like they hookwinked the Liberals, and you keep the railway, meanwhile every day mile after mile of track and bridge goes down to nothing and it is deteriorated, and gradually the Placentia line is gone, the Bonavista line is gone, and we lose freight.

What we have said to the federal government is that our position as

the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is that we want the railway to stay, but it must stay with a commitment by the Government of Canada to put hundreds of millions of dollars into it so it can be a viable, competing mode. Right now it is not a viable competing mode; it is losing to the water, it is losing to the air, it is losing to the road because of a Liberal policy of years ago. Now let us change that Liberal policy and bring in a policy which says not only retain it but give it some decency and give it some money so that it can viably compete and not be deteriorated over time so we lose the railway completely and we have nothing in return.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are not going to accept that kind of position, Mr. Speaker, at all. That is what we have before the federal government. But, at the same time I have a Department of Justice here in this government and the Department of Justice advises me. Now the members of the federal government, because they are so committed to the railway in Newfoundland, have indicated that they believe it is a constitutional right. But, if we had to some day - five years from now, ten years from now, twenty years from now - go to the Supreme Court of Canada, I have a legal opinion - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is a lawyer; he knows about all law in the world - I can say to the Leader of the Opposition, that because of the way the Terms of Union are written, and because the other thing is only a letter from the Prime Minister to the leader of the Newfoundland delegation,

legally it would be difficult to sustain an argument that the federal government has to keep the railway in perpetuity on the basis of those Terms of Union. But, different from the Liberal Party of Canada, many members of the P.C. Government in Ottawa do believe in their own minds, because they have a commitment to Newfoundland, that there is this constitutional right of Newfoundland to continue to have a railway, and they have said so, as the Leader of the Opposition says. And they have gone so far as to say, "Let us not talk about courts. We will do nothing to the Newfoundland Railway unless the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, through their elected representatives, the Government of Newfoundland agree.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, unless they sell out.

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier confirm whether he was saying yesterday that the ends justify the means in that it is all right for the Premier of this Province for seven years to tell otherwise than the truth, take a position that is contrary to what he knows is the truth? Will the Premier confirm that he is saying that it is legitimate for the Premier of this Province to mislead the people of this Province because he feels that the end justifies this means?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what I said in 1980 and 1981, and what I say today is that there is a constitutional position. There is a constitutional position whereby Newfoundland can go to court, if we want to and make our best arguments, as we did on the offshore, for better evidence, as we did on hydro in Labrador, with better evidence. We could if we wanted to. There is a constitutional position there. I am not saying that we do not have a constitutional position, that Newfoundlanders do not have one. What I am saying is that that constitutional position might not be as strong as it should be in order to gain a victory in the courts, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE:

That is what he said in the beginning.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is what I am saying.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And what I did in 1980-81, knowing that there was a constitutional position, was use it to try to get the best deal for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in

this Province. It is sadder than the day that we had the day of mourning a few years back. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier

MR. TOBIN:

You people signed away the railway.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

I am not that surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier admitted yesterday that he was a bluff. The people in my district have known it for years when he promised to keep a hospital open and then closed it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask will the Premier prove that he has an ounce of credibility left, that if the Premier does not get what he is asking Ottawa for now, if the Premier does not get that package, will the Premier resign?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. member opposite from Bellevue, as well as all hon. members opposite, they are not going to get rid of me that easy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And talking about bluff, Mr. Speaker, I ask the member for Bellevue and the people of

Newfoundland is what we offered on the offshore a bluff? Is it a bluff?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It could be! It could be!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You ask the majority of Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I never said a word when the hon. member asked the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. members on my right to keep quiet when questions are being answered.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member called me a bluff. I ask him is it a bluff that St. Lawrence mine will be reopened in a couple of months time? Is it a bluff that the restructuring agreement has seen all the fish plants on the South Coast reopened when the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) was part of a government that wanted to close them all? Is that bluff?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Is it a bluff, Mr. Speaker, that the Baie Verte mines are still operating? Is it a bluff that Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are going now better than they ever did before? Mr. Speaker, we will stand on our record. We know where all the bluff is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is misleading again. While he was on national television saying some plants will close - must close, he said on national television - I was up there getting a restructuring agreement that kept the plants open, that put money into St. Lawrence, that put money into Cow Head over the objections of a Premier who was kicking over the traces, would not even come to the press conference, but we rammed it down his throat and we got the plants open although he told national television some plants would have to close.

Now stop lying to the House. Stop lying to the House. Do not lie this time. Tell the truth.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage, who was then, I think, out of the Cabinet, in the final negotiations on the restructuring agreement was in the hallway of a hotel room when Pierre Debané and Mike Kirby came in and asked if he could sit in as an observer on the meeting. That is what the member for Fortune-Hermitage had to do with it. I can produce documents in this House to show that the federal government that the hon. member was a part of, wanted to close down Burin, Grand Bank, Harbour Breton, Gaultois and Ramea.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not true.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I can show that, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows it. He was only an observer, Mr. Speaker. He was only an observer. They asked me as Premier would I let him come into the room to be an observer after we had the negotiations done. Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened to my former principal.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I must rule there is no prima facie case. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

When he was making his point of privilege, the hon. gentleman for Fortune-Hermitage very clearly said to the Premier several times, "Stop lying to the House." Now,

Mr. Speaker, that is obviously and completely out of order and requires an immediate retraction by the hon. member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I undertake to get for the House a copy of the transcript of the tape in which the Premier said on national television that some fish plants in Newfoundland would have to close. So, Mr. Speaker, when I heard him say the contrary, I understand that the opposite of truth is a lie, but in my exuberance I forgot the rules, so I withdraw the word. But I affirm for the record that he is not telling the truth on this matter. He is packaging the truth as he did on FFTs and he is now doing on the railway. But he is not going to get away with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That point of privilege has been taken care of. The term referred to has been withdrawn.

It is Private Members' Day now. It is past the hour of four o'clock, so it is time to call Private Members' Day. But first, Statements by Ministers, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed. Agreed.

Statements by Ministers

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Opposition for the opportunity to do this by leave. I think it is an important statement.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn), I am very pleased to announce that a tentative agreement has been reached with the Canadian Union of Public Employees on behalf of some 350 employees of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation employed throughout the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very significant that we have arrived at this tentative agreement with Canada's largest public service union.

In addition to improving the terms and conditions of employment in areas relating to layoff, union security and certain fringe benefits, the four year agreement provides significant salary increases over the last three years of its term.

The agreement, which is effective from October 1, 1985 to September 30, 1989, provides for wage increases after the first year, which is the second year of government's wage freeze period. The increases are as follows. I make this information available with the concurrence of the

negotiating from the union because this agreement has yet to be ratified but they have agreed that this information can now be made public:

Effective October 1, 1986 - 6 per cent or \$1,100 per annum, whichever is greater.

Effective October 1, 1987 - 6 per cent or \$1,100 per annum, whichever is greater.

Effective October 1, 1988 - 6 per cent or \$1,200 per annum, whichever is greater.

Mr. Speaker, these numbers may seem very familiar to hon. colleagues. The reason they are familiar is that these salary increases are the same salary increases that have been offered and are on the negotiating table currently with the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees for the General Service and MOS employees. This clearly demonstrates the reasonableness of Government's position in negotiations with NAPE. Accordingly, we anticipate that when negotiations resume on Friday with NAPE on monetary matters, an early agreement should be reached within a short period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the minister takes great pride these days when he can stand up and announce an agreement or a

settlement with CUPE or other units of NAPE, as he should maybe take pride in those settlements. Mr. Speaker, for this side, we can tell him we are happy for both sides, for the workers and for their employers, that those settlements have been reached, but the overriding concern in this Province today is the state of the dispute or the state of the negotiations involving MOS and the General Service. We do not know what progress is being made.

Until the minister gave this statement, we were heartened and took some pride, I suppose, in the fact that negotiations were not taking place in public. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the minister could not resist, when making this statement, taking another flick at NAPE; he could not resist the kind of posturing on his part and the kind of rhetoric on his part that has played a great role in delaying and dragging out this strike that has caused so much concern, so much bitterness and so much despair in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the minister that everyone in this Province is genuinely and sincerely looking forward to having the MOS and the General Service dispute settled so that the kind of recriminations, the kind of concern, the kind of despair that has been caused by that dispute, which he himself and his government is playing a role in dragging out, can be put behind us.

o o o

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the private member's resolution but before we move on and I stand to commence speaking on that, I understand that my colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has a petition and that there are some of his constituents visiting from Labrador. Leave would be necessary in order to have that petition presented at this time. I wonder if members opposite would consent briefly to having that petition presented?

MR. MARSHALL:

Leave is granted.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. member, I would like to welcome to the gallery the Mayor of Makkovik, Gary Mitchell and the Mayor of Postville, Wilfred Lane. I would also like to welcome Mr. Gerald Pye, Chairman of the local school board at Lodge Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Lodge Bay. "We, the residents of Lodge Bay, petition the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador for the government to look into the situation of constructing a bridge across the river at Lodge Bay and

a road around the community. We are all very concerned and we would like to see this under construction as soon as possible." There were seventy-five adults who signed this petition.

