



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 60

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

*Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas*

Tuesday

21 June 1988

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

When we adjourned the House last night at ten o'clock, I had some doubt in my mind as to how we should proceed today. I will just quote part of Standing Order No. 8: "Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted."

I was not clear in my mind whether we should carry on exactly in debate today. In other words, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would immediately carry on the debate or whether we should have our ordinary daily routine.

I looked up the precedents of the House and I found three that are appropriate. I have left out the Wednesday ones because it is Private Members' Day and different. The ones I found, if hon. members would like to take note, are: 1977, May 9 and June 9; and 1970, April 27. When the House adjourned at eleven o'clock on the following dates, May 9 and June 9, 1977, and April 27, 1970, the next day, in every case, the routine Orders of the Day were gone through before the debate was resumed, and in no case was the debate started immediately.

So for that reason I feel that what we should do today is get into the routine business, and I call for Statements by Ministers. Then I will call the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to resume the debate that we had last night.

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the hon. House of Assembly today a list of projects valued at \$26.5 million --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
-- to be publically tendered by my department over the next few weeks for highway upgrading and paving throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, these transportation improvement projects will be carried out during the 1988 construction season. They will be funded under the \$100 million ERDA Enrichment Agreement signed with the Federal Government yesterday --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:  
-- as part of our Newfoundland and Labrador Transportation Initiative.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are moving quite expeditiously indeed to get these projects out so that they can be completed this construction season.

The projects to be tendered are as follows:

1. The upgrading of a 20 KM

section of Trans-Labrador Highway from Churchill Falls towards Wabush.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

2. The construction and paving of Penetanguishene By-pass, in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

3. Resurfacing and improvements to intersections on Route 210 between Red Harbour and Marystown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

4. Paving St. Bride's to Branch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

5. The upgrading of Point Lance Road.

6. The paving of a 12 KM section of Burgeo Road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Burgeo?

MR. DOYLE:

Burgeo Road.

MR. DINN:

Sure the member is against that.

MR. DOYLE:

7. Upgrading and paving Route 205, Hillview towards St. Jones Within.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

8. Paving Route 204 from Little Heart's Ease to Southport.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

9. Paving Route 420 and 421 towards Jackson's Arm and Hampden.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

And, Mr. Speaker, a part of our longstanding commitment:

10. The upgrading and paving of Roddickton towards Englee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Sure he is against the agreement.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, the above named projects, represent a significant increase in the total amount of highway upgrading and paving to be carried out in the Province this year under the Federal/Provincial ERDA Agreement. In the Fall of 1987 projects valued at \$34.6 million were announced under this agreement and what we have announced today will total \$61.1 million under the ERDA agreement. The projects to be carried out are spread throughout the Island portion of our Province, as well as Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

This demonstrates a strong commitment on the part of government to provide a safe and efficient network of secondary

roads in the Province. In addition to these projects, the \$40 million in provincial projects previously announced, amount to a total in excess of \$100 million to be spent on highway -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

How come the Premier is not gone down to Government House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE:

I am sure that members opposite will want to hear that again just in case they did not get that figure. In excess of \$100 million will be spent on highway upgrading and paving throughout the Province this present year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

The employment to be generated by this construction activity will be substantial and the benefits will be felt in virtually all parts of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, the agreement signed with the federal government on June 20, 1988 is for a fifteen year period and in the months and years ahead I will be announcing to the House of Assembly many additional projects to be undertaken in future years.

The Newfoundland Transportation Initiative includes three major road improvement packages. The projects which I have just announced form only the beginning of a \$100 million enrichment of our present ERDA agreement. Over the next four years many areas of the Province will benefit from road improvements from that

particular agreement.

We have yet to conclude the precise projects which will form part of \$235 million agreement for upgrading regional trunk roads. However, funding will begin on that agreement very soon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we shall continue our progress in upgrading the Trans-Canada Highway to national standards. While none of the projects I announce today form part of the Trans-Canada Highway, I fully expect to be placing before this House on an annual basis an additional \$405 million of work as a result of the new Newfoundland and Labrador Transportation Initiative.

Just to give members opposite, Mr. Speaker, some idea of the expenditures which government will be undertaking in the fifteen-year life of that agreement, there will, as we indicated yesterday, be an \$800 million funding package announced by government which will be spent over the next fifteen years. There is currently \$86 million remaining in the present ERDA agreement.

Based on a minimum of a \$40 million provincial expenditure which the government makes available each year through its roads program, over a fifteen-year period that will amount to \$600 million and will total \$1.5 billion which this government will be undertaking, Mr. Speaker, as part of its transportation initiative.

Add to that the other agreements, over and above the railway that we will be negotiating with the federal government during that fifteen-year period, and you have

a package of funding which will be take the people of Newfoundland and Labrador into the 21st Century with a good transportation system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister acted so quickly on the agreement signed yesterday. I am sure the people have suffered during the years who have lived in those areas where they needed those roads paved. But I wonder if the price we are paying for it is going to be worth it.

There is old expression out in Placentia Bay: "I wonder is the shot going to be worth the powder".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

When it really boils down, what we have here is a situation where we are selling the railway to get these funds to do the secondary roads agreement. In other words, we had to sell something to get a secondary roads agreement.

In the three years since I have been in this House, we have been promised a secondary roads agreement, Mr. Speaker, and the price we had to pay will have to be checked out in time as we have

now concluded a deal in which we are going to close the Newfoundland Railway. As far as my figures are concerned, very quickly it looks this \$100 million that we are talking about, well that is \$63 million from the federal government, the \$405 million I am not quite sure as to how that is going to be spread, and then there is another \$235 million that is to come sometime in the future, of which \$147 million of that is coming from the feds. So what we are talking really, I suppose, is we are talking about \$235 million we have sold our railway for.

I am glad we are going to have a secondary agreement and are going to have some of these roads paved since we have waited a long time, but the thing I would be more interested hearing the minister say is, instead of announcing all of those projects he is supposed to be announcing over the next fifteen years, I would much rather if he was going to tell me that there was an agreement in place to be able to maintain those roads once they were in place. That is the question I ask the minister. I would say your problem is going to be maintaining this road, Mr. Speaker, rather than the announcements of upgrading.

I would not worry too much about making the announcements if I were the minister. The only announcement you should make over there is to call the election, then we will see how the announcements are going to be made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter of the statement by the minister today confirms my own reaction to the deal as it was announced yesterday. What we have is the government of the day taking a very serious issue, namely, the dissolution of the operation of the railway, and turning it into a political campaign. The minister today comes in and confirms that the whole context in which the deal was struck yesterday was to give the government of this Province more discretionary authority to spend monies for political purposes.

The way the Premier and other ministers and other members of the government are appauding the announcements and the promise of more announcements of this kind to come just shows the essential purpose of the deal struck by the Premier yesterday was to begin re-election plans and to begin spending money paving roads all across the Province.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation or the Premier should take a whole lot of pride in making an announcement and striking a deal with the federal government yesterday on an issue everybody in this Province takes very, very close to their hearts, and to see that the whole resolution of our historic rights to protection of our transportation needs have been resolved in a very political way.

I think the minister today has confirmed that the actions of the government are simply designed to pave roads with the intention of

winning votes, but I think the people of the Province are not going to respond so warmly and in such a happy fashion as all the ministers across the way are today.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to table the annual report of the Canada - Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board for 1987 - 1988, as is required pursuant to The Atlantic Accord Implementation Acts. The report covers a period from April 1, 1987 to March 31, 1988, the second full year of the Board's operation.

Highlights of the Board's Report are as follows:

The federal and provincial Atlantic Accord Implementation Act were simultaneously proclaimed on April 4, 1987;

Operations offshore were at about the same level as last year with five new wells spudded and two previously drilled wells re-entered and evaluated;

An exploration well was drilled in the South Whale Basin in 1,577 meters of water - a Canadian water depth record;

Four significant events occurred, including one rig fire which caused interruption of operations but no injuries or significant environmental effects;

A call for bids on eight parcels

comprising 258,141 hectares was issued in March, 1988 with closing to be on September 28, 1988; - Mr. Speaker, this is a very significant event in the life of the board and of offshore developments offshore here because we are very interested, of course both governments are, and this government in particular, in seeing the kind of interest that we get from this call for bids of eight parcels, 258,000 hectares, recognizing, as most hon. members do, and those people familiar with the industry, that these land sales are occurring very close to the White Rose discovery. So we will be looking with a great deal of interest as to the level of interest in these bids in September which, of course, will stimulate additional exploration activity off our shores, given that the bids will be assessed on the basis of how much the bidders will be putting into the activity offshore, so that we can expect and anticipate even now that there will be an increased in activity as a result of this sale. The level of that increase activity will await as to who will be the successful bidders on those eight parcels of land.

The total discovered resources Offshore Newfoundland were estimated by the Board, at 50 per cent probability of occurrence, to be: Oil, 1.229 million barrels; Gas, 4 billion cubic feet; and Natural Gas Liquids at 214 million barrels.

Also during this past year draft guidelines for preparation of development planned applications were prepared and a consultative process commenced with the industry over these guidelines for the development plan.

And a computerized Shotpoint Location System was put into operation by the Board.

As has already been, I think, previously announced, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to highlight it again now for hon. members information, the Board is proceeding with the building of our core storage shed here, I think it is in the O'Leary Avenue area, which was a very important component, both symbolically and in real terms. Right now a lot of the core drilled offshore and which is used for examination is stored on the Mainland.

One of the provisions of the Atlantic Accord was that the core offshore Newfoundland had to be stored in Newfoundland and industry and academia who wanted to do studies and assessment on the core then would have to do it in Newfoundland.

They have brought land and called tenders for the building and it will be finished this Fall and then we will see, before the end of this year, all of the core material from way back in the 1960s, when the drilling started first in Newfoundland right up to now, will come back to Newfoundland and all new core drilled offshore will remain in Newfoundland and industry from all over the world and academic people will have to come to Newfoundland in order to do their assessments. That is a small, but symbolic benefit that we already see from the Atlantic Accord, as we do in the operations, of course, of the Offshore Board itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we will have an opportunity to see the report, read it, and then address the contents. We do not know what is in it so it is a bit difficult to deal with it now.

I am just a little bit confused by the suggestion that the operations offshore were at about the same level as last year because it seems to me that last night's news reported that they were down 39 per cent. I do not know which is accurate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is accurate.

MR. WELLS:

Well, I do not know which is accurate. I cannot determine which is accurate, but I will check it to see.

Whether the development of Hibernia is announced in the next few days or not, I hope exploration continues because, of course, the economy of Newfoundland benefits greatly from the offshore exploration activity.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) is very important.

MR. WELLS:

I think it probably will. The economy of this Province benefits greatly from exploration activities, so I hope that that continues at a reasonable pace.

Unfortunately, the policies of the

present federal government are not as conducive to exploration as those of the previous government but still it is going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

I would also like to support the Premier's comments about what he calls a small but symbolic gesture of having the cores stored in Newfoundland. I share his view. I think it is important that they are, in fact, stored here and accessible to persons interested and who have a need to see them and access them here. I think while it may be symbolic and there may be some indirect benefit, but I think it is significant and I support the Premier's comments in that regard.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the publication of the report by the Petroleum Board but would take the opportunity to say to the Premier that, in view of the agreement signed with the federal government yesterday in which we have given up our highway without any guarantee of financial return in perpetuity, that the Premier should not, in the same fashion, for political purposes, run to strike a deal with the consortium to develop Hibernia and to forego earnings and revenue this Province has a right and an obligation to ensure that we collect over the years, whenever the development



occurs.

We would not want to see, especially in light of the difficulties that are going to be created on the fiscal capacity of this Province, because of the moneys we have given up on the railway deal, we do not see this government do the same thing, run to strike a major development deal on Hibernia for political purposes and to throw to the wind the rights we have won, in part through some of the good efforts of this Premier or this government over the years, to secure our revenues whenever the development occurs.

If that happens in the next little while, the Premier can be assured his political future will indeed, with these two deals, be put in great jeopardy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Oral Questions

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
In the arrangement announced yesterday, there was an announcement of an assistance package for employees. That, of course, is good, to take care of the employees who will be displaced as a result of the closure of the railway. There was also an assistance package announced for two particular municipalities, Bishop's Falls and Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, what about the other

municipalities that will be significantly adversely affected by this, Whitbourne, Clarendville, Gander, Grand Falls, and Badger? A town like Badger.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Get your facts straight.

MR. WELLS:  
You may laugh at it, but the little town of Badger will lose fourteen jobs, which is one-third of what Bishop's Falls will lose.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: If the government is arranging \$7 million for Bishop's Falls, which will lose forty-five jobs, why did they not arrange \$2 million for Badger, which will lose fifteen jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, there are various ways the governments could have gone about this business. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition does not agree with the way we went about it. In assessing the economic impact, not only the number of jobs lost but the economic impact, with the facilities that are available in Port aux Basques and the facilities that are available in Bishop's Falls, the work that they did relative to the railway, we thought it important to really put our money where the greatest impact was going to be, and that is in those two communities. Even now the town of Port aux Basques, as I understand it, are not happy with the \$7 million allocation that they have. But we thought that it was important to highlight those two communities, in particular, because, as we assess it, the impact there will be much,

much greater than it is in any other part of the Province. If you start splitting it down, I suppose, you get all the way down to one job for \$50,000, if there is one community somewhere in Newfoundland that loses one job.

Not only that, of course, but you have people who work with the railway who live in other communities that do not necessarily have a railway presence. Do you also provide some money to that community, because that person no longer has a job? You see, it is a difficult proposition. We did what we think is the wisest and most prudent way to spend the money to help those communities which are going to have absorb largest impact. We do not apologize for that. We think we did a reasonable job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, there is also a significant group of employees who worked for many years with the railroad, albeit it seasonally, who have in fact not had any work this summer because CN or TerraTransport has been implementing this agreement now for the past two months. There are some 155 seasonal workers.

Why was there not some provision made for those 155 seasonal workers who will be adversely affected by this as well?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
There is provision for seasonal workers to be compensated under this plan.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Would the Premier tell the House what that provision is?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I cannot tell exactly what it is because it will be negotiated with the unions, and we have communicated this to the unions. The two key areas that we zeroed in on in the final weeks of the negotiations were both employees' compensation and towns' compensation areas.

The \$70 million-plus that will be spent on the workers' compensation, part of the plan includes allocations through negotiation with the union for all of the seasonal workers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, just to pursue this line of questioning to the Premier, the impact on Port aux Basques will be, I submit, more devastating than on any other community, including Bishop's Falls. Where in Port aux Basques

the job loss is in the order of 200 from TerraTransport and Marine Atlantic, in Bishop's Falls it is of the order of 45. Plus the fact, I submit to the Premier, the port of Port aux Basques is being downgraded through the expenditures on Argentinia, and the transportation industry will not have the same clout in Port aux Basques that it had before the agreement was signed.

I ask the Premier, then, assuming that the amount for Bishop Falls of \$7 million is adequate, does he feel that the same amount was fair for Port aux Basques, or is he about to review that or prepared to take it under review?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member confuses the matter somewhat. Let me say that the Opposition, by the way, in a resolution some months or some weeks ago, did not even have anything in their resolution for the towns or the workers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- and now they are standing up as great guardians of the workers and the towns in the Province. And their resolution, which no doubt they laboured over for weeks beforehand, did not even include anything to do with workers or the towns.

Now this agreement that we signed yesterday covers the railway. We are now assessing whether in fact it will have any impact on Marine Atlantic. As I understood it from yesterday, I do not know where the 200 figure comes from, it was my

understanding we are talking about forty or fifty, maybe even fifty-four in Port aux Basques as it relates to the railway. And there is some suggestion now that there may be thirty to thirty-five as it relates to Marine Atlantic. We will be assessing that additional impact, when and if in fact it does occur. We know when the fifty-four is going to occur. It is going to occur over the next three months. We have that identified, and it was for that reason we responded through the agreement for \$7 million. We are now assessing whether in fact there will be additional negative impacts upon Port aux Basques relative to Marine Atlantic, and after that assessment is done we will decide whether, in fact, additional efforts should be made in the Port aux Basques area.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is right in that the figure for Marine Atlantic in Port aux Basques tends to be different depending on who you talk to. I believe the mayor used the figure of up to 200, including the fifty-four in Terra Transport. Another individual indicated to me that Marine Atlantic figures would be comparable, so about fifty. But whatever the figure, I am, first of all, pleased to hear that that is being taken under review.

I put the Premier back to his response to the Leader of the Opposition where he said the job loss is not directly related to the economic impact, and that was the brunt of my first question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I ask the Premier: Given the economic devastation this will wreak in Port aux Basques, is he prepared to have the amount of \$7 million reviewed with a view to pushing it upward somewhat?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The other problem you have to remember in this is when you look at \$7 million, you know, \$7 million can go a long way if it is used wisely. I know that there are towns or individuals around that - if somebody gave me ten dollars and gave somebody else ten dollars, perhaps the other person could realize out of that ten dollars fifty and I might be only able to realize twenty, because they are more aggressive and more innovative than I am. So let us not lose sight of the fact that there is a \$7 million till there in Port aux Basques now for economic diversification and for job creation.

The question, as I said last night, is: How many jobs can \$7 million realistically create in the Port aux Basques area over the next couple of years? It could be very, very substantial.

I have already answered the hon. member. We are looking to see now exactly what the impact is as it relates to Marine Atlantic, and once that is done then we will assess whether, in fact, additional measures need to be taken or not.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
With respect to the Premier's undertaking in relation to the Marine Atlantic people, what will be the mechanism now? Will any additional costs here be funded under the railway agreement, or will the pool of money have to be split in more ways now if we introduce the extra fifty people? How will the funding be found in the event that it is determined that these people ought to be compensated, too?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
We will consider that and decide in which vehicle we will do that if, in fact, we do it.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the agreement made yesterday, I would like to ask the Premier a question in recognition of the many questions facing the communities affected and the individual workers, and in particular the concerns with the workers located in St. John's. I would like to ask the Premier, now that the company has been given three months to negotiate a special assistance package with these workers, if that means that

the Province has given up any responsibility for the eventual resolution of the position that these workers find themselves in?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, the hon. member has not done his homework at all, as most hon. members opposite have not. I am sorry to have to take the time of the House on this. Your Honour, I am at your disposal as to what you want me to do. In my statement yesterday, which I think everybody on both sides of the House had a copy of, I go into great detail about the whole question of compensation as it relates to the workers. I am just looking for the page it is on here. I can read it to the hon. gentleman or I can just refer him to it.

MR. LONG:

The question is he does he not have any further involvement.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

"The Province's prime concern has, from the outset, been the welfare of communities and employees most affected by the railway closure... In our view the agreement provides sufficient funding for a fair, reasonable and equitable settlement for all existing railway employees. The details of this settlement are to be negotiated with the employees in the coming weeks. I want to assure railway employees today that the Province will be taking a keen interest in these negotiations to ensure that the workers' interests are an integral part of the overall initiative. I, myself, and Mr. Crosbie have paid particular attention to this point, and we have met with Mr.

Ron Lawless. We have been assured by Mr. Lawless, as I am sure he will assure you when he speaks, that not only will CN meet all of the requirements of the collective agreement... We will be keeping a close watch upon the negotiations of these special benefits to ensure that the interest of the Newfoundland unions and and the welfare of the Newfoundland workers is protected.

"Pursuant to this the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador believes that if this is to be a true Newfoundland package for the full benefit of the Newfoundland workers then local union leaders must play a key role."

We actually pushed ourselves into the situation before this agreement was signed and said to CN we want a guarantee that local union leaders will be involved in the negotiations of this package and not just the national union leaders, for which we got a guarantee, so our local union people will be involved. It should be centered in Newfoundland and negotiations should be taking place here, which is going to be agreed to.

"Because of the importance of the this aspect of the compensation package, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has requested" -- We have asked and CN has agreed. We have gone through both the departments responsible for CN, as well as CN themselves -- that we be kept apprised of the progress of these negotiations."

So we are going to keep a watching brief on these negotiations to ensure that the package that is negotiated is a reasonable and fair one to all of the workers in the Province, including the ones

that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned earlier, the seasonal workers.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I appreciate the time the Premier has taken to advise everybody of the commitment the Province has given to maintaining some kind of monitoring role in these negotiations. But it is exactly -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question concerns precisely the role that the Province has committed itself to. In particular, will the Premier give an undertaking that the government will be making representation to the company to address specifically the critical point of negotiations, which is going to be whether employees are obliged for their end to exercise the option of moving outside of the Province in order to protect their rights under the collective agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is really out of touch. I hate to say that, but he is. The union leaders understand where CN is coming from and what the package is all about. It is going to be a very, very lucrative, generous package to the employees. And a lot of the material that the hon. member is now asking questions

about is going to be dealt with at the table, and was yesterday. We met with the union leaders, with Mr. Lawless and Mr. Crosbie and so on. They understand the parameters in which they are dealing, and I think we will feel pretty happy as the negotiations continue. There will be various things there, whether they move or not, or can still stay, and continue to have their rights in Newfoundland or continue to get early retirement benefits as well as pension benefits, and the like. But that is detail, that will now be worked out at the table and we will be kept informed as to how that moves along. So I would rather not get into every piece of the puzzle that has to be put together by both sides. But I assure the hon. member that we will be keeping a close eye on the situation. And the union leaders are no fools in their own rights, they know what they are about, and I am sure that they will ensure that a good package is negotiated.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, as a final supplementary on the same general issue, if in view of the experience at the Moncton shops in the last number of years and the difficulty the employees and the company there have had in dealing with and applying the collective agreement to those conditions, will the Premier give a commitment that if at the end of three months there is no resolution between the workers and this company, because of the difficulties in which the employees are invited to move

out-of--Province to protect their rights, that the government of this Province will play a role in ensuring that there is, indeed, a special assistance plan, put in place for the workers of this Province to allow them to stay here in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Hypothetical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. In his statement to the media yesterday on the railway, the Premier stated, 'We have sought and obtained assurances of a continued commitment by the federal government meeting our future transportation needs.' Could the Premier tell the House what specific assurances they have received in this regard? Has the Province gotten these specific assurances in writing, and is the Government of Canada legally bound by these assurance now, and eight years from now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There are ongoing memorandums of understanding between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland for ongoing regional economic development initiatives, including transportation, Mr. Speaker, as there have been in the past. So there will be ongoing ERDA agreements, as I said last night,

on roads, on agriculture, on rural development, on forestry, and on mining. Roads is very much a part of that. As a matter of fact, of all our regional economic development agreements, the one that has more money in it than any other is the roads agreement. It was before this railway agreement was signed. There was \$186 million, or whatever it was. So there are agreements in place, or memoradums or understanding, between the two governments signed by Order in Council by both governments ensuring ongoing ERDA agreements for road rehabilitation and paving and so on, on into the next century, as there are for other regional economic development initiatives in mining, forestry, rural development, and agricultural sectors of the economy.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to the Premier again. Could the Premier tell us, with respect to the reopener clause eight years from now, if there happens to be two divergent opinions with respect to this clause, if Canada takes position A and Newfoundland takes position Z, what security is there within this reopener clause that Newfoundland is not going to take a royal screwing like they almost did under Term 29?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Very hypothetical, Mr. Speaker. Coming from a Liberal who did not

have reopener clauses, I am amazed.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, is the Premier telling the Province that under this reopener clause that he negotiated there is no security for this Province? Eight years from now if Canada says, 'Your roads are on par with the Maritimes,' that is it, it is all over, there is absolutely no security for the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Is that a question, Mr. Speaker? I do not know. The last phrase was, 'There is absolutely no security for the Province.' I understand that is a declarative sentence and not a question.

One would think, Mr. Speaker, that in the normal course of events it will be easy to determine, through factual examination of the state of the roads in Newfoundland, the Trans-Canada and the regional roads and all the rest of it, that there will not be a disagreement over fact as to whether there are two miles or four miles or ten miles. That should be pretty easy to determine.

To construct an argument like the hon. member did, as a premise to his question, that suddenly there would be somebody in Ottawa who would be saying, 'There are four miles paved,' and there would be somebody in Newfoundland says, 'There are two miles paved,'

insults the intelligence of any homo sapiens.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. The press releases state that railway lands throughout the Province will be eventually transferred from the federal government to the Province, but there is no mention of when this is going to take place and no breakdown of the \$5 million, which we assume might be legal and other costs of doing the transfer. But could the Premier explain when in fact these lands will be transferred and what comprised the \$5 million?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, all the questions that have been asked are in the documents. I do not understand hon. members opposite. Read the document. Please read! Read the document. The document is here for reading. That is covered in here. There will be a committee established immediately - the CN, the federal government and ourselves - which will then negotiate the dispersal of the assets. That is why there is no time in there. There are a lot of physical assets, in addition to just a track and a right-of-way, in St. John's and Bishop's Falls, those two main centres in particular, so you cannot give a time for it where we are going to sit down with a committee representing the three parties and



work out a timetable for doing this. What does CN need to continue its ongoing operations here, what it is they do not need, especially as it relates, for example, to St. John's and Bishop's Falls. It will be easy to do the roadbed, because CN will not need that any more. So there is going to be a schedule established by this committee and as that schedule is established we will be announcing it and the time frames in which the various assets will be taken over. But that is all covered here in the booklet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier appears to be saying that there is nothing concrete right now. We have towns and cities throughout the Province affected adversely with employment being taken away, lands and properties being taken away, and no details.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:  
Will the Premier give some detail as to exactly what is happening? And what lands and properties are involved and where they are located in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
All of the railway lands in the Province, all the things that the CN owns in the Province are going to be examined and the need

identified by CN of what they want to keep, and then the rest will be transferred. And from time to time, each month or two, we will be in consultation with some of the municipalities that will be affected. We will be sitting down with them, where it is in a municipal boundary. Where it is not, and it is just on Crown land or whatever as a right-of-way, we will be announcing the orderly transfer of these assets. But none of the assets will be transferred unless parties who have some interest in those assets are consulted before any final decisions are made. So we want to do this on an orderly basis, through a committee that will now be established as is called for in the Memorandum of Understanding relevant to the agreement.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, can the Premier explain whether or not this committee that is going to be struck will include representation from the many towns and the couple of cities involved? Given the fact that these lands, the lands in particular outside of the roadbeds in question, lands within their boundaries and near their boundary, that can be developed for either business or industrial use, can the Premier explain whether or not these cities will, in fact, have some of these lands and buildings transferred to them rather than just transferred to the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that in my previous answer, that the municipalities involved will be consulted on the matter. Obviously, if there is a business interest there, we are eager to pursue it. If there is a tourism interest there, we are eager to pursue it.

First of all we have got to get some legal things done, and an identification of what it is that we are going to transfer, because there are certain assets that CN will still want to hold on to because they are going to try and increase their freight market share in the Province through their trucking and water modal systems. But we intend to, as we said yesterday, as I said in answer to the previous question, as I will say again now, that that process will be under way, municipalities will be fully involved, business who want to take over some of this property and develop a business, in whatever type of business it may be, that is what we welcome and that is what we want to see happen.

Our first initiative must be to establish a committee to get the ball rolling and then everybody will be consulted and involved to ensure that the assets and roads and everything else that happens will be for the benefit of all the Province and the municipalities involved.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Premier. Given the fact that the railway is now gone, the question on top of all people's minds is what about the future of highways in Newfoundland?

I would ask the Premier, very clearly and very sensibly, given the fact that he had been portraying himself as The Fighting Newfoundlander, why would he sign an agreement with the federal government with no provision in the contract for the continuing maintenance of the highway system in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am delighted to answer that question. I am absolutely delighted to answer. I mean, when Mr. Smallwood was doing his drive in 1965 with all this 90-10 or 95-5, money then, which is now 50-50 and 60-30, and 60-40 and so on, where was the maintenance agreement? Who looked after maintaining it.

MR. SIMMS:

The Minister of Labour.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Province looked after it, Mr. Speaker. And the better the road, the less the maintenance. This is a red herring of the first order, about a maintenance agreement. Where was the maintenance on the Argentinia Highway when they gave up the branch line to Argentinia, to Placentia, Mr. Speaker. Where was the maintenance agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You gave it up!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, the Leader of the Opposition gave it up. There it is there in this letter. The Leader of the Opposition gave it up.

MR. DAWE:

The TCH was built to replace the passenger service.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes. The TCH was built to replace the passenger service was it? Where was the maintenance? Nowhere!

MR. SIMMS:

The Minister of Labour was responsible in those days for that, for maintenance.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is the reddest of red herring.

MR. EFFORD:

Answer it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am answering it. The better the road, the less the maintenance. We will have less maintenance on the Burgeo Road next year, because twelve miles of it is to be paved, than we had this year. Is that clear to the hon. member for Port de Grave? Does he understand that? We will have less maintenance on the road from Roddickton to Englee next year because it is to be paved this year.

MR. DOYLE:

The ratio is four to one.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Four to one is the ratio, the Minister of Transportation says. So it is not a question of a maintenance thing. That has always been the responsibility of provinces, in the same way as

provincial governments over the years have negotiated ferry agreements. You are late coming to the table if you are going to make the argument on maintenance, because you should have made the argument years ago when you talked about all the ferry systems that we took over, because the federal government built the wharves to the Island and to the mainland and then the Province operated the ferry system, in the same way as they have built landing strips in Labrador, Liberal Governments and P.C. Governments in Ottawa, and then the maintenance contract became the responsibility of the Province. The precedent was set a long time ago in other parts of Canada as well as in Newfoundland, when the passenger service was given up and the TCH was built in the beginning with no maintenance agreement.

We are very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be able to get our roads upgraded and paved so our maintenance costs will be less than they are now. That is what is going to happen. The Trans-Canada maintenance, the Burgeo Road maintenance, the Plum Point Road maintenance, the Bonavista Highway maintenance, all of that maintenance cost will be less because of what we did yesterday.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. the Premier, two wrongs do not make a right. In the past agreement there were two modes of transportation, and today there is

only one.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
I would ask the Premier: Given the fact that there is going to be less maintenance but we are still going to need money for maintenance, will the Premier tell the people of this Province where the money is going to come from for maintenance, which he tells us is going to be less, but nevertheless there is going to be maintenance required?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I am very sorry to see that the member for Port de Grave would attack his leader that way.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Premier does not have an answer to the question. Let me ask the Premier, given the fact that we do not have any money for hospitals, we do not have any money for education, we do not have any money for maintenance now, where is the money going to come from when all that has to be looked after, and the maintenance of the highways, too? Where is the money going to come from?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the

member for Port de Grave in this House has not realized that \$600 million is going into health care this year.

MR. EFFORD:  
And beds closed!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
And the hon. member just said that there was no money going into hospitals this year. Now, if he wants to play around with \$600 million like that, be my guest. That is just not so. Where we did we find the money after the 'Drive in, 65'? Where did we find the money after the Argenticia road was upgraded and we had to maintain it? We find it out of general revenue, and now we will have to find less because there are hardly any new roads, except the Trans-Labrador Highway, in this package. They are all existing roads on which maintenance costs are very high, and with them being upgraded we will reduce maintenance costs. So, if anything, Mr. Speaker, we will save maintenance money because of what we did yesterday.

MR. SIMMS:  
The is the argument they used to get their roads paved, sure.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
All the members opposite, when they get up with their petitions, say, How stupid is the Premier and the Minister of Transportation and that government over there? Do they not realize that if they gave the money for paving from community A to community B, it would not cost you so much next year on maintenance?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That was that lovely argument that you used. 'How stupid are you over there! You are being fiscally irresponsible to allow this road not to be paved because you can save money.' I can see the hon. member for Bonavists North (Mr. Lush) getting up and giving us a lecture on that. I can see him doing it, because, Mr. Speaker, it makes all kinds of sense and why does the minister not see the rationality of my argument?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If they gave Oscars in the House of Assembly he would be a legend in his own mind, no doubt, Mr. Speaker.