I presented a petition yesterday with regard to the school and the loss of their teacher out in Cape Charles. They had to move into the permanent school in Lodge Bay. About fifteen students are living on the Southside. The majority of the students live on the Northside. The school is on the Northside, also a store, a community hall, as well as the building they use for church.

Under the DREE agreement, we constructed a road from Mary's Harbour to Lodge Bay with a cul-de-sac. There is no way to connect to the houses on the Northside and no way to get over to the Southside. Residents, as a result, when they want to go to the community hall or to the school or post office have to row back and forth in a boat or, in the Winter, go by skidoo. In the Fall with the freeze up and in the Spring with the thaw the children are put in a boat and a rope put around a boat so parents on each side can haul it back and forth. If the boat does go through the ice, the children are not in any danger. I have given petitions on this matter before.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) knows the area. He has been in the area himself. I also realize that we have problems with expenditure. But this is an area that is very, very isolated. The residents will settle for a good steel Bailey bridge. We are talking about one-fifth of a mile, probably even less than that.

Engineering has been done on it. It is just a matter of waiting for funds.

In communication with the minister before, we looked at the possibility of taking a Bailey bridge from another area of the Province and putting it down on Lodge Bay River. Mr. Speaker, it is something to have your own community divided. Also, children, when their parents are out in the Summer community fishing, have to be allowed to row back and forth without any adult supervision and this is a very dangerous situation.

So I ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to look at the possibility of getting a bridge from another part of the Province that has now become redundant, or gett a new Bailey bridge, or look at the possibility of getting money from his friends in Ottawa now, because that is what the people on the Island and in Labrador voted for, to have the same party in government federally and provincially so we would have better co-operation.

It has now been two years. The people are still waiting for that bridge in that community. It has a major impact on that community. If it is done, the residents will be able to go over to Mary's Harbour to a clinic; they will be able to go over to the general store and they will be able to go to the airstrip.

Now, ninety per cent of the community, when they want to go to the clinic in Mary's Harbour, to the airstrip in Mary's Harbour, or to the larger stores in Mary's Harbour or when they want to go to the dock and catch the C.N. boat in Mary's Harbour, they have to

row across the river. People have bought trucks. There are about a half dozen trucks now parked in the cul de sac that connects the Northside with Mary's Harbour. The residents of the other dozen houses that are on the Northside still have to walk up the path to get to their truck and park it with freight in it. They still have to bring the freight down to the houses in a wheelbarrow or by some other means.

If it was in this area of the Province, Mr. Speaker, CBC and other newspeople would be able to see what conditions they have to live under. But, because is it so far and so isolated and so small, many of the people in the Province say that the numbers do not count.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the numbers do count. These are very hard-working people. They have been there since the early 1800's. When they see the doubling of the Trans Canada and when they see also other changes in the roads in this Province where they are getting rid of bends and getting new bridges, it is very upsetting to them when they consider all the money that is being spent on the Island when, with regards to Labrador, it has been continually overlooked.

So I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the petition be sent to the minister. I hope the minister will speak on it and I hope we can see some action. He promised some action on the road to airstrip at Paradise. I hope he can get up and also promise some action on the need for a Lodge Bay River bridge.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition and certainly the intent of the petition. It has been an issue that has come up from time to time with residents from the area.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that some time ago, in relation to the road going into the community, although it was not identified at the time as part of the Coastal Labrador Agreement, which included a roads programme, we say fit as an administration to take some of the money and build that road, although it is not up to a very high standard. We recognized at that time, of course, that the funding that we did have available was not sufficient to complete the job and to make the necessary connection from one side to the other.

We have been consistently pursuing the federal government as it relates to the Coastal Labrador Agreement for additional funding. There are a number of projects, including the road projects, that were not adequately funded under that agreement. It was substantially less than what the Province was looking for at the time and that is identified now in what has happened up there as it relates to water and sewage, community infrastructure and the roads. The funding was, in fact, not adequate to do the job intended. We will be pursuing that avenue and have been pursuing that avenue with the federal government as it relates to trying

to ensure an agreement or an addition to the existing agreement is put in place to do the kinds of things that were first envisaged in that particular Coast Labrador Agreement.

We have looked, as the member indicated, at the possibility of acquiring existing Bailey bridges or temporary bridges from other places on the Island or in Labrador and are continuing to do that. It is a very short section of road and bridge but it is also very expensive in the context of where it is but, we are attempting to identify the necessary materials and the necessary funding to be able to do that. That again, Mr. Speaker, will not be adequate.

I think what needs to be done is a proper road connection and a proper bridge put in place so that the people who are living in that particular community and communities have an opportunity to do the kinds of things that we, as Newfoundlanders, pride ourselves in in our rural society, in all parts of the Island and in Labrador. We are very committed and I think that the fact that the road went in there is an indication of the kind of commitment that this administration has for that particular area.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to address the rest of the needs of a bridge and adequate road connection in the not too distant future.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition presented by the people of Lodge Bay. Now that we have the minister standing up and saying he supports the petition, there would seem to be no reason why construction should not go ahead this year. If the minister has identified it as a legitimate need, as a priority, the minister, if he is a minister of a department, should be able to see that the work is done.

But, I am concerned that the minister is referring to the federal/provincial negotiations concerning a new Labrador agreement because our understanding, from what they have said, is that this will not be concluded until 1987 at the earliest. So this would probably mean that the people of Lodge Bay would have to wait until 1988, another two years, before seeing work on that road even start. Now there is no need of that, Mr. Speaker.

If the minister is really sincere in his position, he should be prepared to make the commitment to the people of Lodge Bay that work on that road will start this year.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

This is Private Member's Day.

Orders of the Day

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is very appropriate that today we are discussing a private member's resolution on the railway. The resolution itself, as presented by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) does not go far enough, the body of the resolution being: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as opposing any elimination or reduction of federal ferry and coastal boat subsidies for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador through the User/Pay Concept."

The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) presented a very, very appropriate amendment to this resolution and pointed out that, whereas the Neilsen Task Force Report recommends the elimination of the Newfoundland Railway, that the following words be added: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as opposing the elimination of the Newfoundland Railway."

Mr. Speaker, I stand here and say that members of the official Opposition go on record, unequivocally, as supporting this amendment. We oppose the elimination of the Newfoundland Railway. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) stood up in this House on the last day and said that, he did not come right out and say they were voting against it but gave every indication that members on the government side would not be supporting that amendment because, they say, with another bluff, that it does not go far enough.

The real reason we have seen the last two days as to why they will not support the amendment proposed by the member for

Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is because they are prepared to sell out the Newfoundland Railway. They are in the process of eliminating the Newfoundland Railway and that is why they are not prepared to support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there is something very fishy in the State of Denmark, something smells.

MR. TULK:

Rotten, something is very rotten.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is a dead fish. There is something rotten in this House. There is something rotten in the state of the administration. There is something rotten in the Premier's Office when we have a Premier go on province-wide television and say that it is all right not to tell the truth, it is all right to swindle, it is all right to perpetrate a bluff and tell the people of the Province for seven years, for political purposes, in order to launch an attack upon a political party of another stripe, that the Newfoundland Railway is constitutionally enshrined. Now the Premier comes into this House and he is saying, "It is not constitutionally enshrined." Well, there are two things. There is another possibility you know. It is a possibility that the Premier is not telling the truth right now. There is a possibility that he was telling the truth all along, that he honestly believed that the Terms of Union protected the Newfoundland Railway but that he is not telling the truth now because he wants to make it easier to sell out the railway, he wants to make it easier to co-operate with his Tory buddies in Ottawa and sell out the railway.

MR. BAIRD:

Were you there in 1980?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. BARRY:

How else can we explain, Mr. Speaker, the fact that members of the Conservative Government in Ottawa say that we have a constitutional right? There should not have to be a court case. Why does there have to be a court case. They are admitting that that railway is constitutionally protected. Good heavens, before the Premier got up with his statement, all the Newfoundland lawyers would have to do would be to walk in the court and present the views of the Government of Canada. Here they are: "The Terms of Union protect the Newfoundland Railway." I rest my case, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Eric Nielsen, has gotten up and reaffirmed the commitment given by the Prime Minister in Halifax that they would preserve the Newfoundland Railway because that is protected in the Terms of Union and it is part of the Terms of Union. Who needs a court case? What sort of evidence do you need? What sort of arguments do you need when the other side would go in and say, "We admit the railway is protected by the Terms of Union."

MR. TULK:

We need one now though, after yesterday.

MR. BARRY:

Now what do we have? We have a very interesting case. Now, let us assume that this goes to court. Maybe we should take a look at bringing it to court.

MR. PATTERSON:

And pay you to do it.