However, my question is not for the posturing Premier but to the Minister of Transportation. In his statement today priority one, I would take it, since it is number one in his statement, indicated that tenders will be called for the twenty kilometer section West of Churchill Falls on the Trans-Labrador Highway. In the ERDA Enrichment package towards the end, he indicated that there were two sections, that particular twenty kilometer section, plus the upgrading of the portion between Happy Valley-Goose Bay and Churchill Falls - even though it says access to Labrador West it means Churchill Falls, and keeping in mind that you cannot tell a prospective contractor what

to bid, can you indicate what portion of that \$19 million would be allocated to the twenty kilometer section, and thereby tell me what is left for the other part?

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:  
First of all let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. gentleman could not join me Saturday on the road between Goose Bay and Churchill Falls, because I did a little tour of it, as a matter of fact, with my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Mr. Speaker, the portion right now that we will be upgrading, that twenty kilometer portion, will be from Churchill Falls toward Wabush. I believe the hon. member is asking how much money will be allocated. Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot really say right now to the hon. gentleman how much money is going to be allocated on that contract. Tenders will be called, hopefully within the next three or four days - it could be in the paper Saturday, as a matter of fact - and two weeks from then we will know what the bids are. We are not in a position right now to say what that twenty kilometer section is going to cost, it is impossible to put a figure on it. I suppose I could get some information for the member based on what other contracts for other twenty kilometer sections cost on that road. There might be some indication I could give him. But I surely cannot give him any indication now as to what the contract is going to come in at

and what the tender will be awarded at. That is something we are going to have to look at.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

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

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

MR. KELLAND:  
Just a point of clarification in my point of order. In the response to my first question, Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated he was sorry I did not accompany him up to the Churchill Falls road on Saturday. I invited the minister to go up on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:  
On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:  
Sit down when the Speaker is standing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. KELLAND:  
That is a cheap shot, Mr. Minister.

**Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given**

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to table in this hon. House answers to three questions asked by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, questions 105, 186, and another question asked in camera.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
I wish to table answers to written questions posed by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick); questions Nos. 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, and question No. 170, all of which were the same questions to all the ministers. I have prepared a response on their behalf.

**Orders of the Day**

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

As hon. members know, the Government House Leader calls the order of the day, and the particular item that we are dealing with today was called by the hon. the Government House Leader yesterday. It was adjourned by me at eleven o'clock. So I will now call on the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to continue on third reading of "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Relating To The Use And Operation Of Vehicles."

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned last evening I was talking about the impact on our highways throughout this Province of the closure of the railway. I was talking about alternatives that we can use to avoid that, and expressing the view that there were constitutional alternatives which the government has ignored. This government, which used to proclaim our constitutional rights, have now chosen to say they no longer exist.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, they do exist. They are written in Term 31. The Premier talks about the legal opinions he had, and he tables something that he calls a synopsis or an excerpt, but I have not yet seen a legal opinion. I understand legal opinions have been written, but I have yet to see them. It has not been tabled in this House. What was tabled here was a sham or a pretence for a legal opinion. It was not the legal opinion of a lawyer who had looked at it in the constitutional sense. So when the Premier talks about legal opinions, I would like to see them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, looking at Term 31 - this is not just my opinion alone, this is the opinion of a great many other lawyers with whom I have spoken about the provisions of this term - when this term was written, they were dealing with a particular situation, how to provide for transportation in Newfoundland. We have to remember that at that time, Mr. Speaker, there were no roads in Newfoundland. The transportation system in Newfoundland was the Newfoundland Railway and the

Steamship and Marine Services around the coast. That was our total transportation system, with the exception, perhaps, of a road around Conception Bay and one between Bishop's Falls and Grand Falls and one between Corner Brook and Deer Lake. That was essentially it. Other than that there were no roads in this Province. So that is what the people who negotiated the Terms of Union and who went to Ottawa to get the position of the federal government were negotiating at the time.

They talked about how this would be integrated. For example, Mr. Speaker, when the federal government responded to questions raised by members of the National Convention as to what the position was with respect to transportation, here is what they said, here is their written response.

MR. J. CARTER:

May I pose a serious question?

MR. WELLS:

A serious question afterwards, but I am going to finish this first.

Their serious response was that the two committees agreed that a committee would be struck to examine and report upon problems involved in the integration of the Newfoundland Government Railway System with the existing transportation facilities in Canada.

Now that is what they were doing. They recognized that one of the fundamental responsibilities of the federal government was to provide for this nation a national transportation system. If hon. members will reflect back for a moment on their history, they will

remember that that was the reason that this country came into existence in the first place, primarily to provide a transportation connection amongst the colonies, and that was their primary activity for the first twenty years or so that the Government of Canada existed. That was their primary objective and this was recognized at the time.

Mr. Speaker, here is the position taken by the federal government as contained in a memorandum from the Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet to the Secretary of State for External Affairs with respect to the railway. "In the event of union I think it would be almost inevitable that in the course of time the railway would become part of the government-owned system since we now provide a governmental transcontinental system covering all provinces and could scarcely make an exception in the case of one."

Now, Mr. Speaker, they can no more make an exception for Newfoundland in 1988 than they could make an exception in 1948. They could not walk away from their responsibility to maintain across this Province the national transportation system that ties the country together from British Columbia to Newfoundland. They could not do it in 1948, and they can not do it in 1988.

There is a constitutional right, it is provided for. It may not be technically, specifically, ideally worded, but it is clearly provided for, and no federal government worth its salt would walk away from it. And we have Mr. Mulroney's word for that, "that they would honour it," he said, except that this government was so

anxious to get its hands on a few paltry dollars that they sold our birthright, they sold our heritage down the drain for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

There were other examples, Mr. Speaker. Here, for example, is an extract from a memorandum written by the Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Louis St. Laurent, and talked about the capital expenditures that would be necessary to maintain and operate the railway in Newfoundland.

Another one, Mr. Speaker, this one dealing with the question of debt. Hon. members will remember yesterday I spoke about debt, that it was the debt of Newfoundland in respect of the railway that drove it into bankruptcy in 1934, and with the program provided for in this agreement for the transportation system will be a debt that will drive this Province into bankruptcy in the future if we allow it go ahead on this basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the extra debt will come from building the roads we will need in the future to take the freight and traffic that the railway would have carried had it been left in place and operating.

DR. COLLINS:

You do not believe the figures?

MR. WELLS:

No, I do not believe the figure of fourteen trucks. You would have to be an idiot to believe it.

Here is another excerpt, Mr. Speaker, talking about the alternative financial arrangements with Newfoundland. This is an



extract from a memorandum by members of the Interdepartmental Committee on Newfoundland, which was a committee made up of members of the federal Cabinet. Here is what they said about the railway. "It is suggested that assumption of the railway and steamship services would be justified on the ground that it was merely the extension of the coast-to-coast transportation system to take care of the needs of a new province." That is what they were doing with Term 31, that is what Term 31 reflects. That is what it really means, that the federal government did for Newfoundland what it is doing for every other province of this Canada, maintaining within the Province of Newfoundland the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation system.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask hon. members to listen carefully to these words. Here is what the Government of Canada was saying that it meant to them at the time that it was negotiated. "It is suggested that assumption of the railway and steamship services would be justified on the ground that it was merely the extension of the coast-to-coast transportation system to take care of the needs of a new province." Now, that is what the federal government should have done, assumed responsibility for it, and that is what they were, in fact, doing.

There are other articles, Mr. Speaker, that deal with it, other memoranda written by Canadian representatives which indicated the manner in which they saw it at the time. Item 2 in this particular one written in August of 1947: "Canada was to take over and operate the railway with its steamship services." Another

memorandum dated August 13, 1947: "Canada to take over the Newfoundland Railway and its associate steamship services and operate them in a manner no less serviceable to the Newfoundland public than at present." Now, that is how they viewed their responsibility at the time, Mr. Speaker, and that is what is reflected in Term 31.

Here is another one where they created a special sub-committee of the two delegations meeting in Ottawa to deal with this issue. Here is the task they gave the sub-committee: "To bring together information on the Newfoundland Railway and Steamship Services with a view to enabling the Canadian representatives to examine the problems that would be involved, in the event of union, in the integration of the Newfoundland Government Railway and Steamship Services with the Canadian transportation system."

So all they were doing was integrating that into the national transportation system and recognizing that it was nothing more than discharging, for the new Province, the national obligation to provide for the national transportation system. Now that, Mr. Speaker, I say clearly indicates the proper construction to be placed on Term 31 of the Terms of Union. When they talk about taking over and will, as from the date of union, relieve the Province of Newfoundland of the public cost incurred in respect of each system taken over, namely, "the Newfoundland Railway, including steamship and other marine services." That is what they were talking about, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WELLS:

A brief question, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition has yielded for a moment, and I will be very brief. I think he is making a good argument. I think his arguments are sound, as far as they go. But I well remember in 1949 it was quite unthinkable that freight would be moved other than by rail or by water, quite unthinkable. The large, heavy-duty trucks, the so-called super highways, were not even conceived, let alone built. Now, if this was still 1949 or even 1952, you would be right.

MR. WELLS:

That is not a question.

MR. J. CARTER:

But you are wrong, because -

MR. WELLS:

The hon. member can make his speech later. That is the last time I will yield. That is not a question but a part of his argument, and he can make it when he speaks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly what Term 31 was intended to do, intended to achieve, to reflect those arrangements and those proposals. The government which maintained that position at one time suddenly does a reversal when it wants to do this deal and get its hands on some money. And the Premier explains it by saying, oh, well, I was only practicing a

deception at that time. That is what he said, 'I was only practicing a deception at the time. It was political posturing.' That is what this Premier does, political posturing.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to get technical and argue that there is no obligation to operate the railway, that is technically correct. I have never suggested there was. Anybody who looks at the Liberal position stated clearly over the last number of months knows that the obligation is to maintain within Newfoundland the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation system. And if that is best done by highway, okay, let it be done by highway. It does not have to be railway. But it does not in any manner diminish the constitutional obligation to do just that.

And furthermore, if you want to just get technical about it and look at the technical words, the Province could take over and operate the railway, on the technical words, and send the bill for the deficit to the Government of Canada, because the Government of Canada has unquestionably undertaken to relieve the Province of Newfoundland of the cost involved in the operation of it. That could be done.

DR. COLLINS:

Are you advising that?

MR. WELLS:

I do not recommend it, but it is stupid to abandoned constitutional rights. It is silly, Mr. Speaker, to abandon constitutional rights and in order to present this package to the public pretend that we have no rights under Term 31. That is clearly wrong, demonstrably wrong. The rights

are there.

Mr. Speaker, that is not my opinion alone. It was an opinion that was expressed by Premier Peckford before. It was an opinion that was expressed recently by Prime Minister Mulroney, who said in August, 1984, "A Progressive Conservative Government will support and continue to operate the Newfoundland Railway." Was he practicing a deception too? Was that just political posturing?

MR. TULK:  
It could be.

MR. WELLS:  
The then Deputy Prime Minister, the hon. Erik Nielson, was asked about this in 1986: "Will the Deputy Prime Minister assure us that since this task force recommend the abolition of this railway, the government will live up to its election promise to the people of Newfoundland and keep that railway?" Here is what the Deputy Prime Minister said, "Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the New Democratic Party is exposing is his ignorance of the Terms of Union between the Government of Canada and Newfoundland. Clearly all that the Prime Minister was saying in that speech that was quoted by the hon. gentleman was a reaffirmation that this government intends to honour the Terms of Union between Canada and Newfoundland, and that is one of them." What is it? To continue to operate the Newfoundland Railway? Now that is what the Prime Minister thought of it in 1984 and that is what the Deputy Prime Minister said in 1986. Were they practicing political posturing and deceiving too? Clearly there is a constitutional obligation, recognized by

everybody, that has been abandoned, sold out by this government to provide it with some money to run an election in desperation because they know what is going to happen when the next election is called.

DR. COLLINS:  
That is all water under the bridge. It has nothing to do with the issue at hand.

MR. WELLS:  
It has a great deal to do with the issue at hand. What the government is doing is transferring and continuing to transfer to Newfoundland, and this is where my concern comes in - the financial burden that the federal government undertook in 1949.

Because, Mr. Speaker, you have to bear in mind that in 1949 there were 2,990 employees on the railway and another 761 employees in the steamship services a total of 3,750 employees for which the federal government took responsibility. Today there are 642, and that is the extent to which the burden has already been transferred by allowing the railway to deteriorate and allowing diversion of traffic from the railway onto the highway, and it is this Province that is carrying the burden of paying the people who would otherwise have maintained the railway but now have to maintain the highway. So the burden has been transferred to the Province by that means and this government has failed to enforce those rights, failed miserably to enforce those rights, and now they say they do not exist. Those words meant something, they dealt with a factual situation that existed and continued to exist, and the government has abandoned the

constitutional right, they have sold it out.

The real problem, too, Mr. Speaker, is not just maintenance costs. Everybody recognizes that maintenance cost is a provincial responsibility. The building of highways is a provincial responsibility, the maintaining and operating of them is a provincial responsibility, but, Mr. Speaker, the point we make is if you are going to abandon the railway and increase the provincial burden with respect to highways, then it is fair that the federal government, which had responsibility for the railway, should take that burden as well. That is why we say they should pay the capital cost of twinning the highway and the additional costs of maintenance made necessary as a result of the twinning. Not the basic maintenance cost but the additional cost made necessary as a result of diverting traffic from the railway onto the highway system, necessitating a more extensive system. That is what their responsibility is, that was what was provided for in the Terms of Union, and that is what this government has sold out, clearly sold out.

The statement that was issued yesterday indicates that they expect it is going to cost \$2.5 million per kilometer to construct four-lane divided highway. Ultimately, that is going to have to be done in this Province because the traffic is diverted from the railway to the highway. That is what will necessitate it at an earlier stage than it would ever otherwise have been done, and when it is, if this agreement goes through as it is now, that burden will be this Province's burden and that is what concerns me. If

it is too expensive now for the federal government to do, what is it going to be for this Province that cannot even keep its hospitals operating properly? What is it going to be for this Province where school children have to go out and raise money so the schools can have materials to work with? That is the situation we are in.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, just look at the other side of it. The federal government is being relieved of the \$40 million a year deficit on the operations of Terra-Transport, they are being relieved of an additional \$20 million a year deficit on the rail section of the Gulf operations, so that is at the very least \$60 million a year. Now, if the federal government even continued to discharge that obligation, and did nothing more over the life of the 15-year agreement, it would require \$900 million, which is more than they sold the thing out for. It clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that they have allowed us to be taken to the cleaners. Not only allowed us, but I think, Mr. Speaker, they have pushed us on the way, and they will never be forgiven for it.

MR. TULK:

They took us to the pawn shop.

MR. WELLS:

That is right.

While we cannot even operate our own hospitals and schools, the Government of Canada is being relieved of its responsibility totally.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I would like to address a couple of points made by hon. members when they spoke. The Minister of

Health talked about maintenance and the cost of maintenance, and that it is a provincial responsibility and the Province should take the responsibility for it. That is the same minister who last year, as Minister of Finance, prostrated himself before the Government of Canada begging for money because Newfoundland was in financial chaos, and the same Premier who spoke those words, "Newfoundland is in financial chaos. We have got to go cap-in-hand begging to the Government of Canada." And they do this deal in this way! It is clearly, Mr. Speaker, short-term gain for long-term pain. That is what they have done. They have reversed Mr. Crosbie's complaint. They have imposed on us long-term pain in order to give them some short-term gain, and the people of this Province will not forget it.

The Minister of Health also said that this Province should be the leader in Eastern Canada, because it has the resources and the people. I agree with him, we should be the leader. If it were not for this government taking office in 1979, we would have been the leader. Up until the time they took office, even under Premier Moores, we were the leader of the Eastern Canadian provinces. We were growing more rapidly, our earned income was increasing more rapidly, our population was increasing at a more rapid rate, until this government took office and they put us back behind everybody in the country to the point where our population is decreasing, our growth in earned income is far less than what it is in any of the other Atlantic provinces. We are way behind each and every other one when we were once ahead of them all. That is compliments of

this government, and that Minister of Health had a great deal to do with it, because he was Minister of Finance for most of the time. Of course, we should be the leader in Atlantic Canada, but under that government, Mr. Speaker, we never will be.

The member for St. John's North raises the question: Where was the constitutional right when the passenger service was abandoned? That is a good question, so it deserves a good answer. I say to him, it was working effectively and well and provided for us an alternative, the bus transportation system. This government has sold the works with no alternative, no alternative highway for the whole railroad. That is exactly what they have done.

MR. PATTERSON:

You sold yourself, that is what you did. You should be ashamed.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, would you ask the hon. member to get out of the House, or back to his seat, operate properly, and abide by the rules so that I can finish my speech?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

The Liberal party never had (inaudible) until you came on the scene.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, would you have the hon. member removed if he cannot control his rubber mouth?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to finish.

The constitutional rights were alive and working well, Mr. Speaker, when the passenger service was abandoned. It had the affect of getting acceptable alternatives, the bus transportation system. But this government has abandoned the rights totally. They gave them away in Clause 10 (1) of this memorandum of understanding, and they gave them away for virtually nothing, for what we would have gotten anyway had there never been such an agreement.

I would just like to have a few words, as well, on the Premier's comments. He says if there is an obligation to maintain the railway, how come the government agreed to abandon the passenger service? I have just explained that. We have never maintained that there was an obligation to maintain the railway. It is not there, but there is an obligation to maintain within Newfoundland the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation service, and that is exactly what was done by substituting the buses for the rail passenger service. It was a more effective, a more efficient means, and they substituted a more efficient service for the one that was being abandoned. So it was working well, and the constitutional obligation recognized that, and the federal government recognized it and provided for the alternative service.

He also commented on the Argentinia Branch, and he waved this letter around, all marked up in yellow, and all hon. members were shouting about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you how fundamentally dishonest this kind of an approach is, how fundamentally dishonest it is. To begin with, the letter is a letter written by the Hon. J.W. Pickersgill to Mr. T.C. Douglas on May 13, 1967, and what it says is that "insofar as the application for abandonment is concerned, it is being undertaken principally on an understanding reached with the Government of Newfoundland when the federal government undertook to pay the full cost of building a modern highway from Argentinia to the Trans-Canada Highway." At that time, the provincial government agreed that it would offer no objection to the abandonment of the railway after the highway had been opened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me raise several points. First, the agreement he was talking about was done in 1965, just for the Premier's edification, long before I was every near political activity or in the Cabinet.

But that does not bother the Premier; truth or fact or accuracy have never bothered the Premier. If he wants to say something, he just says it anyway. Truth, fact, support for what he is saying has never bothered him, nor does it bother hon. members opposite who jump on the bandwagon and say the same silly thing.

The other thing that the government at the time did, of course, was insist that Ottawa pay the full cost of the road and that it be done and completed before there was an application to abandon - that it be done and completed before.

As well, Mr. Speaker, it was a branch line. Now let me tell you

the rest of the truth, Mr. Speaker; in fact the Liberal Government never did abandon. They persuaded Ottawa to continue. Do you know when that branch line was abandoned? In December, 1986, by this government. That is when it was abandoned!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Lies, deception do not mean anything to them. Put on a show, divert attention when you are being stung, and when you are being hurt say anything to divert attention. It does not matter that it is not true. Say anything you want to divert attention.

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

CN made application to the Board of Transport Commissioners in 1966 to abandon the branch line, providing they would not oppose the transfer of the South East Coast Terminal to St. John's. You were a minister in the government. You were there. You are a quisling. You sold out the railway.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

That is the truth.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Whatever arrangement was made between Mr. Pickersgill and Mr. Smallwood was made sometime in 1964 or 1965 long before I ever thought of politics.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, that interjection shows they will use anything to divert attention from the reality of what they have done.

Then the Premier talked about the reopener clause, that is going to solve everything. That reopener clause is an absolute nothing. It has got about as much substance as fog. All it says is there will be a review. For what purpose? What does the federal government undertake to do after the review? Nothing. Absolutely, nothing!

Mr. Speaker, even Term 29 had a requirement for additional financial assistance, that the federal government would provide additional financial assistance, and look at what happened to Term 29 that the Liberals fought so hard for and the Tories resisted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Now this so-called review is nothing. Other than we will sit down and look at it, there is no obligation to provide one further single cent. It is a complete smoke-screen to divert attention again. The federal government could do with this the same as Diefenbaker did with Term 29, which gave Newfoundland nothing, virtually.

MR. PATTERSON:

What did the Liberals do with the I.W.A.?

MR. WELLS:

As the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage said, I am also responsible for the Trojan horse.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they say there is no constitutional obligation. But look at what Clause 10 (1) says: 'The foregoing arrangements are, however, offered herein by Canada as a comprehensive transportation package intended to address the parties' concern to provide a full and effective transportation service for the Island of Newfoundland following the closure of the Newfoundland Railway. It is offered in full satisfaction of all Canada's constitutional obligations related to railways on the Island of Newfoundland' - 'In full satisfaction of all Canada's constitutional obligations,' but none exist according to the Premier - 'and Newfoundland acknowledges that these arrangements are made for such purposes, and accepts that when carried out and performed in accordance with the provisions and intent of this Memorandum of Understanding, they will represent a meeting, to the satisfaction of Newfoundland, of Canada's constitutional obligations related to railways on the Island of Newfoundland.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, no Liberal Government would ever sell out our heritage and our constitutional rights in that manner, would ever abandoned or ever allow the Government of Canada to abandoned its constitutional obligations in that matter. And I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Liberal Party has agreed that as

soon as the government is changed in Ottawa and the government is changed here, the two governments will get together and, Mr. Speaker, restore to Newfoundland her constitutional rights under Term 31.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

We will make sure, Mr. Speaker, that Term 31 is amended in such a manner as to give Canada the responsibility for maintaining within Newfoundland the Newfoundland portion of the national transportation system, even though it may be a highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

It will be made abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker -

DR. COLLINS:

Would they do that for all provinces, or just this Province?

MR. WELLS:

Every province where the national railway is abandoned totally, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Every province where the national railway is abandoned totally, because it is fundamental to this country that the federal government maintain an effective national transportation system. That is the precept on which this country was built.

DR. COLLINS:

How would you handle the education system and having to fund that also?



MR. WELLS:

We are not handing over any education system. Any province that does not want it can refuse it.

DR. COLLINS:

How would this be set out to the Government?

MR. WELLS:

That is a pretty weak response. Indeed, it is a very, very weak response.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government sits in this House and pretends that they have gotten a great deal. Eight hundred million, they say, \$405 million for the Trans-Canada Highway in lieu of the railway. Mr. Speaker, we would have gotten that much or more over fifteen years without this agreement. We probably would have gotten more. Over the last fifteen years, in terms of federal funds for rebuilding and restructuring the highways, we got more than that without having to abandon anything. So it is a nothing, Mr. Speaker, that they sold it out for. I will tell you what they sold it out for, the \$100 million that they can use and announce now to make them look good for election purposes. That is exactly what they sold it out for, \$100 million slush fund, and they sold out the future of the Province.

MR. MORGAN:

Your time is up.

MR. WELLS:

No, it is not.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reality of it.

MR. J. CARTER:

The Leader of the Opposition's

time is up.

MR. WELLS:

I also spoke, Mr. Speaker, during Question Period about the other towns affected, and this is a serious matter. You cannot solve these problems by giving two towns some benefit. What about the other towns that proportionately are equally adversely affected? What about those towns? You cannot walk away from that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, particularly not where you give it to some. It would be easier to do, and fairer, if you provided none at all, but to provide it for only two of the towns that are going to be significantly adversely affected is clearly wrong.

Badger is one of those towns. Badger will lose a third of the number of employees that Bishop's Falls will lose. There will be a significant adverse economic impact on Badger. The railroad work crews operate out of Badger during the Summer and buy their goods and supplies there, so the town will be significantly adversely affected by this, and it is wrong to provide an alternative for Bishop's Falls and none for Badger.

I also mentioned seasonal workers. Now, nothing is mentioned in this package about seasonal workers, but the Premier told us in the House today that there is going to be some benefit for them, and I am glad to hear of that, Mr. Speaker. I will not say any more about seasonal workers until I hear in detail what their benefits are.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit down without saying, in general terms, this government has been very

shortsighted. They have taken a look at our long-term interests in this Province and thrown them to the dogs in order to get some short-term benefits. That may be beneficial politically, but I do not know whether they will benefit politically or not. That depends on how desperate people are for work. The extent to which our people have been driven to desperation, beyond having to leave the Province, they might approve of anything with the prospect of getting a few weeks work so that they can put food on their tables with a modicum of respect and dignity.

MR. SIMMONS:

They are desperate but not crazy.

MR. WELLS:

They are desperate but I do not believe they are crazy, and I do not believe our people will be taken in by this.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of its lasting adverse impact on this Province, it is probably the worst agreement that any government since 1832 has ever negotiated for this Province and they ought to hang their heads in shame.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, having listened to the last speaker, in particular, I find it amazing that he would close with such a negative comment on such an important issue. I listened very carefully to what he had to say and I listened very

carefully to his points of argument as it pertains to the Constitution, and I say at the outset, on reflecting back, I wish he had taken the same stand on the Water Reversion Act and the Upper Churchill recall case, he had used the same kind of enthusiasm and the same sense of support for this Province then as he does today for the railway. But no, Mr. Speaker, he stood in the courthouse and argued against our Province and against the rights for water reversion in a very articulate and successful way, unfortunately for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

No member of this House can stand today and look at this whole issue and say somebody in this House is responsible for the diversion of the traffic of the railway to the road, of the freight from the rail to the road. Look back at it, Mr. Speaker. Transportation is a tool of economic development anywhere in the developing countries today in the world, and in our own developed country of Canada. Transportation is the tool of economic development! Let me pose one question: Is an outdated, narrow gage railway a tool of economic development in this Province anymore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is quite obvious. It has not been for fifteen years or longer in this Province, fifteen years at least. Back in the days of the Moores' administration I served for three years as Minister of Transportation and at that time

we could see the demise of the railway approaching, not by the government of the day, either in Ottawa or here, but by the people who were moving freight in this Province, from the opening gate to our Province at Port aux Basques, or from any other part of our Province. Who chose to divert? The people. They chose to move their freight in a more efficient way and a more beneficial way; they chose to move it from the rail to the road, because, Mr. Speaker, road transportation is a more effective transportation system.

Today we have a situation where the Liberal Party is hurting badly on an issue because not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, and this is fact, a certain member of the Opposition stood in a certain public place and said, 'I certainly hope my road does not get paved.' And when somebody asked why, he said, 'If it does not get paved, I am assured of re-election. If the PCs pave my road and send down a good candidate, do you know what is going to happen? He or she could get elected and I do not want that. I do not want my roads paved.' They stand in the House every day and play politics. They moan and groan and attack the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:  
My good friend for the Strait of Belle Isle should be proud today. I supported him a number of times when he presented petitions in the House asking for road pavement in the Roddickton - Englee area. He moaned and attacked the government saying, 'You are arrogant. You will not do anything for us, while

keeping his fingers crossed that we would not. Then along came the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. For about five days in a row he brought in petitions asking for what? Improvements to the Burgeo Road. At the same time, he was hoping and praying we would not answer the prayer of the petition of the people, because if we did, he would be hurt politically.

The Leader of the Opposition scored it home at the close of his debate today by saying, 'this may be of political benefit to the government.' That was his concern right throughout his whole speech on this new agreement, where we are going to see \$800 million spent in this Province as result of yesterday's agreement to take care of all the road work in places where people have been eating dust for years, longing and longing for gravel roads to be paved. That is not going to do the Liberal Party any good, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about that.

For example, we mentioned the Labrador Highway. Tenders were called today. The Red Bay Road, the Plum Point towards Englee Road; Jackson's Arm, the Burgeo Road and all these areas - there is no point going over the list again - there is no question in my mind that people in these areas will say, What did we ever get from the railway in our area? Did we get jobs? A few years ago they closed down the branch railway on the Bonavista Peninsula, closed it down the same way, Mr. Speaker, they closed down the coastal service years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

The Leader of the Opposition said, Oh, well, there is no point in using the rail passenger service as an argument that we have some constitutional rights here, because they have replaced it with an adequate bus system. Mr. Speaker, there was an outcry in this Province from St. John's to Port aux Basques against the bus system. We had petitions in this House, voted on unanimously by all members of the House, against the removal of the rail passenger service, but it was done. Why was it done? Because there was no constitutional law which said they must maintain that service.

MR. SIMMS:  
Who did it?

MR. MORGAN:  
It was done by a Liberal Government.

We fought it together as a party and a Province - the two parties.

MR. CALLAN:  
No, Joe did away with it.

MR. MORGAN:  
No, this is the rail passenger service.

So to argue suddenly that there is a change under Term 31 of the Terms of Union -

MR. SIMMONS:  
There is and that is all there is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, why was there no argument when we lost our coastal boat service along the coast of Newfoundland, both the Northeast Coast and the South Coast, a very important service which was taken

away under the same Term? Why were the Argentia, Bonavista and Carbonear branch lines taken away and not replaced?

My good friend over there for Twillingate, I can see him now very much opposed and fighting vehemently as a Member of Parliament, with all Newfoundlanders behind him, do not take away our passenger service! It was shown quite clearly at that time, and the hon. the member for Twillingate is aware of this, that there was no constitutional argument which could be put forward that Ottawa would recognize. But suddenly, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is going to argue the only argument he has to try to offset this massive spending program, which is going to be of benefit to this government, which is that there has to be a legal way under the Constitution to make sure they maintain the railway.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not maintaining the railway. Who wants to maintain it? It is gone!

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we were getting 20 per cent of all the freight movement in this Province. Four years ago we had 34 per cent, and it has been coming down since the early 1970s. Nobody is using the rail service any more.

MR. YOUNG:  
Does the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir use it?

MR. MORGAN:  
The fact is the Government of Canada had a right to take over and relieve the Province of that public cost, but not to maintain it.

The only argument they are using, Mr. Speaker, is, Oh, well, fifteen years down the road when they get this new highway built - I can see it now, in the next twelve month period, bulldozers and paving machines all over the place, and all over the place on the Trans-Canada Highway signs up for you to watch our for all the activities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, boy! Great! And someone will say, 'Yes, but Mr. Wells, Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, is concerned about one major thing.' 'What is that?' 'The movement of dangerous goods on the highway.' The movement of dangerous goods on the highway.

Mr. Speaker, he is concerned about the burden on this Province of maintaining the highway, when during the '65 Drive, and I recall it quite clearly the Leader of the Opposition Party has good reason to stay away from the House when this man stands to speak, because he is always afraid of what I am going to say.

AN HON. MEMBER:

About his salary?

MR. MORGAN:

No, no. Back in the days of 1965, the member was a very prominent man in Western Newfoundland, a lawyer. Not only was he a lawyer, he was a very prominent businessman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes?

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, indeed. He was very much

involved in business. I would say, Mr. Speaker, he was a very successful businessman, and more power to him. But do you recall 'Finish the Drive in '65? Do you recall what we got for the Drive in '65? We all saw what we got for the Drive in '65. We got a road which is substandard, second-class, the main reason being the contractors at that time were incompetent.

MR. PATTERSON:

And cost-plus.

MR. MORGAN:

And the cost-plus arrangements. The hon. gentleman should know. He was involved with a couple.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, yes, a shareholder in companies which were involved in building the highway in 1965, when Mr. Smallwood brought all this money in.

Mr. Speaker, since 1965, when the road was finished, we have had a substandard highway all across this Province, right from Port aux Basques, up until a few years ago when we were successful in arranging major funding for the Trans-Canada Highway. Up until that time, we had a substandard highway across our Province and, in most cases, we had to place restrictions on truck traffic.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is we have maintained that highway since then at a cost to the taxpayers of this Province. Now if we could afford to maintain a substandard highway, very much substandard, for fifteen years -

MR. EFFORD:

How much is a railway car worth (inaudible)?

MR. MORGAN:

Now, gentlemen, let me finish.

We maintained a substandard highway for fifteen years, strictly Newfoundland Government dollars. We did that. Now suddenly we see a \$405 million program going into the Trans-Canada Highway to improve it, to make it safer. We are going to twin 18 per cent of the highway, the only province in Atlantic Canada with 18 percent twinning.

MS VERGE:

That is on top of what we had before.