MR. BARRY:

No, I will do it for nothing. I will do it for nothing, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us assume that we take it to court now. Just imagine this picture: we go into court and we present our evidence. We just present two pieces of paper to the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. The Terms of Union and the statement by Eric Nielsen and the Prime Minister that I read out today into his House.

MR. TULK:

And Don Mazankowski.

MR. BARRY:

And Don Mazankowski, and we rest our case, Your Honours, My Lords.

What does the Government of Canada then turn around and do now since the Premier's statement yesterday on province-wide television? They stand up, they get a transcript of his remarks from Hansard yesterday, from the television last night and they present Mr. Peckford's statements to support their case. They will present the transcript from Hansard and his statements on television last night and they will come in and say the Premier of Newfoundland does not think there is Constitutional protection. He does not think he has any case.

Now, what happens, Mr. Speaker, if they have not already taken their thirty pieces of silver, if they not already got a deal signed, sealed and delivered - and if they have they are once again showing great contempt for this House of Assembly and breaching the privileges of members of this

House - if they have not signed a deal, what sort of bargaining power do they now have? What sort of bargaining power do they now have if they have not already signed a deal? Let us suppose the Government of Canada says, 'Well, here you go, guys, here is \$50 million or \$100 million or \$200 million, maybe \$500 million or \$750 million, much less than the value of this railway.' What is going to happen, what is the Premier going to do then?

Is he going to say, 'Not on your life will I take that money because I have my Constitutional protection. Not on your life will I let you underpay, cut short, the people of this Province; not on your life because I have my Terms of Union.' Now, does he not have a strong case now since his statements yesterday! He has really put this Province in a great bargaining position, about the same bargaining position, Mr. Speaker, he put this Province in when it came to offshore negotiations.

When he asked today what was supposed to be a rhetorical question, was his position with respect to the offshore a bluff, we did not have any hesitation in saying, 'Yes, bloody right. A colossal bluff!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Brian's bluff.

MR. BARRY:

We will point that out when we come to debate, if they ever have the courage to bring back the Atlantic Accord for debate in this House. They hoisted their tails and ran in the last Session, cut

for home, Mr. Speaker, because they did not have the courage to try and defend that document.

Let us wait and hear what they have to say about why they are agreeing with the Government of Canada that for the next five years Canada will be considered as not self-sufficient in oil when the world is afloat in a sea of oil; there is such a glut of oil that the price has plummeted and they have agreed that Canada is no longer self-sufficient in oil. What a bluff, what a colossal bluff!

The reason it was done was to give control to the Government of Canada for the next five years and, of course, did they have any choice? Did they have any choice because Mr. Peckford desperately needed that letter to try and squeak through in the last election. One thousand, six hundred and thirty-five votes he needed. That is how much he won the government by the last time, 1,635 votes, and he figured he desperately needed that piece of paper and he was prepared to give away anything in order to get it because he had no bargaining power. He had wasted his bargaining power in the same silly fashion as he is now wasting his bargaining power on the Newfoundland Railway.

I have never seen anybody so foolish, so silly, so incompetent as that Premier over the last several days. He just opens his mouth to change his shoe laces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
It is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, to have the Premier of this Province,

the great fighter, yes, a great fighter all right! With the election September, 1984, in Ottawa we saw the great fighter turn into a lap dog, and all of a sudden instead of Brian the greater, we now have Brian the lesser, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:
Brian the bluff.

MR. BARRY:
And Brian the bluff as of yesterday, Brian the lesser bluff. Brian the lesser, Mr. Speaker, and it is lesser and lesser every day.

The other thing that is a little bit lesser is his credibility. Why should the people of this Province believe that Premier on anything anymore? He has publicly admitted to the people of this Province that he has misled them for the last seven years. It was done deliberately, he said. It was done for political posturing. It was done, and you get the impression, Mr. Speaker, as he goes through this, because he says, he had the best interest of the Province at heart.

What else is he allowed to do; anything he wants because he has a certain objective which he considers good? That sort of dishonesty, Mr. Speaker, we would expect from the Richard Nixon White House.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
No, let us muddy the Province.

Mr. Speaker, that sort of dishonesty is what brought down Richard Nixon! The notion that he could do anything that he wanted

in order to persevere himself in power and in order to seek the ends which he thought were important.

MR. J. CARTER:

You believe you can do anything to get in power, do you not?

MR. BARRY:

I am prepared to defend, Mr. Speaker, my actions, the actions of members of this side of the House and we are prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, that we do not go out and mislead the people of this Province. We do not go out and deceive, we do not go out, Mr. Speaker, and engage in a deliberate systematic process of misleading the people of this Province!

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We do not say one thing one day and another the next.

MR. PEACH:

You say nothing.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to see the point in time at which the position of the government changed. Was it only a coincidence that it was September 4, 1984? September 4, 1984 we had a great conversion from members opposite, all of a sudden there was no more need for political posturing. Why has not the Premier indicated to us what has changed? Why was it important to put our best case forward when you

had a Liberal government in power but it is no longer important to put our best case forward now?

MR. SIMMONS:

Because he made a deal with Brian on the offshore.

MR. BARRY:

Is it, as the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) says because it is the price of a half ass deal on the offshore? Is that it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Is that why he is now selling out the Newfoundland railway? Is it because he has his marching orders from Brian the greater in Ottawa and Brian the lesser has to get in step?

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the Premier of this Province is now putting the interests of the Conservative Party ahead of the interests of the people of this Province. He is prepared to do anything to promote the interests of his political party to try and insure his re-election. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has already realized that his biggest problem, and he has been telling this to some of those closest advisors, his biggest problem is that, 'nobody believes me anymore.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that that is a masterful, brilliant ploy on his part that he engaged in yesterday to get back his credibility.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's North, on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to read from page 18 or our own Standing Orders, Section 51, Subsection (b). "Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or of the Committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or needless repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech, and if the member continues to speak, Mr. Speaker may name him, or, if in Committee, the Chairman shall report him to the House." I merely advance that for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that he be directed to discontinue his speech. He is being boring and repetitious.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

There is not even a member in the district of St. John's North, Mr. Speaker.

That was a very brilliant device that the Premier yesterday seized upon to win back his credibility, to try and deal with that basic problem, 'that nobody believes me anymore.' He has decided to reinforce his credibility by establishing that he has misled the people of this Province for

seven years! Was there not something about who led the people of Isreal into the desert? Was that not for seven years? By God, she is starting to look like a desert around here now, does she not, as far as jobs are concerned! For seven years he has been leading us into an economic desert.

DR. COLLINS:

No, it was seven years of plenty, it was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

It was seven years of a province in despair.

MR. BARRY:

Well, it would be typical of the Tories to arse it up and get the seven years in the desert first. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals will bring in the thirty years of plenty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

But, Mr. Speaker, what we now have is a Premier in this Province saying, 'My political problem is that nobody believes me anymore and I wonder why that is?' Mr. Premier, I can not understand why nobody believes you anymore when you admit publicly that you have misled the Province and not told the truth for seven years! I can not understand! I can not understand why nobody believes you anymore!

MR. TULK:

Do you know what he is doing now? He is blaming the people. He has got to the place where they do not believe him and now he is blaming

them. He is like a child.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) makes a very good point. We saw, I think, the same thing in the Richard Nixon White House. When it started to crumble, he started to blame it on the people, on the voters. It is not the Premier's fault that his world is crumbling! It is not the Premier's fault that nobody believes him! It is not the Premier's fault that his credibility is shattered because he has been misleading people for seven years! It is the fault of the people of the Province.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

The Leader of the Opposition seems to be very familiar with the activities of Richard Nixon when he was in the White House. Nixon had tapes under his desk. Does the hon. member have any tapes? Does he do any secret recordings?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It is a very interesting point, though, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, please do not let members on the other side of the House dictate and give orders to the Chair.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) was told yesterday by the Premier that he is not listened to as far as the railway is concerned. He will have no say, no influence, no impact on the decisions, nor will any backbencher, including the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). They will have no say as far as the railway is concerned, or any other important decision of government. No say! You are irrelevant, boy! You are useless! Mr. Speaker, they are useless!

And now we know the real problem. The problem is that the Premier has, in fact, lost his credibility and he has lost it with his own members as well as with the people of the Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We now see a sorry and pathetic sight of a Premier who, by his own admission, can no longer be believed!

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

The hon. member five minutes ago

was told that he had three minutes left. Five minutes have passed since then and I suggest that the hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I wish to notify all members of this hon. House that I know the time. I will notify any member who is speaking when his time is up and I do not need to be advised by any hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the resolution presented by the hon. the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

Mr. Speaker, I have read this resolution and I also have a note on the amendment. I want just to be very brief on the amendment.

I refer hon. members to the submission to the Standing Committee on Transportation presented by the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador on November 25, 1985. If the hon. gentleman does not know what it says concerning the Newfoundland Railway, I will repeat it.