MR. MORGAN:

That is on top of what we had before and what we did before. We are going to see a modern, at least modern compared to 1965, when we had a substandard cow path built across the Province. That is what it was, a little narrow two lane road. But we have maintained that old road at our cost. For fifteen or sixteen years, the taxpayers of Newfoundland totally covered that cost. Now we are getting a big new road built and the Opposition say, "Oh, how are you going to be able to afford to maintain that road over the next fifteen years? How you going to be able to afford to maintain it? You have no money to keep the hospitals going? You cannot build new schools.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is, quite clearly, that the maintenance argument is out the window. It is a red herring. I market lots of herring these days, and it is a red herring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, let us go back to the point I made initially. The railway is no longer a tool which can be used for our development. It cannot be used anymore to tie into any economic development we have proposed or planned for the future, none, so we have to have an adequate transportation system.

Are not the people in Burgeo entitled to a paved road? Over here we say yes. Are the people in the Plum Point area, up to Roddickton and Englee, entitled to a paved road? Sure they are. Are the people of the Bonavista Peninsula entitled to a new highway, linked to the Trans - Canada Highway? Yes they are, and they are going to get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Nobody more viciously opposed the closing of the Bonavista branch line of the railway than this man here, as the member for the area. I opposed it viciously here and in Ottawa at meetings of the Transportation Committee, in the minister's office and, on one occasion, in the Prime Minister's office. We fought it, but the issue was dead. He looked me straight in the eye and said, "Mr. Morgan, in your area, who is using the railway?" I had to look back and honestly say, "Two businesses." That was all I could find who were moving freight over the Bonavista branch line. So the argument was all gone. The constitutional argument or any other kind of argument, it was all gone. Nobody wanted to use the railway because it was inefficient

in moving freight.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of the quantities of funds, there is no question. There is a fifteen-year reopener clause. The leader of the Opposition should not toss that kind of a thing out, a reopener clause eight years down the road. I think I can quote from his comments. He said it was - I made note of what he had to say. Maybe I did not, because I did not think it was not so important - useless. It was only a smokescreen, was the term he used. Yesterday he asked me if he could find a hypocrite in the House. I recall his conversation back and forth across the House. He said, 'You would not know what hypocrite really means.' Well, we had a good example this afternoon. A man stands up and condemns a government which has a reopener clause eight years from now in a major agreement for this Province, and he says it is a smokescreen, it is ridiculous, there is no need for it to be there at all, it is certainly not going to mean a thing. The same man who said that today, back in the days when he was in the government of the day agreed to a Churchill Falls contract for sixty-five years with no reopener clause. Sixty-five years with no reopener clause. To me, Mr. Speaker, that alone is a clear definition of the word 'hypocrite'. It clearly defines the word hypocrite.

The issue of monies is of major concern. Does this mean my time is up? It is just a foolish note from the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker, the major concern of every member over there today is what is going to be the result of this spending between now and

election time. The Premier I do not think is a very naive politician. He is not going to call an election until he gets those bulldozers and paving machines going all over the Province and everybody is saying, 'Oh, great stuff! Look at all that paving coming', down in the Liberal districts in particular, and that is the major concern of the Liberal Party not the fact that they think it is a bad deal. They are afraid of the political benefits to this government; they are afraid of what is going to happen in certain areas when they get all this paving activity, and all the general improvements to the transportation system in other parts of the Province. That is what they are afraid of. Because by the time the Premier calls the election - this is the advice of one backbencher here: He will not call it until he sees a lot of this activity going on - and why should he? - so that people can realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is not what one member said it was yesterday, blood money. That was his quote.

This morning I called five prominent people in his district and said, "Do you know that yesterday afternoon your member condemned the paving of your roads in the Coomb's Cove area, because yesterday afternoon he stood in the House and said, 'we do not want blood money'?" He said, 'Mr. Morgan, he said that?' I said, 'Yes, I can give you the transcripts of the House.'

I called another prominent man who is on the Liberal Executive, or he was, in the hon. gentleman's district -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is still a Liberal.

MR. MORGAN:

'Still a Liberal', he says, still a Liberal.'

- and he could not understand why his member spoke in the House against getting their roads paved. He could not understand it. That occurred in the House yesterday afternoon.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not blood money. Because under the agreement with a \$75 million allocation towards the labour portion of it, there is no question in my mind that when that \$75 million is adequately negotiated between the unions and the parties concerned, these employees are going to be adequately looked after, adequately compensated. There is no question.

What is the total number of employees? You are talking - what? - 540 employees, total. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, if \$75 million cannot look after 540 employees in this Province, what are we doing with the thousands of employees in various fish plants with no government dollars? What kind of a society are we living in if we need more than \$75 million to accommodate 540 people? Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not an argument. That cannot be an argument. There is, I agree, and I have to say it today, one aspect of it, and that is the amount of money going to the communities. My friend here from Port aux Basques has some concerns at this time, in particular, because of the fact -

MR. TULK:

And he should have.

MR. MORGAN:

No, not because of the railway

agreement, but because of the fact the economy of this town is suffering right now. The fish plants are in question over there, the bankruptcy, and receivership, and the plants not operating, and now a sudden loss of more jobs. At this immediate time there is reason for the member to be concerned about his town of Port aux Basques, and I can understand that. But \$7 million towards Port aux Basques, and \$7 million towards Bishop's Falls will, indeed, I am convinced - again I will use the term 'adequately' - adequately find, if it is dealt with in a proper way, alternative economic activity to create more than the number of jobs that are there now.

So, these two aspects also cover the human aspect of what is happening to the employees in the towns involved with railway services in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A bunch of pirates.

MR. MORGAN:

We are not a bunch of pirates, Mr. Speaker. The kind of language I heard in the House yesterday evening from the Opposition, we are Judas Iscariots, we are a bunch of pirates, we are using blood money. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this terminology which was used in this House on this agreement was sent out around the Province to the general electorate - only a few people in the gallery heard them. The media did not carry them, I think they would be embarrassed to. Under this agreement all this money is going to be spent in our Province. By the way, it is going to create over 1000 jobs per year in the construction industry over the next fifteen years - 1000 per



year, Mr. Speaker. They are opposed to jobs, they are opposed to paving, and they are opposed to money for our Province to improve our transportation system.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they have no hope for the future in that party and an example of that is, 'In fifteen years time you will be bankrupt because the highway maintenance costs will be so much you will not be able to cover it. You will be bankrupt!' Oh, Mr. Speaker, how fortunate it is to be on this side of the House with a party that looks forward to a bright future for this Province and not a dismal future, not a doomy-gloomy picture as has been painted by the Liberal Party in the last number of years while constantly attacking.

Only a few days ago the Leader of the Opposition stood and he could not support what the Premier said about the Terra Nova well. Why? Because he was doubtful, he was concerned, despite the fact that it was so positive. It was a very positive announcement and because it was positive, the Opposition leader says he has concerns, he is not sure. That man, Mr. Speaker, has never stood in this House yet to say anything positive about his Province. I will go further: He has never stood in a courtroom, before coming to the House, and done anything positive for our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Now with that kind of a leader, the Liberal Party might as well recognize one thing: you will be lower in the polls in the next election than you were under your previous leader. You will have

less seats in the House of Assembly. I am not going to give them advice. Maybe I should give them a little bit of advice.

Today, for example, the member for Naskaupi stood in this House and tried to condemn the paving of the Trans-Canada Highway. Instead of getting up and saying, Oh, I am very pleased we are finally getting the money I fought for as a member over the years for the highway across Labrador, he stood up and condemned it. The transcript of his question will be sent out to the riding most likely by my good friend responsible for Northern Development. In other words, he is opposed to getting money for the Trans-Labrador Highway. I mean, not knowing how to play politics! My goodness gracious, I know people in high school who can teach these fellows lesson in politics. And the same with the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

Now I know there is one member over there who is quite pleased, and he may very well make his move before too long. I noticed he is very much concerned over some of the things the Liberal Leader has been saying in the House recently, and outside the House. He has made his comments in circles and, in fact, I think he was hoping they would be spread further. Maybe there is hope for him yet. There is a good possibility, I think, that he may move before the next election.

MR. BAIRD:

To whom are you referring?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who might that be? Name him.

MR. MORGAN:

My good friend for Bellevue is

getting lots of road work this year, and rightly so. It is long overdue in the Bellevue district. He may have a friend come over. Maybe we will make a seat for him. Maybe I can move over so I can have a former Liberal on each side of me. Because there are some good Liberals. They are not all bad Liberals. There are some good Liberals, but they are very few.

But I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Liberal Party today is indeed on a very slippery slope on this issue. I want to close, because I have to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

MR. EFFORD:  
No leave. We have heard enough nonsense here tonight.

MR. MORGAN:  
But let us look at it again in perspective, Mr. Speaker. The railway is no longer being used by the people of Newfoundland and will never again, whether it is closed by government or not. It will never be used. It has been used less and less every year. It was drawing to the point that more and more employees were being laid off, losing their jobs. With no government involvement at all, they were just being laid off, losing their jobs. They were losing their jobs year after year. So the time was fast approaching when the railway would have been closed down, faded away, gone, the same way as the coastal boat service back fifteen years ago. It would have been gone, Mr. Speaker. But now it will be gone and what will we have in its place? We are going to have a Trans-Canada Highway upgraded and improved and made safe for driving

for big trucks - 18 per cent twinned. We are going to have an improved transportation system in many parts of our Province, in areas where it is needed. We are going to have an adequate compensation program for the employees through the \$75 million program, and we are going to have \$15 million to go towards the two major towns most adversely affected.

And down the road, Mr. Speaker, in fifteen years time, when Hibernia is going and when Terra Nova is going, we are not going to need to be worried about the bit of maintenance cost to keep that highway maintained. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of a pleasure to be able to speak here in this House, because I am sure, when this agreement, this sellout, we are talking about is talked about in five years here, there will be a lot of people saying, 'I wish that I had been over here to speak with them.'

After listening to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) for a few minutes, I am reminded of a phrase: 'There is none so blind as those who will not see.' So when I heard him speak, it reminds of that phrase.

MR. DOYLE:  
There are none so stunned as those

who will not read.

MR. GILBERT:

That is good from a minister who would not answer questions on the railway. I am glad the minister in the back row over there now would say he could not read because that is the reason all Winter, when we were asking him questions as to what exactly was going on as far as the closing of the railway, where there any negotiations - none that he knew of. Maybe that is the reason. He was just that stunned that he did not know. That could have been the reason. So now we can possibly know that is it.

MR. CALLAN:

He said there was no deal. He did not say there were no negotiations.

MR. GILBERT:

No, he said negotiations.

What I am concerned about right now is: What is the long-term affect of this action we saw the Premier perpetrate on the people of Newfoundland again yesterday? What really is the situation?

Someone said yesterday when I was talking to him, "It seems to me like someone has had to sell the car to paint the garage."

I can remember years ago in Newfoundland outports, if you lived in a Newfoundland outport and you saw some people who had a bit of pride and the fell upon a bit of hard times, they possibly had to sell off a bit of their equipment or something to try and keep going, to put up a good front. So this, I think, is what we have seen here. In the Newfoundland outports, people where had to sell off some of the

goods they needed to make a living to try and put the front up that they were still living a sort of prosperous live, you could sympathize with people having pride.

What we see here is not someone who has any pride, but someone who is trying to grasp and hang on to power at any cost. It really does not matter to him what the cost to the people of Newfoundland will be, what the long-term ramifications of this agreement, this sellout we are here debating today, is going to be.

What we have based our argument on, of course, is the fact that, number one, the constitutional guarantee we had at the time of Confederation, Term 31, was that the Government of Canada were going to operate and maintain a transportation system, mainly the railway. The railway was the only thing they had to talk about in 1949 as a transportation system. As the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday, if we were entering Canada today, we would not be talking about a railway, we would be talking about a Trans-Canada Highway.

I just had the privilege to attend a press conference with two of the Liberal members of the federal caucus, Brian Tobin and Bill Rompkey, who are here today to reinforce a statement that John Turner made when he was here on May 12. The statement is he would ensure Newfoundland's rights under the Constitution were protected in any agreement entered into between this Province and the current government in Ottawa. So after the next election there will be no problem with getting this. With mirror legislation introduced in this House and the federal House,

we will then get back the thing which concerns us most of all right now, the fact that there is not a maintenance agreement included in this present agreement. That is the thing we feel is going to be the tragic flaw of this agreement.

We have a second concern, the phasing out of the railway immediately. The recommendations of the Sullivan Commission and other people who have looked at this some degree of knowledge and without any political ramifications have said, in the interim, from the close of the railway to the build-up of the highway, there had to be a period of time. I think the Sullivan Commission recommended a five year period.

Just imagine what is happening now. The agreement was signed yesterday. We have the government doing their political agenda. We have heard the announcements that they are starting to pave roads, and we heard the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) point out that definitely it was a political arrangement and the announcements were purely political. I assume, even though he is a backbencher, he must have some knowledge of the agenda of the government. I know that he would not have any concern about common decency, about the needs of the people of the Province or the priorities of where this paving had to go.

I have heard several comments about the Burgeo Road since this thing came in as if this was a bad thing that there was \$12 million gone into the Burgeo Road. I do not think it was, but what I am concerned about is that this \$12 million should have gone into the

Burgeo Road in 1985 because this was promised, Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1985, when the first ERDA agreement was signed.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) He is not worthy of representing you. He should not be allowed in the House.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

As I say, Mr. Speaker, this agreement should have been signed in 1985, and the Burgeo Road should have been included in the agreement signed in 1985, when it was promised during the last election.

Since 1985 the people of Newfoundland have been made aware of the fact the Burgeo Road is a very serious problem in that area. It happens to be the longest, continuous gravel road in the Province. There are 6,000 people who live in the Burgeo, Ramea, Grey River, Francois, area who depend upon the Burgeo Road.

I must tell you I was sort of pleased yesterday when the Premier stood in this House and gave me the credit for the getting the paving for the Burgeo Road included in this agreement. That is on the record, and I thank him for recognizing the fact I did do what I was elected to do, to point out to this government the need and the suffering that was being endured by the people of Burgeo. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, there is a small amount of money

allocated out of this agreement to go to the Burgeo Road, \$12 million, of which, I guess, \$8 million is federal and \$4 million is provincial.

But the interesting thing, as the Premier went on, thanking me and saying that I was the reason the money was there because of the fact I made him aware of the problem, I was a little concerned, in view of the fact, until I went there, in the six years previous, they had been represented by a member on that side of the House. I would have thought he would have possibly pointed out the hardships and suffering of the people of Burgeo, but obviously he did not.

So now I have it on record that the Premier did say I was the one who was primarily responsible. But I tell him no it was not me, all I was doing was the job I was elected for, representing the people of Burgeo and doing what they wanted me to do.

The interesting thing that happened there when the Premier continued on, he talked about funding in other provincial districts. He took the district of Bonavista South and he the reason that paving went in there from Bonavista to Clarendville because there was a lot of traffic and he threw in the fact that the fish plant in Catalina was the thing that made it the viable part of putting money into the Bonavista highway.

I would like to point out to the Premier, and he did not mention this yesterday, but in the Burgeo area there happens to be a fish plant and there happens to be a fish plant in Ramea, and in those two communities, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Premier,

there are more people employed in the two fish plants in Burgeo and Ramea, and the deep sea trawlers than work in the paper mill in Corner Brook.

So, the justification and the point I have been trying to make about the Burgeo road for the last three years is the fact that it is very vitally important to the economy of Newfoundland because the dollars made in Burgeo and Ramea by the fishing industry are new dollars to Newfoundland and this has to be transported over the Burgeo road.

We have seen, again, in this agreement, tokenism, \$12 million to go into pave a 90 kilometer road, which will do maybe 20 kilometers. This road has been there now for the last eighteen years, in dribs and drabs, and has not been fit to drive over. I hear members over there being proud when they stand up and mention the Burgeo road to me.

I say, yes, the people of Burgeo are happy a little bit of the suffering has been relieved but the Minister of Transportation knows, he had a meeting with them, and he told them the Burgeo road was going to be a priority on any list. He also knows that until February of this year, in this agreement the minister denies he knew anything about while the discussions were going on, and he can verify this if he wants to, he knows until February or March of this year that the Burgeo road was not included for any funding, even though the previous Minister of Transportation had stood up in this House and said how the Burgeo road was a priority. I had the Premier stand up and say how the Burgeo road was a priority. That minister stood up and said it

was a priority but, until March of this year, it was not even going to be considered in this agreement to sell out the railway.

It is only because of the pressure put on the government, with the petitions from the people of Burgeo, and myself making representation on their behalf in this House, that the Burgeo road was included.

So, now the only thing I say to the minister is I hope the other \$20 million required to do this road will be included in the subsidiary agreement. The other part of this mythical agreement we are talking about, the \$235 million which is going to be announced sometime in the future, is a political agenda rather than a practical or a priority agenda.

What I am saying is the Burgeo road, I hope we put it to bed as far as members opposite are concerned. The people are not really happy with the situation but they realize, with the present government, the pressure we put on them, and the Premier admitted that I had done a good job, so we have something started. Once we go from there, we will see what is going to happen.

As I pointed out, the Liberal Party of Canada has reinforced the arguments we have been making today by having a press conference here in St. John's today outlining some points. The fact there was no maintenance agreement in this railway agreement made it a very flawed document and made it one that, without it, could, in a period of ten years, bankrupt Newfoundland. So they have agreed, as I said, to look at that again.

They also agreed and realize this funding we talk about, the \$100 million now and the \$405 million which is going to be put into the main highway, is woefully inadequate and will be reopened.

The thing I find most interesting when I see this agreement, and the thing that frightens me about this agreement, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that in 1979 this government signed an agreement to take over the interprovincial ferry system in this Province. The agreement was signed on February 7, 1979 for \$1,292,000. This agreement was supposed to be terminated on March 31, 1984.

The great spirit of co-operation between the two Brians was in effect then, and because of this, the agreement was extended for one year and then another year. When it finally expired in 1986, there was \$2,400,000 paid into the operation of the coastal ferry system in Newfoundland.

Now, if anyone would care to look at the budget figures for this year, the operation of the ferry system in Newfoundland today is costing the taxpayers of Newfoundland something like \$10,000,100.

Mr. Speaker, when you take into consideration that in 1979 this was a federal responsibility and, for some reason or other, the federal government - I do not know what the justification was at that time - persuaded the Newfoundland Government to accept the responsibility for the ferry system on a five-year agreement, extended to a seven year agreement, and now we have a \$10 million bill the taxpayers of Newfoundland have to assume to operate our ferry system, I am

afraid of what is going to happen when the chickens come home to roost on our railway deal, when we have to assume the maintenance of the Trans-Canada Highway.

Just as an aside to that ferry agreement, the same time the Province was signing one in Newfoundland, they signed one in B.C. and there was no five-year agreement. It was in perpetuity and it was signed for \$8 million in 1977. It is now \$16 million in 1988.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very suspicious when I hear of the Premier signing any deals and coming back and telling me it is good for Newfoundland, because remember, he is the same Premier who said, up until yesterday, he believed Newfoundland had a constitutional right to have a railway guaranteed. Now he tells us no, he really did not mean it. He was just saying that. He was posturing. So I wonder what he is going to say when this deal blows up.

But fortunately, we will be over there to form the government and we have an agreement now with the next federal government, the Liberal government in Ottawa, to bail us out of this deal he has gotten us into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Before recognizing the hon. member for LaPoile, I would like to welcome to this hon. House, M.P. Brian Tobin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity today to enter this debate as it relates to the railway.

As we look back at the historic district of LaPoile, the town of Port aux Basques and the people who live there, it was quite a shock yesterday when they saw the demise of the railway. I believe everybody who grew up in a railway town, who has been associated with the railway all their lives, had to feel a type of nostalgia yesterday. The heart strings were being pulled as the railway was being signed away forever in the Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we look back we can say, it is not the government at Ottawa or the Government of Newfoundland who gave away the railway in this Province. Both governments have fought very hard for the survival of the railway. In the last ten years there has been millions and millions of dollars pumped into the railway to make it work in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it was the people of this Province who used the railway who caused its demise because they did not use it.

Mr. Speaker, I would basically like to open my remarks this afternoon in this House by saying the signing of the railway agreement yesterday was a great

deal for Newfoundland, but a very sad day for Port aux Basques.

Mr. Speaker, as the member who represents the district, I too have some grave concerns as it relates to the closure of the Newfoundland Railway. We are going to have a lot of diversification to do.

When we look back at the agreement signed yesterday and one starts to delve into it, we can see the demise of what once was a thriving town. It may now no longer be as we see the erosion of the presence of CN in Port aux Basques. As the intermodal transportation network takes over in the Province, we are going to see freight going into other centres of this Province.

That, yesterday, was quite evident to the town fathers of Port aux Basques as they sat there during the signing of this historic deal. Mr. Speaker, this was the major concern they had.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Why was it not looked after beforehand? Did the member really let that thing go through?

MR. MITCHELL:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member sits there and he talks about this member on this side of the House letting it go through.

Mr. Speaker, this member -

MR. SIMMONS:  
Did you? Did you?

MR. MITCHELL:  
This member on this side of the House -

MR. TOBIN:  
You scuttled (inaudible.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. MITCHELL:  
This member on this side of the House represented the people of LaPoile, represented them well and will continue to represent them well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I ask the hon. member on this side of the House if he would please be quiet while the hon. the member for LaPoile is speaking. If any member wants to stand on a point of order, by all means, but if not, please be quiet while the hon. member is speaking.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, if they would do the same thing for us while we are speaking.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I wish to advise the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that I did the same for this side of the House, and I am actually referring to the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) likes to stress the point of how he represented the people of Port aux Basques in a federal riding.



Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say right from the outset in my speech here today, if that hon. member did such a wonderful job as the member representing those people, he would not be sitting where he is today. That is argument enough, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Ask the people of Port aux Basques about their water, Mr. Speaker, and they will tell you about the hon. member.

MR. J. CARTER:

We know all about him.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, back in the 1960s I had the unfortunate situation of being told my mother had cancer, it was terminal, and she was going to die. We were only going to have her for a certain length of time. It came as a tremendous shock.

All members of the family had to prepare for the day when there would no longer be a presence of the mother in the family. We had to accept that fact.

Mr. Speaker, for a long time in this Province we have been aware of the fact that there was terminal illness with the railway in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Everybody knew that! Even the people in Port aux Basques knew that, Mr. Speaker, and we had to accept the fact that some day the railway no longer would be. The same as the people on the Coast of

Newfoundland who depended on the ferry services for transportation from one community to another realized when the road network went it, that no longer would they have the use for the **Northern Ranger**, the **Springdale** or the **Taverner**, Mr. Speaker.

If you were to ask these people today if they would want to go back to that service they were given back in the 1940s, the 1950s and in the early 1960s, they would tell you, Mr. Speaker, 'No, we do not want to go back to that mode of transportation.'

If you asked the constituents, Mr. Speaker, in the hon. member's district, down in Fortune - Hermitage, if they would like to have a road network going all the way up the coast or connecting with the main highway system in this Province, would they give up their ferry system, yes, Mr. Speaker, they certainly would.

This is what has happened with our railway. We have seen the demise of it.

I can understand the feeling, Mr. Speaker, yesterday of our town fathers when they sat in that meeting and knew the railway was going to be signed away. It was a little bit much for them to take. Mr. Speaker, they walked out.

Mr. Speaker, they have some grave concerns. Mr. Speaker, as a member who represents those people, I too have some concerns with the deal, concerns about what is going to happen with our town and the diversification program.

I must say, I have been working very, very hard since I have been elected for that day, for that day, knowing good and well the

railway was going to go and an infrastructure had to be put into place.

Mr. Speaker, that I why I say that it was a great day for Newfoundland, but kind of a sad day for the people of Port aux Basques.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at what this deal is going to do for areas of Newfoundland, yes, it is a wonderful day. I see the member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) sitting over there. When the town fathers get on radio, and I heard them this morning, I also listened to the hon. member as he made his speech today, and he made the remark, 'None are so blind as those who cannot see.'

Mr. Speaker, if the residents of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir are so blind as to not know this is of benefit to them, then they do not deserve to get their road paved! They do not deserve, Mr. Speaker, to receive the money, as they call it, blood money! Blood money, Mr. Speaker, they call it! The mayor from Burgeo this morning said they are going to pave the road with blood money.

Let me ask the hon. member and let me ask the residents of Burgeo, did they lose any track? Did they lose any jobs as it relates to the closure of the railway? No, Mr. Speaker, but they are going to benefit, their children are going to benefit, and their industry is going to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, here we see the member today stand up in this House and what does he do? What does he do? He condemns the deal! He condemns the deal! He says it is a sell out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

It is a sell out, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right! Right!

MR. MITCHELL:

It is not going to do anything for me in my district! Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is.

I can honestly say it is going to do something in his district, Mr. Speaker, because after the next election they are going to have a member down there in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir who is going to represent them in this House and is going to represent them well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

It is not going to be a member, Mr. Speaker, who is going to stand in this House day after day presenting petitions, begging this government to do something for them, and then, when the government turns around and does something for him, he stands on his feet and says 'I do not want it! Why do I not want it,' Mr. Speaker?

What is a good reason? I think that my hon. colleague for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) touched on it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I have listened with great

interest to what the gentleman from LaPoile is saying, especially with great interest because I am going to mail a copy of today's Hansard to the people in Port aux Basques. I give them notice of that because, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this: When I was outside the Chamber a minute ago, I think he perhaps unintentionally mislead the House on a matter involving the Port aux Basques delegation. He suggested -

DR. COLLINS:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to mislead the House is a matter that ought to be brought to the House's attention, I submit.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member is not making a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am trying, Sir. I rise on a point of order to allege the member has mislead the House. As I understand the rules, that is a matter to be raised as a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the misleading took place when he informed the Chamber the Port aux Basques delegation left because the deal was being signed. They did not leave for that reason at all.

They left because they were really disgusted the member had not succeeded in getting any more than \$7 million for them. That is why they left! He is misleading the House!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I think it should be made abundantly clear to anyone who wishes to listen the hon. member just broke the rules of this House. He got up on something he knew was not a point of order. It was just a play to the galleries by giving a spurious speech. It is clearly an abuse of the rules of this House and is typical of the member opposite.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker further to that point of order and I think this is an important point.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, they are all important points, but this is vital and that is that, the member opposite from Fortune - Hermitage, deliberately got up to waste the time of this House and subtract the time from the member on a spurious point of order. I suggest the member's time should be extended a little bit to cover this kind of thing. I think that this is only fair.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. SIMMONS:

There he goes again.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize you are extremely fair, Mr. Speaker, and you tend to overlook some frightful abuses perpetrated by the members opposite. I think it is well worthwhile listening to the tape to listen to what that member just said about Your Honour. I think it is disgraceful! It should not be allowed. The member should be named. Disgraceful, it really is.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I did not hear any comment and certainly if I see anything in Hansard which is objectionable, I will see that the matter is withdrawn.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. YOUNG:

He said, 'You will,' Mr. Speaker, he said, 'You will.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) he will not have the opportunity to send my speech to the residents of Port aux Basques or LaPoile because I am going to be doing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

As soon as I am finished here today, I will be sending my speech to them. This is exactly why, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have the privilege of entering this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was a minister.

MR. YOUNG:

For 10 days!

MR. MITCHELL:

Let me ask him, and probably he can tell the people down in his riding, how much money he got for them when he signed the deal to have the coastal boat ferry service eliminated on his coast, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Let him get up and tell us what kind of deal he made.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind standing in this House today and -

MR. SIMMONS:

lying and lying!

MR. MITCHELL:

saying that I am not satisfied.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

I think, Mr. Speaker, the comments

from the member for Fortune -- Hermitage were clear to everyone in this House when he called the hon. member a liar. I think Your Honour, he should be made to withdraw it. That type of conduct should not be permitted in this House, Mr. Speaker, and if it is permitted to continue, you will see too much of it. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is very important the hon. member be ordered to withdraw that immediately.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I did hear the hon. member making comments about lying and I would ask him to withdraw them.

MR. SIMMONS:

I was waiting for the translation, Mr. Speaker. The member for LaPoile -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Withdraw! Withdraw!

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for LaPoile has said I signed a deal about the ferry service. I never did that, and for him to say that is to lie, Mr. Speaker! That is to lie! That is what we call a lie in this country, a lie!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member will withdraw these remarks.

MR. SIMMONS:

The hon. member withdraws.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will please sit

down now.

MR. SIMMONS:

The hon. member rises on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The gentleman from Petites who is squirming because he sold out the people of Port aux Basques yesterday, cannot correct the record by getting up in this House and misleading, misleading!

MR. SPEAKER:

Sit down!

The hon. member is not making a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

How would you know?

MR. SPEAKER:

I beg your pardon!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will withdraw that remark immediately.

MR. SIMMONS:

I withdraw, Sir.

I want to rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I am prepared to hear a point of order from the hon. member as I will from every other hon. member, but let me just warn the hon. member: If he thinks he can get up persistently, time after time, on a point of order -

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, Sir. That was not my intent.

MR. SPEAKER:  
— abusing the privileges of the House, I certainly would not condone that.

The hon. the member for Fortune — Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That was never my intention, Sir, to abuse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
If the hon. member wishes to make a point of order, I will hear it.

MR. MORGAN:  
Can Clyde not control the members over there? Can Clyde not control you?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Can the Speaker not control you?

MR. MORGAN:  
Can Clyde not control you?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have always understood in this Chamber, and correct me if I am wrong, that a member cannot mislead the House. I am drawing to the attention of the Chamber that that gentleman has deliberately misled the House on this one.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member will have to withdraw that comment now, that

the hon. member deliberately misled the House.

The hon. the member for Fortune — Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, if it is unparliamentary, as I believe it is, I withdraw the term deliberately. There is no question that he has misled the House on this one.

MR. J. CARTER:  
That is not a withdrawal.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has just perpetrated a tactic which is his trademark. He has risen on a number of points of order. Clearly, none of them were legitimate and Your Honour even had to, after hearing a number of them, point out he was not getting anywhere near making a legitimate point of order.

There can only be one reason for him doing that and that is he is impinging on the time allotted to the hon. member for Port aux Basques (Mr. Mitchell). He has now taken well over five minutes of his time. This was clearly a tactic.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair in view of that deliberate taking away of time the hon. member has as a right as a member of this House, that that time should be added on and he be allowed to finish his remarks in the manner he feels they should be

finished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) does not want me to be into this debate this afternoon because it is going to embarrass him, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on! Right on!

MR. MITCHELL:

He does not want me to address the concerns of Port aux Basques. He does not want me to get into the body of my speech, Mr. Speaker. I only have about fifteen minutes left and I do have a tremendous amount of concern as it relates to the closure of the railway.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a point he made on a point of order, just for the record and for clarification. He said I misled the House yesterday when I talked about the representatives of Port aux Basques leaving that meeting during the signing of this historic deal. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read exactly from the press release the town fathers of Port aux Basques, the same people, Mr. Speaker, who walked out of that meeting yesterday, released to the press. I would like to read the last sentence of that press release, Mr. Speaker.

It says, "We have discussed our concerns with the Newfoundland Railway deal with our M.P., Joe Price, and our M.H.A., Cal Mitchell. We have a deep sense of sadness at the loss of the Newfoundland Railway, bearing in mind the historical association of the town with this industry. As a result of the meeting with our elected representatives, we are now assured that our concerns will be addressed."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. member if he got an endorsement like that from the people in Port aux Basques when he represented them? No, Mr. Speaker, he has not and he never did.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And he never will.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the rest of it. I will address every issue raised in that press release.

But, Mr. Speaker, I remember when I was one of the leaders in that community and that particular hon. member told me that if I did not tow the party line and did not do what he said, we would never get another cent out of the federal treasury as long as he had anything to do with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, that is the premise on which I made my statement earlier. He is sitting there and not representing the people. Mr. Speaker, I never tried to play

that type of politics and I never will.