The final paragraph, Mr. Speaker, says, "Mr. Chairman, you and the Committee members recognize that the provision of an efficient, affordable, and dependable

transportation system presents a great challenge. Nevertheless, as Canadians living in Newfoundland and Labrador we have a full right to a transportation system comparable to that which exists in the rest of the country and no effort must be spared to ensure that that is achieved."

Mr. Speaker, that is the position of the government on transportation in this Province. We are not like the members opposite who want the railway to continue in the state that it is continuing to be in now.

Also, on the future of the railway, Mr. Speaker, and concerning the Sullivan Report, it should be noted that an individual who was employed and paid while the Sullivan Report was being compiled was none other than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) today. He is the same person who did not, I might say, go against what the Sullivan Report said. Now, what did the Sullivan Report say? The Sullivan Report said, "Get rid of the railway."

MR. BAIRD:

Shame!

MR. WARREN:

The Leader of the Opposition was paid at that time and here he is today getting up in the House and saying, "Maintain the railway". The Leader of the Opposition should go back and look at the correspondence that he had with the Sullivan Report and he will know what he has said and reported and what has been documented that he was for the Sullivan Commission's recommendation to get rid of the railway. Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said on that.

Now, to go back to the main part of the resolution, it concerns the Nielsen Task Force. I am quite pleased today to have a few words to say on this, in particular, when I have the Mayor of Makkovik and the Mayor of Postville in the gallery who are quite concerned about a means-of transportation to their communities. It does not have very much to do with the railway going across the Island from St. John's to Port aux Basques but, it does have a lot to do with the coastal boat service and with the user/pay concept. Mr. Speaker, this cannot happen. It cannot happen.

We are living along the Labrador Coast from Red Bay to Nain and the only means of transportation, other than a third class airline, is the coastal boat service. The coastal boat service is the only means of bringing in goods and services for as high as six and seven months of the year. Mr. Speaker, for this government to object to the Nielsen Task Force, I think, shows that this government, regardless of who is in power in Ottawa, is going to fight for the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. FLIGHT:
How hollow, how hollow!

MR. WARREN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, how hollow. I must say to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) how hollow was he when he came up to the Estimates Committee and asked about a nine foot bridge, taking up two hours of the Estimates Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased also that with my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), and my colleague from

Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), we had the opportunity to sit down and meet with CN officials.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going to make statements in the House, then he should be truthful, he should indicate exactly what the situation is. It is not a nine foot bridge, it is probably closer to a twenty foot bridge, and it denies access to all the people of Newfoundland who have the right to use that stripe of road and has a right to cross that bridge. He himself had the occasion a year ago, Mr. Speaker, to use that bridge to get into Dashwoods to hunt moose. He is showing no spine now in going along with the government in backing up Abitibi-Price on taking out that bridge.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, not to the point of order, but in response to the hon. member, I am more concerned about the coastal boat going into Makkovik and Postville than I am in a hunter from St. John's going up to the Dashwoods in Buchans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the coastal boat service on the Labrador Coast, last Summer, and it was admitted by the CN Marine

officials to my two colleagues and myself, and also the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), that the worst CN coastal boat service in the past twenty years was last year along the Coast of Labrador. It was the worst service CN Marine has ever provided. It was admitted by CN officials at this meeting. It is hoped, as I indicated to many people along the coast, that there should be improvements carried out this year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, CN Marine is in the process of setting up a task force to look at ways and means to improve the coastal boat service.

Mr. Speaker, it is also worthy to note that this year we are going to see the discontinuence of the Motor Vessel Bonavista, which is considered by many people from Southern and Northern Labrador as maybe being a sister to everybody; a boat that has been respected by young and old alike. This year, it looks like, in September or October, she will be making her last voyage along the Labrador Coast.

However, it is quite worthy to note that she is going to be replaced by a modern, efficient vessel, none other than the Northern Ranger. She is going to be called Northern Ranger II, I guess, or the New Northern Ranger. Maybe not many members of the House remember the old Northern Ranger, which spent many, many years supplying the Coast of Labrador with goods and services and serving passengers. We are quite pleased that CN Marine has seen fit to retain a very famous name to the people of Coastal Labrador, the Northern Ranger.

I was also interested to note,

when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, he said in the last election with another 1,635 votes the Opposition would have won the government. I would also like to advise the hon. members opposite that, with less than 1,200 votes, we would have won six more seats. With less than 1,200 votes we would have won Menihek, Mount Scio, Bellevue, Bonavista North, Twillingate and St. Barbe. So, Mr. Speaker, by the Leader of the Opposition saying we could have won the government, in fact, Mr. Speaker, they could have lost it worse than they did before.

Mr. Speaker, on the coastal boat service now, there are not very many complaints concerning the fare structure, concerning the cost. In fact, this year I think there is a small increase in the passenger fare and freight service. But there is not very much concern on what it would cost to get a package from St. John's to Hopedale, for example.

However, if the user/pay system is brought in, now, on the Coast of Labrador, where you have to pay as high as ninety odd cents for a tin of milk, just imagine if you go into user/pay what that tin of milk will cost on the Labrador Coast.

Mr. Speaker, I, as one member, as a member that knows what isolation is all about, knows the trials and tribulations of people who live up there, will fight tooth and nail to see that the people do not have to pay any more than is absolutely necessary. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have no problem in convincing my colleagues on this side that user/pay should not become a part of the Labrador coastal boat service. Neither should it become part of the

Southern coast of Newfoundland's coastal boat service.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to see is the Gulf Service from Port aux Basques to North Sydney treated the same way as the Trans-Canada from Vancouver to North Sydney. I believe that if it costs twenty dollars for ordinary wear and tear on a car with gas and everything else for that many miles, ninety-six or ninety-eight miles, whatever the case may be, you should only pay that amount of money and not pay the extraordinary amount that we have to pay now.

I am also quite concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the Motor Vessel Bond which goes from Lewisporte to Goose Bay. It is ridiculous in this day and age that we see a boat such as the Bond with has very little activities onboard for children. The biggest complaint that I get from people in Labrador who travel on that boat, and this includes people from all along the coast and, in particular, Goose Bay, Labrador and in Labrador City who travel the Churchill Falls Road, is when they take their vacations during the Summertime, there is absolutely no entertainment whatsoever for children during the thirty-three hours they are on this boat.

MR. FLIGHT:
Come on 'Garf', (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I only have about another five or six minutes left and I am sure if the hon. gentleman wanted to talk about the railway, he can get up and follow in his leader's footsteps. He can get up and talk about whatever else he wants to talk about, but I can assure the people here that he

will not talk very much about the Labrador Coast because he does not know where to find it.

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

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, the member's problem is not that he is stunned, it is just that he thinks he is smart.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last time I spoke I took a note. I spoke for twelve minutes on the last resolution and I was interrupted on seven occasions by points of order by the hon. members opposite. Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that the hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), in particular, gets very upset when somebody else in this hon. House has to tell him how to get to the Coast of Labrador. He does not know how to get to the Coast of Labrador. He thinks he has to go to Wabush and get a small plane. You do not got to Wabush, you go to Goose Bay and get the small plane.

MR. FLIGHT:
(inaudible) went to work in Labrador.

MR. WARREN:
Sure the hon. gentleman worked in Churchill Falls and you do not go to Churchill Falls either to get into Postville and Makkovik. You

have to go into Goose Bay and then you go by Labrador Airways, if the weather is not bad; if the plane is working right; if there are not too many other passengers on the waiting list and everything else.

MR. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regard to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the Parliamentary Assistant, if he is going to be the Parliamentary Assistant for Labrador, where we do not have a minister, I suggest instead of the member for Torngat Mountains getting up and belittling the members on this side, he would be much better off if he tried to get the bridge for Lodge Bay and other facilities along the Labrador Coast and, particularly in his own district, where Torngat Fisheries want to have their own plants. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I suggest that the hon. member is certainly the best member we have had for Labrador for years and years and probably the only real representative of the people from Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT:

Old landslide.

MR. TULK:

Old landslide Baird.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two or three hon. members.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I should advise the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that he should not put his foot in his mouth because I have more calls from the hon. gentleman's district than I have from everywhere else in Labrador.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. WARREN:

That is five.

MR. TULK:

If the member for Eagle River has one foot in his mouth, the hon. gentleman usually has two and that means that the member for Eagle River is twice as good.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I should also advise the hon. member for Eagle River, when he spoke about Torngat Fisheries, he should get his facts straight, in fact, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), who was asking questions, should also

get his facts straight. We had a very productive meeting this morning with the Mayor of Makkovik, the Mayor of Postville, LIA representatives, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and myself. We had a very, very productive meeting and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the representatives from the Coast of Labrador were quite impressed and quite satisfied for what came out of that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I have to thank my hon. minister for telling me this. I think it would be a good idea to pass this along. I can see the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) looking at me with his eyes wide open because I think good advice for the hon. gentleman is that you should check your facts before you get up in this hon. House and shoot off your lip. That is basically what he said.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I do not know where the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is coming from. I have sat in my chair the whole afternoon, even during the rowdiness of Question Period, and I have not opened my mouth. Now, if the member is speaking to the issue of the railway, would he get to that point and not bother me, the member for Port de Grave, who is sitting in his seat and not saying a word.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Now see, Mr. Speaker, last time I said there were seven points of order came up and there are six already so far this evening. You see I get the members upset. The reason I addressed the hon. gentlemen is he had a nice flower in his lapel and he is eye-catching.

MR. EFFORD:
As always.

MR. WARREN:
The reason I spoke of the hon. gentleman is also because only last week, when he started talking about the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), he jumped before he looked. He did not get his facts right. He talked about a report and he has not shown the report yet.

MR. BAIRD:
He never had one.

MR. WARREN:
The hon. gentleman should lay the report on the table. Where is the report? I should tell the hon. gentleman he should get his facts straight before he speaks in this House.

MR. TOBIN:
Right on.

MR. WARREN:
Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have about two or three minutes to clue up. I have to say to all hon. members opposite that those of you that do not know how to get to the Labrador Coast, let me know. I will make the arrangements for you. I will make sure you get there in Goose Bay first. In fact, the hon. member from

Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the former Minister of Fisheries, comes in this House with all kinds of pieces of paper trying to ask questions on Torngat Fisheries.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The member for Torngat Mountains is probably proving a point by getting some the members opposite to stand on their feet but this is a most serious point of order, Mr. Speaker. The resolution concerns the railway, which is a very important part of the Province of Newfoundland and all people. We are supposed to be using up the time of the House of Assembly in which to debate that resolution and to try to do something seriously about it. We saw the Premier last evening admit a complete failure on television. Now we are seeing the member for Torngat Mountains take up his time, during which he could be presenting some very serious facts to this House about the railway, and all he is doing is ridiculing the members of the Opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you ask the member for Torngat Mountains to say something positive and not something stupid like he has been saying all afternoon.

MR. WARREN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to the hon. gentleman. It was his own colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who brought up Torngat Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns coastal boat service and in order for Torngat Co-op to survive, it needs the support of the coastal boat service.

MR. EFFORD:

And the whole transportation system.

MR. WARREN:

I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should open his ears instead of his mouth.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record that we oppose the Nielsen Task Force recommendations, or any elimination or reduction of the federal ferry and coastal boat subsidies. We need it. We need it on the Coast of Labrador. We need it in Coastal Newfoundland. We are completely opposed to it. We will not do what the Leader of the Opposition has done today by supporting, in one hand four or five years ago, and now coming back with a different expression on his face. I will not do that, Mr. Speaker.

I will do everything in my power to make sure that the subsidies stay into effect on the Coastal

Labrador service and Coastal Newfoundland and make sure that the people who have to depend on this service for a half decent living will continue to do so. I will object to the federal government in any way possible if they decide to bring in a user/pay system.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words on the resolution put forward by my colleague from Humber West (Mr. Baird) and, of course, also to the amendment which was put forward by my colleague from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. CALLAN:
Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. BAIRD:
You are all pretty close over there.

MR. CALLAN:
We sit close but I am not familiar with the districts on the South Coast. I know about LaPoile because our former leader represented LaPoile much better, I would say, than the present member.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Friday will be a holiday in this Legislature because, apparently, there is going to be a big meeting out in the district of LaPoile, in Port aux Basques. I do not know what the meeting will be all about but I assume that the announcement

will be made in Channel-Port aux Basques on Friday that the provincial government has accepted the package that has been offered by the feds, the envelope which will give us \$750,000.

MR. J. CARTER:
Get your figures right.

MR. CALLAN:
Well, the Premier is on record as saying between \$.5 billion and \$1 billion and the reports that I have are that the package will contain \$750,000,000. Of course, we know what the package contains. We know because the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) was easing into it a few days ago when he suggested, as a backbencher, his comments did not amount to very much in the mind of the Premier, but the fact that he said it in committee was an indication that he had some background on what will happen regarding the railway in this Province. He said that the railway is dead and it is going to be abandoned.

Prior to that, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) also gave some indication because when my colleague from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) introduced his amendment last week to this resolution by the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), the member for St. John's North got up on a point of order.

By the way the amendment reads as follows: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as opposing the elimination of the railway." That was not contained in the resolution of my friend from Humber West.

Immediately, the member for St.

John's North (Mr. J. Carter) got up on a point of order and he said, 'part of that amendment, Mr. Speaker, is quite out of order because I would argue that the Terms of Union, unfortunately, do not guarantee that the railway be kept here in perpetuity. I would call upon my hon. friend, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who can elucidate on this matter much more cogently than I can, to come to my assistance here.'

So we had the member for St. John's North a week ago also giving us an indication that the Province has sold out the railway to the feds. And, of course, as I said, we had an indication from the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) more than a week ago in Committee. Then we had the Minister of Transportation when he said: 'To that point of order, I would like to concur with my colleague for St. John's North, perhaps, if I could just see a copy of the amendment' he said. 'Mr. Speaker, as he relates to the second WHEREAS, WHEREAS the continuance, in perpetuity, of the Newfoundland Railway is guaranteed by the Canada-Newfoundland Terms of Union, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps is taking somewhat of a great liberty with the section of the Terms of Union that refers to the railway. I do not believe the word 'perpetuity' or in fact, the intent in that particular clause that relates to the railway involves anything that would resemble perpetuity.'

So we have the Minister of Transportation also, a week ago today, giving the members of the House of Assembly and the people of this Province another indication that the railway is sold out.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, what we saw the Premier do last night in the media was something he did not do it in the Legislature yesterday, even though, he was questioned for thirty minutes about the railway. I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we had there was an insult the Legislature.

The obvious place for the Premier to let out his secret was in the Legislature, especially when we were asking questions about the railway. But the Premier showed his contempt for the Legislature by not letting the people of this Province know, through this vehicle, the people's House, what he said later in a media interview.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, left no doubt in anybody's mind last night and yesterday afternoon that the railway in this Province is a fait accompli. And, as I said, when we have that holiday, I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, it is not referred to as a day of mourning. That is what it should be referred to. Mr. Speaker, we will have better reason in this Province to mourn on Friday when the Premier and his colleagues tell the people of this Province that the railway is sold down the drain. We will have more reason to have a day of mourning on Friday than we did a couple of years back when the Premier declared that infamous day of mourning when he lost the offshore court case. Well, actually it was not when he lost the offshore court case. Was that when we had the day of mourning? I am not sure exactly when it was but it was silly. I think it was when the Liberal government in Ottawa announced that they were going to court. I am not sure which it was. But whatever it was, Mr. Speaker, we

saw a silly day of mourning because the Premier, in his foolish way of acting, wanted to put on the appearance of the fighting Newfoundland, fighting against that bad old enemy Ottawa. And we see now, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier did last night. He admitted that he was a bluff and that he had been bluffing all these years.

The Premier did not have to say it, of course, for a lot of people in the district of Bellevue and other parts of the Province, the people who sent fifteen Liberals back to this Legislature in the last election in the Spring of last year, many of the people in the Province, Mr. Speaker, had begun to see through the Premier's bluff. Out in my own district of Bellevue, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the people what kind of bluff the Premier was. I did not point out to them, all I had to do was remind them because they saw the bluff. They saw it in Markland, Mr. Speaker, and they will soon see it in Come By Chance with that other cottage hospital, one of the two cottage hospitals that were located in the district of Bellevue.

Next weekend, on the 17 May, 1986, I have an invitation to attend the 50th Anniversary of the creation of the Walwyn Cottage Hospital in Come By Chance. Fifty years ago this year the hospital was built there.

MR. BAIRD:
Created, was it?

MR. CALLAN:
Well, it could have been fabricated or created, it does not matter; that is when it was built, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:
Are you going to have your tongue removed? That would be a good operation.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I will not be going to the hospital. The celebration, well, it is called a celebration, I would say again it should be a day of mourning. However, the people who have worked for years at that hospital and all of the people who are concerned and disappointed with the present Premier for, on the one hand, bluffing them in the most terrible sort of way, Mr. Speaker, will be gathering.

The Premier stood up in a crowded hall in Arnold's Cove with 300 or 400 people there, after making his speech, got down among the audience and then, to reinforce the point, jumped back up on the stage again, as the Premier is wont to do - you see him on television - he jumped up on the stage and he said, 'Oh, by the way, I forgot. I understand,' he said, 'that the rumour has been circulating that we are going to close your hospital at Come By Chance.' He said, 'Nothing can be further from the truth. As long as I am Premier,' he said, 'the Come By Chance hospital will not close.' I can bring into the galleries of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, 300 witnesses who were there.

DR. COLLINS:
I think you are shading the evidence a little bit.

MR. FUREY:
Go bluff the breweries 'John'.

MR. CALLAN:
I am not bluffing anybody, Mr. Speaker, I am telling it the way

it is. I was not there, but there were lots of Liberals in that hall. It was during the Bellevue by-election of 1981 that the Premier lost by almost 700 votes; 694 actually was the margin of victory for the admirable Liberal candidate, that was myself.