Mr. Speaker, I am not, here on my feet in the House today, going to tow the party line on this one because it is the people of LaPoile who put me here, it is the people of LaPoile I am going to represent and it is the people of LaPoile I am going to today stand up and fight for because they have confidence in the member they elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity yesterday to take my wounded officials, who felt very up here and I sat down with them to go over the deal, to look at why they were dissatisfied with what was signed yesterday, and probably have a look at what was omitted, unintentionally perhaps. Mr. Speaker, we did that. I talked to them this morning. I had a telephone conference with them at their Chamber and I told them I would be speaking in the House today and I would be addressing their concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I want to do that. I hope to deal with my concern for this deal and for the town which once had over 2000 people working in the railway industry, and has sat by in the last twenty years and watched the dwindling away and the erosion of that industry.

Mr. Speaker, the town fathers, the elected officials, have worked very hard to try and turn that around, knowing yesterday was going to come. June 20, 1988 will be a day that will be long remembered in the minds of the

residents of LaPoile.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, it is also going to be a new beginning because that fear was always hanging over their heads, the fear that the axe was going to fall. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there was anybody who worked with the CN railway in that town that did not have that fear and yesterday that fear was realized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some grave concerns because the railway will no longer exist. We are not looking at fifty-four people who are going to be affected in Port aux Basques, but there is a contingency that left CN some years ago for greater security when Marine Atlantic became a Crown Corporation. For that security, Mr. Speaker, and because they knew the axe was going to fall on the railway, they went with this new Crown Corporation. Since the railway is going to go, we are going to see thirty-five or forty, maybe more, of those employees affected. Mr. Speaker, they were not addressed yesterday.

I have had a communiqué with this government and the MP in Ottawa is having communiqué with the government of Ottawa. I can tell you now that if there is any way in addressing that problem, that problem will have to be addressed. It will have to be addressed, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MITCHELL:

The hon. member cannot take it, Mr. Speaker! Election day is going to tell who sold who out. The hon. member is quite experienced at that.



I am going to stand up and I am going to support my people. I am going to look for more money as it relates to the diversification.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I already have meetings set up with the officials of the railway and officials of the Marine Atlantic to discuss this problem on an emergency basis.

Mr. Speaker, if it means doing a new deal, we are going to do a new deal!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

He is not like you, betraying the people of Burgeo.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, he was party to the doing away of the ferry service on the South Coast.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very intelligent, aggressive leadership in the district of LaPoile and I am very confident in their ability. Mr. Speaker, they have the confidence in their elected member to see this thing through. We are going to have a diversification program. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you now this diversification program has been ongoing for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, we knew the railway was going to go, and through the efforts of our member in Ottawa, we got the Enterprise Development Center put into place in Port aux Basques, \$3 million, with the industrial park, Mr. Speaker!

We had our harbour development, \$10 million!

Mr. Speaker, in our future's program, we put in \$6 million, about \$3 million directly into training in Port aux Basques, in the MDT program, in the QC program, Mr. Speaker, in the QA program!

We have twenty students now trained working on the mainland who will be back here in Newfoundland working in the offshore development, when that is announced, Mr. Speaker. That is the type of diversification that this member has been doing, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, we did not build a new hospital in Port aux Basques so that Port aux Basques would be phased out!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not like to hear the truth.

MR. SPFAKFR:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would -

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the

Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I feel really that it is necessary to bring a point of order before the House now, because I think a number of members in this House are really not clear - I must say I count myself in that number - on exactly where we are with our procedure.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we got into the third reading of bills. It has been the tradition in this House that unless there is a specific amendment to be brought in on third reading, third reading is almost a formality. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour correctly ruled there may be debate in third reading, but Your Honour also ruled it had to be a narrowly-focused, specific debate, well defined and not ranging beyond the subject matter in the bill itself.

We went on like that for a while and clearly the business of the House was not being proceeded with because, I think, it was the hon. member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) who kept ranging beyond the limits that Your Honour quite correctly set for him.

Finally, to get us out of that impasse, it was decided we would go through a number of third readings, then we would go back to the third reading on a bill which would give an opportunity, by agreement - and Your Honour recognized this agreement by both sides of the House - to get into this debate on the railway situation.

Mr. Speaker, that was yesterday and we had, I think, about an hour and a half of debate, again by

agreement on both sides, and we would not hold ourselves to the established procedures recognized by precedent in this House, and, indeed, supported by Beauchesne and Erskine May, that we would not, by agreement, hold ourselves to those narrow limits, and Your Honour recognized that because there was agreement on both sides.

We have now gone another several hours on the subject. Mr. Speaker, I do not see that we are - I do not get that impression anyway - any nearer getting a vote on this third reading of the bill, any nearer now than we were when we started an hour and a half yesterday and approximately two hours today.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point of order I bring up is this that this is not a filibuster.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is.

MR. DINN:

Oh, listen to him now! Look!

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member is an expert on filibusters? You are an expert on filibusters?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, if the hon. member is an expert on filibusters, I guess I will have to accept his wording on things. So the hon. member says it is a filibuster and I accept that if he wants to push that point.

Anyway, the point of order I make is that if there is agreement on both sides we will, shall we say, bend the rules a little bit for a

certain reason, to achieve a certain objective, and then that objective is not being achieved, and I suggest that after debating for two days and we are no nearer the vote, the objective is not being achieved, if that is the case I think it is quite in order for one side to withdraw its agreement to go by this irregular procedure. As I say, unless there is some indication we do not have to do that, I do not like to do it. I do not want to withdraw the permission on this side for this arrangement. I hesitate to do it.

But if I have to do it, I feel it is only in the best interest of the House for our side to do that. If I have no indication from the other side they are willing now to bring this matter to a vote, I would therefore have to withdraw our permission, our agreement, there has to be mutual agreement on both sides, to go outside the normal rules of the House. There is no doubt about it. We are outside of the normal rules of the House now. His Honour can find nowhere, I am sure, in any of the authorities that you can go on third reading of a bill for two days on a matter which has nothing to do with the wording in the bill itself.

I mean, the wording in the bill itself, when you get to third reading, has to be very narrow and specific. That is not what we are doing now. We are therefore in an irregular fashion and I, therefore, say that if we do not come to a vote now, we will withdraw our permission to continue this irregular activity.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Is it agreed we will stop the clock?

MR. TULK:  
No, it is not agreed to stop the clock, Your Honour. There is no agreement that we stop the clock.

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
To a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, it is five o'clock, Your Honour has to leave the Chair.

MR. BAIRD:  
He was on a point of privilege.

MR. J. CARTER:  
I adjourn the debate because it is five o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
No, no, do not adjourn. You cannot adjourn.

MR. SIMMONS:  
He had the floor.

MR. TULK:  
I had the floor.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

According to Standing Order No. 7, the House is recessed until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

MR. SIMMONS:  
7:00 o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
7:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
7:00 o'clock this evening.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
8:00 o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
Well, it was 7:00 o'clock  
yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:  
What do you want?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
8:00 o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
Yes, but we have agreed to change  
the rules. Is that all?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:  
All right. Good with me.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What time are we coming back?

MR. TULK:  
The Speaker said 7:00 o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
8:00 o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
7:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The House is recessed. It is  
normally recessed to 8:00 o'clock,  
but we are dealing with an hour  
ahead, so it is 7:00 o'clock.

The House resumed at 7:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

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

MR. TULK:  
We are continuing on third reading, centered on the bill that we are now debating, Bill No. 14, and an agreement as to what will be called on the Order Paper. I want to say to Your Honour, and Your Honour, I think, is well aware of this, what I believe the hon. gentleman was attempting to do was to let the clock run to five o'clock and then hopefully move a motion of adjournment. As usual, he got caught out, because, Mr. Speaker, there has been no agreement.

We told the Government House Leader, the member for Grand Falls, that indeed if he wanted to call Orders 4 to 19, I believe it was, that he could do that, no problem, and he could call any order he wanted to, but we wanted to debate certain bills on third reading. There was no agreement on time or topics or time limits or what orders would be called. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that we do not need any agreement to debate any bill on third reading. There was no agreement that the Speaker would not call anything else. Of course, there cannot be.

MR. DOYLE:  
But there cannot be wide-ranging debate.

MR. TULK:  
Well, now, if we want to debate what can be wide-ranging or not,

Your Honour has allowed, for the past number of sittings in this House debate to be as wide-ranging as we want to be.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Or as narrow as Morgan.

MR. TULK:  
Or indeed, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage suggests, we can be as narrow as the member for Bonavista South was.

MR. WELLS:  
There was no agreement that it would not be wide-ranging.

MR. TULK:  
There cannot be any agreement on what is allowed in debate anyway. Your Honour decides that and Your Honour has obviously decided that in this case what we are debating in this Legislature, namely the shutdown of the Newfoundland Railway, the selling-out of the Newfoundland Railway, for a mess of potage, is indeed in order under this legislation.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Good speaker! Good speaker!

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman - I suggest this to him - can stand in his place all he likes and try to stifle debate on this very important issue to Newfoundland, but it is only Your Honour, sitting in the Chair, and not the owls from the other side, who will decide what is legitimate debate in this Legislature. What we saw this afternoon at about five minutes to five was the hon. gentleman stand in his place and try to block debate on this issue by the Opposition, try to stifle, try to muzzle the Opposition and try to get an adjournment debate so that tomorrow morning or

tomorrow afternoon - not tomorrow afternoon because tomorrow afternoon is Private Members' Day - but on Thursday he will be able to walk into this House and call whatever order he wants to call. He has failed miserably. There has been no agreement on anything. This Legislature will perform and will do its job and the hon. gentleman can try all he likes to stop us from doing that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to this point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I do not know whether the hon. House Leader opposite was given a shot of something, but he seems to be in a different mood now than before. He seems to be getting off into all sorts of extraneous areas. The point is: What was the arrangement over this somewhat irregular activity that we are in now? If the hon. House Leader says that this is normal third reading debate, he must have fallen on his head when he was a very small child. This is not a normal third reading debate. So the question is: What was agreed?

Now, unfortunately we do not have Hansard, but my understanding from yesterday - and I am open to correction, I am not totally perfect, I admit that - was that we would bend the rules a little bit by mutual consent on the third reading of this bill to have a debate that would have a definitive end, a definitive objection. We do not, in this

House, have debates that go off into the wild blue yonder and have no point. We have debates for a purpose.

Now, I am suggesting that after two days of so-called debate, mainly good points made by this side and sort of garbagey comments by the other side, that after two days of that, surely we have exhausted the subject. I am just saying that, having done that, our agreement has been exhausted, and now is the time to pull us back to where we should be on third reading of the bill.

Unfortunately, as I said, we do not have Hansard to see the exact wording. Perhaps Your Honour might wish to review Hansard just to see what was said yesterday when we started on this particular exercise.

The hon. leader opposite wishes to get up. He might want to make a John Turner type of speech, because I think he is the Newfoundland type of John Turner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

DR. COLLINS:

Well, he was in there for a short period of time, then he ran away, then he comes back and in a very rusty fashion says that I am now going to change the way that this House of Assembly operates. I am now going to make this House of Assembly something to look up to. Something to be a beacon of light to all the rest of parliamentary activities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Whereas in actual fact since he

has been here he has made a travesty of the rules that we operate by. There has been many people in this House for many, many years, they know how we operate, they know, even though we are on opposite sides of the House, we have understandings that we live by. But since the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been here he has made a travesty, he has upset the way we normally operate. He has done it in a most sanctimonious way, and now he undoubtedly wants to get up and again fulminate in the same sort of way.

The point is we now are not operating the way it has been understood for years, that this Assembly operates, and this Assembly operated to the good of the people of this Province. We have a new person who has come in here, sort of parachuted in after a period of time, doing whatever, and he now wants to make this House operate his way and, of course, he is making a travesty of the whole British Parliamentary tradition.

No other parliament based on the British tradition would be here tonight debating something that has nothing to do with this point on the Order Paper.

And this only has come about, Your Honour, because Your Honour, in his inimitably patient way, has been manoeuvred by this new parachuted, sanctimonious influence in this House.

So unfortunately we are in this position, and we are quite willing to deal with it. But, nevertheless, we are not going to go beyond what we agreed. We made an agreement and we are willing to abide by the agreement, but I

suggest that we are now going beyond that agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Indeed we are.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, after that diatribe of trash --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

- I am tempted to refrain from saying what I was going to say.

During the supper hour, I was conscious of the member's concern about government business, so I went around and I talked to the members to see how they could quickly wind up this debate, and ask them who really felt that they wanted to speak on it, and I wanted to make sure that no member who wanted to have some input in this debate would be deprived of the opportunity. What I said is, "Do not anybody just be repeating what has already been said, and if you can say what you have to say in five minutes, that is enough. Do not run out the clock on a time limit." And our members have agreed to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we intended to do. But then we come back in the House and we get that diatribe of insults and nonsense from the Minister of Health, who should know better.

It is tempting to say no, we will

do whatever the rules permit us to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, we place the order of business of this House first and we place the interest of the people of this Province first. And there are four or five members on this side of the House who have something further to say.

MR. WARREN:

You place yourself first with your where is my money?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, we will never get anything said if we are going to have a gaggle of noise like this constantly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point to facilitate the order of business of the House. There are four or five other members of this House who have something they want to say on this matter. They are operating totally and completely within the rules of the House. There has been no agreement between the government side and this side that we would or would not speak about any particular thing, we are just operating strictly within the rules of the House. I would have anticipated that without that kind of gaggle of noise and nonsense and interventions coming from the other side every time anybody tries to speak, Mr. Speaker, we could get through this fairly quickly. I am satisfied that the members on this side of the House who want to have some input into this should have an opportunity to

do so. But they insist on their right to do so and I am going to support them in it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am prepared to rule on that matter now. I would like to draw hon. members' attention to what I said on a number of occasions yesterday. Third reading, and this is in Beauchesne, Page 221, Section 712 (5): "Third Reading - The purpose of the third reading is to review the bill in its final form after the shaping it has received in its earlier stages."

Obviously, that is not what we are doing at the present time.

Now, why was it allowed to get to this stage? I think it was allowed, and I allowed it, to get to this stage because there seemed to be an understanding between each side of the House.

I have only had a chance of skimming through Hansard in the last five minutes because it was not available earlier, but I would like to point this out clearly, as I think it should be. It was the hon. the Government House Leader who said: "You see, Mr. Speaker! Do you see what they are attempting to do? They are attempting to use this particular bill, or whatever other bill they can find, to get into a debate on the railway agreement."

I quite agree with that. It is obvious that we are in a debate on the railway agreement.

And he carries on: "I have said there are going to be lots of opportunities for that. I am going to be calling the budget debate, which is wide open. If



the hon. members want to do it under Order 3, I said they could do that. No problem."

Because of that statement I have allowed this matter to get beyond the confines of the very narrow field that it should. At the present time I have looked up the list of members who have spoken. There are four members who have spoken on the government side and three on the Opposition side. Quite frankly, I think it would not be fair to hon members on either side, and the third party certainly has not been recognized so far to speak. I certainly would not be comfortable if there was a restriction made on hon. members when it had not been made on hon. members up to this time, and seven have already spoken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

What hon. members want to do is their affair, and if they would like to come to some agreement as to how we can resolve that, that is fine. I do not think I am going to resolve it other than on that basis at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

A new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very serious decision to make from the Chair, because it was by leave of the House -

MR. TULK:

No, it was not.

MR. MORGAN:

- and by agreement between the two sides of the House, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No!