MR. BAIRD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! On a point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. the member for Bellevue has strayed somewhat. I do not recall anything in the Nielsen Report about the Come By Chance hospital or how many Liberals were in the hall out in that district now so poorly represented. I would suggest the member get back on the topic we are discussing, which is the resolution on the Nielsen Report.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the resolution.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for Humber West. I was straying, because this invitation that I have here is close to my heart, and that is where I will put it now, Mr. Speaker. The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier has betrayed the people of this Province over the railway issue; he admitted it yesterday. He has betrayed the people in the same way that Stan Dawe -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who?

MR. CALLAN:

- the big Tory from Old Shop, accused the Premier of betraying the people in the Whitbourne/Markland area over the Markland hospital and in the same way that he betrayed the people in the Come By Chance/Sunnyside area over the Come By Chance hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the resolution and I want to respond to some remarks that were made by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

I agree with the member for Torngat Mountains. My friend, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and myself, as members of the Public Accounts Committee, last Summer had the opportunity to visit Nain and Makkovik in the district of Torngat Mountains, looking at the fish plants there, and we saw first hand, Mr. Speaker, the Coast of Labrador. We visited the stores. We saw the high prices of goods in these stores, the high prices that the member for Torngat referred to earlier. I think he mentioned a tin of milk was ninety odd cents. I am not sure what the odd cents were, but anyway, we saw it first hand and I sympathize and I agree with the argument of the member for Torngat Mountains that, as the resolution says, the subsidies on these coastal boats, despite the Nielsen Task Force Report, should not be removed. It would put the people on the Coast of Labrador, in particular, but other persons as well, in a very, very awkward position, Mr. Speaker. It would be almost impossible for them to live if they did not have these subsidies on the coastal boats. The price of freight, obviously, would have to escalate, so I concur with the member for Torngat Mountains.

I also concur with the member for Torngat Mountains, Mr. Speaker, in the few words that he had to say about the Gulf ferry. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that I nearly had a job one time, back in 1980, when I was not a member of the Legislature, working for CN Marine to do some studies for CN Marine. Actually, I was ready to pack my bag, Mr. Speaker, to go to Halifax to go to work with CN Marine in 1980, or it could have been in early 1981. I am not sure of the dates now but I remember the Leader of the Opposition had resigned. I was working in the Leader of the Opposition's Office as a non-member of the Legislature at the time. The hon. Don Jamieson had resigned as a member and so Bellevue district was open, but I was offered a job with CN Marine at the time.

The Leader of the Opposition sent up a letter to His Honour, the Speaker, because I was hired through the Speaker, and I think it was the member who is now the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). Anyway, the Leader of the Opposition sent up a letter informing the Speaker that I would no longer be in the employ of government and the Speaker's Office. I was going to pack my bags and go to Halifax to work with CN Marine. However, the next day, Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office downstairs when the Premier got up on a Ministerial Statement I think it was, and announced that the Bellevue by-election would be held twenty-one days hence. So, instead of going to Halifax to work with CN Marine, I went back to Bellevue district and, as I said earlier, fought a great campaign, against great odds.

The present Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) was out in Hillview and other areas of the district. I remember I met the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) down in Dildo or South Dildo area and he was knocking on doors. The NDP candidate, by the way, was the present member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I believe he got 150 in that election, I am not sure.

MR. FENWICK:
Ninety-two.

MR. CALLAN:
He got ninety-two and my margin of victory was 694. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I had gone to Halifax to work with CN Marine, I would have at least made one recommendation. I had made several trips across the Gulf. I had driven to Toronto a couple of times to see my brothers and my sister who live up there, who were driven out of this Province by this administration to find employment. Since they did not want to stay home and go on welfare, they were forced to go. It was that other resettlement programme that we talk about from time to time, Mr. Speaker. My two brothers and my sister were resettled to Ontario and they are still there, but they are employed.

If I had gone to work with CN Marine, one of the recommendations I would have made was the same recommendation that the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) made earlier, that if there is going to be any fee at all on the Gulf Service between Port aux Basques and Cape Breton, it should be a minimum fee and, perhaps as the member for Torngat suggested, it would be the same as the gas you would burn travelling ninety-six miles on the Trans-Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the volume of tourism in this Province would increase and the million of dollars that we garner each year from the tourism industry, I am sure, would increase if the people who come to North Sydney did not discover how costly it is to put their trailer and car or whatever they are travelling with and their families on the ferry to cross the Gulf to go to Newfoundland. When they get there they say, 'well, that is too much, that is too rich for my blood so what I will do is I will either stay in Nova Scotia an extra week or I will dart over to PEI or to New Brunswick to see Mr. Hatfield and have a smoke or something.' Anyway, they do not come here.

I believe one of the reasons why they do not come here is because of the tremendous costs of putting on the ferry your car and your trailer, if you are towing a trailer, or whatever you are driving, along with your wife and a couple of kids or whatever, to come to this Province. I concur again with the member for Torngat.

By the way, if you want to know, the member for Torngat got these ideas when he was on this side of the House of Assembly. Those are the ideas that he espoused here today because we have discussed these things over the years in caucus and elsewhere, myself and the member for Torngat. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) obviously agrees because he just told his colleague there, 'yes, that is true what the member is saying.'

Mr. Speaker, to the resolution put forward by my colleague, it is really a sad day, as I said in

Question Period today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CALLAN:
I will get back some other time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am in complete agreement with the hon. gentleman who just sat down on one point, and that is that the Port aux Basques ferry is not up to the standards it should be. But I am rather glad that he did not get the job with CN Marine, because any prospective passenger who would see the ship crewed by such a man would realize that there was such incompetence that they would be taking their life in their hands.

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

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, it is just a point of clarification really.

I did not intend to go to work on the CN vessel. I was going to work in an office in Halifax doing some studies on the coastal boat

service and on ways to improve it, and that would have been one of my recommendations. I was not going to be a crew member, I was going to do some studies in an office in Halifax.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

MR. BAIRD:
He should go to work with them as an oiler. He is pretty slick.

MR. J. CARTER:
To that point, Mr. Speaker, certainly the knowledge that such a person was working with CN Marine would certainly undermine any faith or credibility that CN Marine might have. There is no doubt about it that the service is deficient, it is expensive and it does cut down on the tourist potential that we have on this Island.

I do not know how old the member for Bellevue is.

MR. BAIRD:
I would say about seventy-five by looking at him.

MR. J. CARTER:
This speculation is relevant. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to say thirty-nine, like Jack Benny, he has been thirty-nine for years. That would make him not very old in the late 1940s when the Confederation issue was being discussed. I do not know how well the hon. member or the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who is not much older, I would suggest he is - what? - in his early forties, and again this

is a relevant question - forty-two, forty-three.

MR. CALLAN:
Free, white and twenty-three.

MR. J. CARTER:
I would suggest that neither of these gentlemen remember what the Newfoundland Railway was like in its heyday. Not that it was the best railway in the world, but it was a very good service; it was a reliable service the people came to depend on and also one the people enjoyed, and it was a service that was widely used.

DR. COLLINS:
You could get out and pick blueberries.

MR. J. CARTER:
Yes. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins) has said that on some of the gradients the train went so slowly that you could get out and pick blueberries and still get back on the train again. It had something for everyone.

Anyway, it was inconceivable in those days that a country could do without a railway. It would be just as inconceivable then to say that there would be no railway as it would be today to say that in twenty years time Newfoundland will not need any roads. So all that Canada had to do when signing the Terms of Union was to say more or less, 'We will look after your railway,' and that was accepted as a guarantee that we would have a railway looked after by the federal government, and any other thought would be inconceivable, just as inconceivable as if we had an agreement today, just a letter from the federal government saying, "Oh, we will look after the Trans-Canada Highway." Because the suggestion, the very

concept of not having a Trans-Canada Highway today is absolutely unthinkable. There is no other way of getting your private car back and forth around the Island.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is pretty much the way it is now with the way some of the roads are.

MR. J. CARTER:

That is purely temporary, a very hard Spring. The Trans-Canada Highway is just as necessary today as the railway was thought to be in 1949.

Now, I do fault the negotiators who put together the package for the Terms of Union. They did not think through all the possibilities but, to be fair to them, those were different times and they could not foresee all the immense technological advances that we have today. But the situation is rather like this: The railway would be kept if used and the railway would be used if kept and you have, I would suggest, a Catch-22 situation here. It is the same kind of Catch-22 situation that we have with Churchill Falls. If we had an intertie with Churchill Falls and could bring power down to the Island, we could then have all the recall power we could use. But we cannot get an intertie down to the Island unless we have an assurance we will get all the power we can use. And you cannot raise money on the bond market on just an assurance, it has to be something just a little firmer than that. And this is the problem we have.

Now, if we used the railway more, the federal government would have to maintain it. They will maintain it to the extent that it

is used. That is the understanding. And I would much rather see the railway upgraded to a wide gauge railway so that we could use some sort of piggyback system for bringing trucks and trailers and tractor trailers into this Province, because if you are on the highway, even if you are on one of the broader sections of the highway and you meet one of these tractor trailers, I suggest to hon. gentlemen that there are some smaller boats on the high seas than some of these tractor trailers, and certainly they are going a lot slower. I would not call them vehicles, I would call them almost travelling men-of-war because they are so threatening. They present a flat sort of cross-section to the wind and, if there is any mist or moisture on the road, they drag along a great fog of moisture that prevents you from seeing for a few seconds after they have passed you. They are quite dangerous. I must say I would rather see a wide gauge railway with piggyback potential than a highway, and I would hope that this is the kind of representation that we will be making to Ottawa and I hope that Ottawa will respond.

That is my view on the railway, but my view on the amendment, of course, is that it does not go far enough, it just suggests that we oppose the elimination of the Newfoundland Railway. So if we just oppose the elimination of the Newfoundland Railway, we will just keep it as a toy.

Now it is true that the first railway was a toy. The first railway tracks, I think, were just iron rails leading out of mines so that you could roll ore cars on them. But the first railway on tracks was apparently in an

amusement park, and I think that is a matter of record, sometime in the 1820s. So the railway began as a toy and it may end as a toy. I hope it does not. But this would be the fate of it if this resolution were not only passed by this House but adopted by the federal government.

So I think we have to vote against this amendment because it does not do anything. It is really destructive. It is cosmetic, destructive and mischievous. Certainly those three adjectives could apply to it. Also, I find the official Opposition's stand very hard to understand. Because what about the Sullivan Commission? The Leader of the Opposition when he was in a former life, did he not sign his name to that Sullivan Commission which recommended the phasing out of the Newfoundland Railway?

So hon. gentlemen cannot have it both ways. I must say, not that I have ever been tempted to become a Liberal, but if ever I were, I would find it very hard to swallow the kinds of inconsistencies that hon. members opposite have to swallow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:
How they could support a regime that has given away the Churchill Falls in its history -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Say it with a straight face.

MR. J. CARTER:
I sure can. - how they can support a leader who is almost a figment of one's imagination, more of a follower than a leader, and someone who is so inconsistent

that he signed the Sullivan Royal Commission suggesting that the railway be done away with and now he is trying to suggest himself as the champion of the retention of the railway.

In a few minutes the mover of this motion, not the mover of the amendment, but the mover of this motion must get up and close it. I would like to give one more chance to some member of the Opposition to make fools of themselves, so I will sit down and wait for the next person.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Your namesake.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I guess I am fortunate in that I am the next member that the hon. member allowed to rise in his place to make a fool of himself but, I will tell you, if this is making a fool of myself, well, then, I must confess I am not adverse to doing it.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, we witnessed a very sad spectacle on television, as we did last week. In fact, almost exactly one week ago we witnessed another very sad spectacle, as I pointed out in this House, we witnessed the spectacle of Newfoundland fishermen having their ship towed into port for having violated a Canadian law. Last night we witnessed the spectacle of the Premier of Newfoundland being in tow and being towed to Ottawa, obviously.

Some of the questions asked here today, Mr. Speaker, I think are very relevant, in that the Premier last night willingly and openly went on public television and admitted to having bluffed or - I am not allowed to use the word 'deceived' I suppose, but certainly admitted to having bluffed the Newfoundland electorate and others for the past five or six years on the question of the legitimacy or otherwise of Term 31 of the Terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada.

The question, of course, Mr. Speaker, that must be asked is that if the Premier is willing to go to that length to score political points on the matter of the railway, well, then, surely it must follow that he would be willing, also, to go that far and to bluff the people when it comes to factory freezer trawlers, for example, or when it comes to talking about the offshore or about the offshore Accord. The Premier today in answering some of the questions put to him by our Leader, Mr. Speaker, made a great deal of fuss over the fact that in 1980, when he made some of those statements, and I have them here, clippings, he was doing it for the benefit of Newfoundland. He realized, he said then, that our case was not a strong one but we did have a case. I asked the Premier what has changed? Assuming that is correct, assuming that is the reason for the Premier's about-face and his reason for having bluffed the Newfoundland people in 1980, what has changed? Why would he now not fight for the retention of the rail passenger service as promised in the Terms of Union?

MR. FUREY:

Did we not have a strong case

under Term 29?

MR. W. CARTER:

We all went through that back some years ago when the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker disallowed Newfoundland's rights under Term 29, and we all know what happened then. Now, of course, with another government of the same stripe in Ottawa, we are seeing another Term of the Union between our two countries, as they were then, being ignored and violated. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Premier has already agreed to a sell-out. I believe he is looking ahead to the next election and, I suggest to you, that on the eve of the next election there will be unveiled a massive road building programme, \$700 or \$800 million maybe, people employed laying pavement, building roads, by-roads, twinning the Trans-Canada, and I believe that is what the Premier is pinning his hopes on.

I have an interesting quote here and I will table this if the Speaker so wishes. These are conclusions and recommendations of a certain report. The author of it says, "It is the Province's intention to hold the federal government to the undertakings that were entered into at the time of Confederation. The Province will not allow the prospect of decreased federal funding for other modes to influence its position with respect to the Newfoundland Railway. The Province takes this position not only because the promises made at the time of Confederation were solemn ones and should not be repudiated by the federal government merely because their present impact is, in their view, more onerous than anticipated in

1949. The Province's position is also based on the fact that the people of the Province are entitled to both a good rail as well as a good high-way system, as in the case of all other provinces." That is a quote, Mr. Speaker, from a report compiled and presented by one Cabot Martin as a ten-year plan for the revitalization of the Newfoundland Railway.

On January 18, 1980 we know that the Premier made another historic statement in that he said, 'The railway must be made attractive to users, it must be made to work. The Government of Canada has that constitutional obligation under the Terms of Union.' Those were the Premier's words on January 18, 1980. Why the change of heart, Mr. Speaker, in May of 1986? I believe the most naive Newfoundlander will suspect that maybe it is because now we have a different party in the House of Commons than that which was there at the time the Premier made that statement.

Another interesting document we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a letter that appeared in the Western Star, I believe it was, September 22, 1981, in which the author of this letter goes to great lengths to defend Newfoundland's rights to have a rail passenger service. In this letter the author poses a number of questions to the member of Parliament for Humber - St. Barbe - St. George, Mr. Brian Tobin. In its conclusion the author says, "I call on you, as the Member of Parliament for the area, to state publicly your concern on the long-term viability of the Newfoundland Railway. I urge you to work along with the railway unions, the provincial government

and everyone in your district who wants a good rail freight service assured for our future. Specifically, I would like to know your views on the following questions." And then, the author of this letter poses a number of very important questions. The author of that letter, of course, is none other than the present Minister of Justice, the hon. Lynn Verge, MHA for Humber East. This is the first law officer of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, the person who now advises the Premier and the government on legal matters. Now, the advice is that we do not have a strong case. In 1981 in a letter written by her and published in the papers of this Province, she left no doubt, I am sure, in the minds of the most naive -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Read the second paragraph.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, the second paragraph of this letter: "The future of the Newfoundland Railway is of deep concern to many Newfoundlanders. Since 1896, when the transinsular railway went through Corner Brook and the regional headquarters was established at Riverhead, the railway has played a key role in the development of Humber East. Over the years, many individuals and families in Corner Brook East have earned their livelihood from the railway. As the MHA for Humber East" - and I am quoting the Minister of Justice - "and a member of the provincial government, I am committed to the Newfoundland Railway." Again, Mr. Speaker, those are the words of the lady who now occupies the esteemed position of Minister of Justice, whose responsibility it is to advise the Premier and the government on legal matters.

MR. FUREY:

The second paragraph, second column, "Will the federal government honour, etc., etc."

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, another paragraph that bears quoting, I think, "Will the federal government honour its promise to Newfoundland at the time of Confederation, set out in Terms 31 and 32 of the Terms of Union, assuring the operation of the Newfoundland Railway and the subsidy of the Port aux Basques/North Sydney Gulf crossings?" Again, these were the words of the Minister of Justice, who advises the government on such matters.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier earlier on in his career very gallantly, very deliberately wrapped himself in the Newfoundland flag and, stripped to the waist, took on all comers on behalf of Newfoundland and, I suggest to you, a lot of Newfoundlanders were impressed by that behaviour. Today, we have a Premier who has shed the Newfoundland flag, who has wrapped himself with the Maple Leaf flag and who is prepared to turn his back on Newfoundlanders and ignore the statements and the promises made by him concerning the railway and go along with his friend in Ottawa, Mr. Mulroney.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in his remarks made reference to certain comments that were made by the hon. Erik Nielsen, who is the Deputy Prime Minister. I saw that clipping from the House of Commons proceedings, wherein he left absolutely no doubt in my mind or, I am sure, in the minds of any other Newfoundlander, that Newfoundland does have a very legitimate right to a retention of

rail passenger service. Certainly, I believe that if, and I underline the word 'if', if the service is ever to go, then I think it should be on our terms and not on those of the Ottawa politicians or bureaucrats.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It is now twenty minutes to six, so I would call on the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) to conclude the debate.

MR. BAIRD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I would like to thank the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), who filled in in my absence last week, for introducing this resolution. I think he did an excellent job of it, from the comments I have heard. As everybody is aware, I was out performing a very pleasant duty on behalf of government and, indeed, all members of the House of Assembly, as the record will show, in welcoming home our Corner Brook Royals, the number one team right across Canada, which means right from St. John's to Vancouver, not Halifax. So again I would like to thank the member for LaPoile for doing an excellent job.

DR. COLLINS:

In a very sober fashion, too, I might add.

MR. BAIRD:

In fact, he read the speech that I had prepared for me because I wanted to be quoted, or criticized, for anything that might have been there by the members of the Opposition.

In reading Hansard of last week I notice that the hon. member for

Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) certainly agreed with the resolution. The Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) was very supportive, as was the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). I did note that the member for Fortune - Hermitage also brought in an amendment, which I will discuss a little later.

I noticed the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) probably felt that he was speaking in the Budget Speech, because a lot of the topics that he was discussing certainly had nothing to do with the resolution. I note he made reference to Fisheries, the Prices Support Board, Fisheries Improvement Loans, Fisheries Vessel Insurance, the Salmon Enhancement Programme, the Weather Service Centre, and the Newfoundland Railway was the final part of his speech. So I think that probably whilst the member for Gander was supportive, I feel he was rudderless. Not utterless, rudderless.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Both.

MR. BAIRD:
Maybe both, but he did do a bit of wandering.

With reference to the amendment, I think it has been stated over and over again, and crystal clear, by the Premier and the Minister of Transportation and members on this side that we are for the retention of the Newfoundland Railway. Not for the status quo, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, but for improvements to bring it up to the standard it should be to be able to compete in the market, a new modern railway, and not just keep a monument there forever and ever

which is no good to anybody.

I wish to advise hon. members opposite that I will be voting against the amendment and certainly I will be expecting them to be voting for the resolution.

MR. FUREY:
For the resolution?

MR. BAIRD:
That is correct.

MR. FUREY:
You are voting for the amendment, are you?

MR. BAIRD:
I told you I will be voting against the amendment. If you would listen with your ears instead of with your mouth, you might learn a little bit more than you have.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:
You had your chance to speak, you had your opportunity, but now you have lost it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:
I, and all members of this government, and I would like to think all members of the Opposition, are certainly against the Nielsen Report on the user/pay concept. The fact is we do not have the population here that they have in Ontario and Quebec, where the major centres and concentration of people are. We are an island with a very, very scattered population, and the user/pay concept certainly is not conducive to anything on this island.

Further to that, I think the gulf between Port aux Basques and Sydney, and I have said it for years - in fact Hansard will show that I said it three years ago when the same subject came up - that ninety miles of water should be treated as an extension to the Trans-Canada Highway, which is really the gateway to North America for the Province of Newfoundland, not only for people but for goods and services that are going back and forth. The cost should be the same as it would be to drive if the highway were there.

MR. SIMMONS:

What do the Tories in Ottawa say about it?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:

I think the Tories in Ottawa are a lot more sympathetic toward it than the Liberals who were up there for twenty-three years, when everything was downgraded.

MR. MATTHEWS:

With you there.

MR. BAIRD:

We all realize that something has to be done about the national debt, but, however, with our economic conditions, and with the oil situation, certainly some leaway must be given for our position here. We cannot and will not tolerate the user/pay concept.

There is a saying, which it is quite true, that the Gulf ferry is not only a mode of getting from point A to point B, it is our highway to North America, as I said. As has been said many times, we are spending millions of dollars on our tourism industry,

encouraging people come here, and when they get to Sydney and they find it is going to cost them another \$200 to cross the Gulf, they think twice and head back again. Because of the uniqueness of our Province, the scenery and the attitude of our people, including the Liberals, I think tourists would flock here. Even if the subsidy were greater, not talking about the user/pay concept, that would greatly enhance it and we would have a lot more people come to the Province. I am sure the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) will certainly be supporting it, to get people up to the beautiful Gros Morne Park in his district, and into Bay of Islands and the Humber Valley.

MR. FUREY:

If I can get my ferry back.

MR. BAIRD:

If he can get his ferry back. I have not heard him fighting too much for his ferry, just complaining rather than going to the proper authorities. If I were the member for St. Barbe, I would have to be a lot closer to having that ferry back than he is at the present time. I might say that every year I did take a trip on that ferry and I enjoyed it. In fact, I supported him on that issue a little less than a year ago, when the ferry subsidy was withdrawn because the roads had been put into shape. I no soon had my offering of support for it out of my mouth when the hon. member was on the radio complaining that I was after stealing his thunder, that he did not get up to complain in the House of Assembly. I would suggest you are either hearty and sincere in what you are doing or you just want to shoot off your mouth.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not get nasty now, 'Ray.'

MR. BAIRD:

Getting your work done is a lot more important than trying to play a little bit of politics. I would say that if I were to lose my position, which I darn near did three or four years ago, it would not worry me too much as long as I was sincere in what I was trying to do for my particular area.

I would like to read from a couple of reports too, Mr. Speaker. The Macpherson Commission in its report on Transportation in 1961, which is certainly pertinent to the position we are talking about today, the user/pay concept, stated: 'The situation in Newfoundland is a special case, distinct from the rest of Canada. Because of the lower level of the economy as compared with the rest of Canada and because of its geography, transportation costs are high and the people concerned cannot yet assume the full cost of moving goods from the Mainland to the Island.' I would suggest that is certainly as evident today as it ever was. The Macpherson Commission argued that 'Newfoundland should be excluded from basic transportation policies which are appropriate to other regions of Canada and should be treated as a special case.' It is interesting to note that these very issues are still being debated twenty-four years after the findings of this Commission.

The Sullivan Commission of Enquiry into Newfoundland Transportation reaffirmed this special case argument for this Province, 'Noting that the objective of commercial viability, therefore, is appropriate under certain circumstances and is clearly

inappropriate in others. In Newfoundland, at the present time, most transportation services fall within the latter category, that is to say they are either social services or required for essential economic development but are not commercially viable. Under these circumstances it is not expected that the user/pay philosophy should prevail. The Commission must reiterate its view that most of the Newfoundland transportation system requires substantial subsidy.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why do you not (Inaudible) while you are reading your speech?.

MR. BAIRD:

If you were over here looking at what I see opposite me, I do not think you would be too anxious to look at them either.

'It is further stated that it is obvious that certain forms of transportation, for example, serving the Gulf route will require a continuing subsidy for the foreseeable future. Indeed, the costs involved on that particular route are such that they could not be recovered' -

MR. KELLAND:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

If the hon. member would just bear with me, it is not, I guess, a heavy one from that point of view, nor was it my intention to interrupt him, but I was outside talking to some constituents when I heard reference to our Province, it was inadvertent, and I just would like to say for the record

that he referred to our Province in his very eloquent presentation as 'We are an Island'. For the record's sake, I would like to make note of the fact that we are a large Mainland Province which has an Island as part of it, of course. I know it was inadvertent on the member's part.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

To that point of order. The CN coastal boats certainly cover the Newfoundland and the Labrador section.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

For years and years, when the Liberals were in power, it seemed that we were left as an Island - that is what we were considered - certainly far removed from the rest of Canada. I thank the hon. member for his clarification, and it is nice to see him back in the House after a long absence.

'Indeed, the costs involved on that particular route are such that they could not be recovered by direct charges, except at astronomical expense to the consumer. The travel of passengers across the Gulf will be continued to be subsidized and the amount of the subsidy may well increase in the foreseeable future.'

It is interesting to note, when we

talk about the CNR, that most members opposite wanted to talk about the Sullivan Commission rather than the user/pay concept. It is interesting to note that the now Leader of the Opposition, 'Mr. Leo Barry', was involved with that Commission. In fact, I think he was paid for being on the Sullivan Commission, the findings of which was the abandonment of the railway. Now all of a sudden, a few years later, he seems to have changed his mind, he seems to be on the fence, wondering whether he should go that way or the other way. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members will find out what happens to a lot of people who sit on the fence, eventually they wind up with a picket where they might not appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered just about everything. The user/pay concept is certainly not feasible or conducive to Newfoundland with our distance from the big markets and our scarce population. I think the authors of the Nielsen Report were certainly ill-advised and maybe did not have our greatest interests at heart when they came up with this. I am sure all hon. members on this side, and I would say all thinking members there opposite, will be voting for this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the amendment please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
The amendment is defeated.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Divide.

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:
All those in favour of the amendment please stand:

Mr. Callan, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the amendment please stand:

The hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural

and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Patterson, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I declare the amendment defeated.

All those in favour of the motion please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the motion 'nay'.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
The motion carries.

Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:
The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 8, at 3:00 p.m.