MR. MORGAN:

- that we would have a wide-ranging debate on Bill 14, "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Relating To The Use And Operation Of Vehicles." The Chair agreed, because it was agreed between the two major parties in the House, that that would be a wide-ranging debate to enable the Opposition to bring forward their views on a specific topic, the Railway Agreement. We have had debate since yesterday on that topic. Now, Mr. Speaker, the agreement is broken from our side. I think we have had adequate debate on this very topic and we should get back to the precise bill itself, and debate not be wide-open and ranging, but confined to the narrow topic of the bill, and debate third reading of that bill, because we have had adequate discussion and debate on the wide-ranging topic of the Railway Agreement. If we are going to agree to do this on this bill here now, Mr. Speaker, it leaves it open to be done on any bill before the House, and that is a violation of the rules of the House. The point is, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is wrong in saying we are operating within the rules of the House because we are not. We are in an exception to the rules of the House based on two agreements. Mr. Speaker, in your ruling yesterday you made it quite clear that it was a special arrangement, a special agreement. And if this side of the House says that

agreement is no longer intact, the Leader of the Opposition has no right to say he wants to decide how many members on his side want to speak in this debate. He has no right to do that, none whatsoever. So, Mr. Speaker, my point is that we should be back to the bill itself. The agreement to have wide-ranging debate on the railway is no longer intact and, therefore we get back to the narrow topic of the bill itself.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I have only this to say: Your Honour has accurately stated the situation as it developed: That is my recollection of it. There was no specific agreement. I told Your Honour that there are four or five other members on this side of the House who wanted to speak, and there is no intention to drag it out. If we are finished in an hour, good. If it takes until 10:00 o'clock, well, that is fine. But there is no intention whatsoever to drag it out. There are four or five other members who have a few things to say and they should be allowed the time to speak.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Just on that point of order, for clarification. If I understand the hon. the Leader of the

Opposition rightly - I think he is more or less admitting that he has put Your Honour in a most invidious situation by bringing us to this particular point - he is indicating that this evening's debate will terminate this particular proceeding and that we will come to some sort of resolution. The usual resolution in this House - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition may not understand that, he does not seem to know much about parliamentary procedure - the usual way we terminate a procedure in this House is to bring a matter to a vote.

Now my understanding from what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition seems to indicate, to the extent that he indicates anything because he usually says one thing and then five minutes later he says another thing, but to the extent that he says anything that one can decide what he says, he is saying that he has no wish to drag out this particular proceeding unduly, which would seem to me to indicate that when members opposite and members on this side, because members on this side have as much right and as much expertise to make their points, that when that has been done there will be a vote taken.

Now if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes to go a bit beyond 10:00 o'clock, we have no problem with that. We will stop the clock, if need be, and go beyond 10:00 o'clock. But he is strongly indicating, and it is very difficult to understand the hon. Leader opposite because he is so much over the shot, if I understand him right, as saying he does not wish to drag out this unduly, we will come to a definitive end, and in this

particular sitting of the House we will finish this by having a vote. Now that is my understanding.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
I said no such thing, and when you read Hansard you will see it. This is the hon. member's distortion. When things do not go his way, he likes to distort. Now here it is simply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:  
What do you want?

MR. WELLS:  
Listen and you will hear. Listen to it! Stop the noise and you will hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:  
How can anybody hear anything, Mr. Speaker, with mouths going like that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, it is as simple as this: There are four or five members on this side of the House who still have something to say on

this matter and they want an opportunity to say it. Hon. members opposite appear to want to vote immediately, so I presume none of them want to speak. They want to vote right now, so I assume nobody over there wants to speak.

DR. COLLINS:  
Do not distort. We want to speak. Do not distort. We want to speak.

MR. WELLS:  
Well, then, you do not want to vote now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:  
All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: There are four or five -

DR. COLLINS:  
We can vote after each side speaks.

MR. WELLS:  
The minister will never hear what I am saying if he is speaking himself at the same time.

DR. COLLINS:  
It is possible to have a vote after each side speaks. You may not be aware of that, but it is possible in this House to have a vote after each side has its say.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, the simple statement is there are four or five members on this side of the House who want to speak. Now, if half or more of this evening is taken up by speakers from the other side, I have no doubt whatsoever that we will not finish before ten o'clock. I have no doubt that we will not finish before ten o'clock.

DR. COLLINS:

Is it your idea of procedure that only one side of the House speaks?

MR. WELLS:

No. That is what the minister would like to have.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is four or five members on this side want to speak. If everyone on each side speaks, I have no doubt they will not finish before ten o'clock. But that is okay by me. I have no problem with that. We can finish tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, some may need ten minutes, some may need five minutes, some may need twenty-five minutes, whatever is appropriate, but there is no intention to draw it out. We are doing simply what is necessary to handle this matter responsibly. It is as simple as that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I do have to say one further word because we must have an understanding. What the hon. leader said just now was totally adverse to what he said previously, which I understand because he does it all the time. What he is now saying - please correct me if I am wrong - is that the Opposition want the right to speak on this motion and as long as no one speaks on this side he is willing to bring it to a vote. But if anyone from this side brings it to a vote -

MR. WELLS:

No, no!

DR. COLLINS:

I am just quoting what you said. If anyone on this side wishes to speak you will want it to carry on until tomorrow.

MR. WELLS:

That is wrong.

DR. COLLINS:

I am just quoting what you said. That is what you said. You yourself may not understand what you said, but this is what you did say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make our position quite clear. We are willing to carry on with debate in this House, speaking one side from the other. At the end of the desire of members to speak, we are willing to bring it this evening to a vote.

MR. MORGAN:

This evening. That is reasonable.

DR. COLLINS:

Now, we are willing to stop the clock for that purpose if necessary. Now, if the hon. member opposite wishes to have only one-sided comment in this House and then bring it to a vote, that is so far out of parliamentary procedure that I can hardly comment because it is so laughable. I only put it down to the hon. member being so far away from parliamentary procedure he does not understand what is going on in parliamentary procedure. So can we have that clear? If the debate is to continue there will be someone from that side, someone from this side, and then, when no further members rise, we will have a vote. That is normal, common or garden type, throughout the world,

British type of parliamentary procedure.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition may not understand that, but I am afraid the rest of the world does understand it that way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, he does little to induce a reasonable arrangement at all. His insults are offensive, in fact. Mr. Speaker, it is simple: There are four or five people on this side of the House who want to speak. They will continue to speak until they have been heard, and that is it. If it is nine o'clock, that is okay, and then we will bring it to a vote. If it is ten o'clock, then we will bring it to a vote. If it tomorrow, then we will bring it to a vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

And they can do what they like, speak or not, as they see fit.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion that might resolve all this, and it has been tried before. It will require leave of the House, and I would certainly be prepared to give leave. That is if everyone were to speak at once, then we

could get it over with. It would make it somewhat arduous for Hansard to unscramble, but I would certainly be prepared to give leave.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I think Your Honour has heard enough, to be quite frank with you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I take the hon. member at his word. I have heard enough.

MR. TULK:

Yes, and I think it is time to get on with the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have nothing further to add that I have not said before. There is not a point of order. I thought that we were possibly getting to some understanding, and we could possibly curtail the debate or otherwise. That is purely up to the hon. members, not up to me.

The last speaker was the hon. the member for LaPoile. I will recognize the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure, finally, to be able to speak to this issue, given the fact that like so many other -

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order is, it is a most serious one because I think based on the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition that his speaker from his side will speak in debate on the condition and I am not going to repeat something already said. So if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, we have to all agree that what he is now saying to us in this agreement we have, on both sides of the House, is that any speakers from his side must not be repeating what has already said in debate and not be wasting the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I am not aware of any agreement.

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I intended to stick as much as possible as I can to the bill. And to preface my remarks which what I was going to say is that, as so many others in the House have said, I have a real connection with the railway given the fact that my father spent forty years with CN here in the city. And the fact that we now have an agreement which changes the railway certainly as I have known it down through the years, a railway which in the city, in particular, has shown a demise over the years from a very viable situation of some 1,500 to 2,000 people down to 350 workers left now in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, the point was raised

that we had stated our position, I thought our position was rather clear throughout in that we maintain that a four lane highway across the Province would be good compensation, if you like, for the fact that we were losing the railway, adding two lanes and losing the railway tracks seems to be equitable agreement. But we have not attained that goal. We have four lanes in the major areas where traffic deems it necessary, but we do not have four lanes across the Province. So are we, in fact, replacing the railway? A railway which was guaranteed to us by terms of union and now we find that we are getting less than the terms of union with less than a four lane highway as we all thought would be the final agreement.

The other point we always said we stood for was the maintenance agreement and we do not have that in place. When I spoke on the estimates earlier on it was one of the points I made that if a railway agreement was put in place that one of the conditions of it should be a maintenance agreement for the highways and for the extra demands on those highways given the movement of rail traffic to the highway and the addition of two more lanes. Now we find ourselves in a situation where we are not only now we find ourselves in a situation, where not only do we have some \$400 million being paid out over a fifteen year period, but we do not have any agreement at all for maintenance. The government tries to argue that maintenance agreements are not necessary because highways are a provincial responsibility. Surely, they are our responsibility normally, but when you think of the fact that we are changing a mode of traffic from

rail to roads and that should be a continuation of a Terms of Union agreement and, indeed, probably forthcoming a constitutional agreement, then surely it should be put in place that the highway should be maintained as a four-lane highway, just as in fact it was agreed that the railway would be maintained with no limitation in time.

Mr. Speaker, I note the legal opinion states there is no requirement to maintain rail service in Newfoundland. They question whether or not it is obligated to bear the cost of replacing the rail service with an alternative, such as an adequate road transportation system.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, the Terms of Union very clearly stated, since we are an island, with water separating us from the Mainland, the Terms of Union went to great pains to ensure the continuation of a trans-Canada communication and transportation system would be maintained, in spite of having water in between. That was guaranteed in the Terms of Union.

Having received that guarantee, I would content that a legal opinion, and we do not have a legal opinion stated here, at least it is not given as a legal opinion per se, would surely say that if you are guaranteeing a continuation of a trans-Canada communications transportation network is indeed not to be impeded by water, then rail is a continuation of that, and has been traditionally. If you remove the rail, you say now this is going to be a road connection, that road connection whether two lanes or four should continue to be accepted as one of the Terms of

Union.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

I would think any legal opinion would connect the two and say the opinion that there should be a connection maintained by way of ferry traffic would surely link into a legal opinion maintaining the removal of rail would mean the obligation on rail would be moved to the highway. We do not see any opinion to the contrary in anything we have received on this side. That would naturally connect, Mr. Speaker, to the maintenance of the highway.

It is unbelievable to think that we have \$400 million put in place, not \$800 million, as we hear, \$400 million of new money and new agreements, and absolutely nothing for maintenance. It blows the mind to think that down the road fifteen years from now, and indeed, throughout that fifteen year period as we indeed put these millions in place, we are going to have to maintain four lanes of highway throughout this Province with absolutely no help from the Federal government.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in Question Period I mentioned the railway infrastructure. Throughout the Province we have not only infrastructure such as track, switches and signals, buildings and bridges and whatever a lot of which, naturally, will have to be removed and, I would think, relocated wherever possible, but we have railway land and buildings located within the municipal boundaries in many, many cases or near municipal boundaries which can be used by these cities and towns to help replace the

economic base they have lost by losing the railway. We see absolutely no mention at all of how this is going to be treated by the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you there are cities - I can speak for one, St. John's - and other and councillors I have spoken to who are very, very concerned about being able to have these lands transferred directly to them, so they can help decide their future, having lost a major economic base with the loss of the railway. Without the lands, and without the buildings being transferred to them - I do not mean transferred by way of a very long, drawn out legal procedure where it gets transferred to the Province first at a cost of millions of dollars and then, eventually, some of it, depending on the whim of the government, gets transferred to whatever communities they see fit, I mean a direct transfer to the communities which are losing the railway right now.

We all know which ones they are, the four or five major communities from Port aux Basques to St. John's which are adversely affected most by the loss of the railway, the loss of lands and buildings, the loss of the economic base, and the loss of employment for their people.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Province should enter into renegotiations right away as far as these lands and buildings are concerned. These properties are worth hundreds of millions. If you want to just isolate the rail bed which, of course, is valuable in itself, and deal with the properties throughout this Province, I would suggest there are hundreds of millions of

dollars worth of property in land and buildings which should be properly transferred in a lot of cases, not in all cases, but in a lot of cases, to the communities, the towns, and the cities adversely affected and will be dramatically affected economically if these properties and lands are not transferred to them.

Mr. Speaker, returning once again to the point of maintaining the railway, I would like to just quote from a person who was involved earlier on and is now in his eighties. I am referring to Mr. Pickersgill.

The three points he made were: Number one, keep the railway operating while the highway is being upgraded. He did not mean that be open-ended, but certainly the Sullivan Report recommended a five-year period during which the railway would not close down until the highway, at least in terms of being upgraded and expanded to a four-lane system, as is being recommended now - hopefully the government would have gone further, but certainly as we see the deal in place right now - at least five years be a time frame whereby the railway would not close until five years of construction had gone on and we would see a good portion of the Trans-Canada expanded to four lanes. We do not have that in place. It is an open-ended situation now. If we read it correctly, September 1 the railway's mandate ends and we start construction on the expanding the Trans-Canada to four lanes in given parts of the Province.

The other point Mr. Pickersgill made was that four lanes should be put in place across the Province



and maintenance and snow removal be an obligation of the federal government and, finally, that preference for highway work would go to railway workers.

Sure we see a grandiose promised package being proposed by this agreement whereby rail workers are promised to be looked after. We have already heard the comments of some of our union leaders saying they hoped that that will be so. But hope is not always the best way of doing things.

We would like to see more of an agreement put in place whereby it is guaranteed in the agreement these people will be looked after and that, in fact, if highway work, as we know, is going to be started relatively soon, workers would be given some preference as far as working on the highways if, in fact, they cannot be placed in railway jobs. That sort of an agreement is certainly not in place as we see it now.

Mr. Speaker, we only see \$5 million being allocated in the agreement, \$5 million which I assume will be mostly spent on legal fees, as I read it, but no agreement whatsoever on the transfer of lands and properties, the value of which, of course, is in the hundreds of millions. I shudder to think of the amount of legal fees and time that is going to be expended before we finally get a lot of these properties transferred to the communities in which they are involved.

Mr. Speaker, I think in closing I would just like to say there is great concern out there in St. John's, in Mount Pearl, in Port aux Basques, Bishop's Falls and all areas of the Province whereby workers are being affected

adversely by this particular agreement. Not only do we want to see workers looked after, and guaranteed in this agreement that they will be looked after, but that the economic base they have been counting on for so many years would be maintained and the lands and properties would be, indeed, transferred over to these municipalities so they would have a better control, Mr. Speaker, of their future.

Thank you.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

I would certainly like to have the opportunity to have a few comments as it relates to the discussions taking place, Mr. Speaker, today and yesterday as it relates to a very positive deal that was worked out between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada as it affects our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am like all hon. gentlemen conscious or cognizant of what has taken place here over the past few days as it relates to discussions that were brought about as a result of the government receiving funding for the railway that was on its way out. I guess, as the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) just suggested, it was given its death knell some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. the

member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Gullage) made reference to Mr. Pickersgill. I guess, I have the opportunity to read it into the record again - it probably was done already - a letter Mr. Pickersgill wrote when he was the Minister of Transport, I understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

He said 'Insofar as the application for abandonment is concerned, it has been undertaken principally on the understanding reached with the Government of Newfoundland when the federal government undertook to pay the full cost of building a modern highway to Argentia from the Trans-Canada Highway.'

MR. DINN:

How much did (inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON:

There was no maintenance in that.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, that is the question I have. We are sitting here, Mr. Speaker, with a letter from the federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Mr. Pickersgill, when he agreed to phase out the railroad from Argentia to the Trans-Canada. That was in 1968.

Mr. Speaker, where was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) at that time I wonder, when this deal was worked out, when the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador agreed, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

- and the federal government

undertook to pay for the full cost of building a modern highway from Argentia to the Trans-Canada?

At that time the provincial government agreed that it would offer no objections to the abandonment of the railway after the highway had been opened.

Mr. Speaker, where was the clause in that agreement that shows us where there is a maintenance program? Where were the concerns of the Leader of the Opposition then, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to a maintenance program on the roads? The Government of Newfoundland, of which the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, was a part, agreed with the federal government to close out the railway for a road with no clause, Mr. Speaker. Was there any money put in place for the communities of Dunville, Argentia, and these places that are going to be affected by the close-out of the this? Was there any package put in place for people who are affected as a result of this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition cannot come into this House with his holier-than-thou attitude and make out that he can walk on water and do all these wonderful things and at the same time be part of a government that sold us down the tube, Mr. Speaker, the people who worked in that area. Where was his maintenance agreement as it relates to that?

That was the first nail in the coffin in the railway of Newfoundland and the Leader of the Opposition was one of the fellows

who controlled the hammer in driving that nail and he cannot get away from that. He comes into this House today and make such statements, Mr. Speaker. He makes statements about the agreement and no maintenance clause. Where is the maintenance clause there? Why does he not come out and come clean with the people of this Province and let the people what he is?

I can tell him further, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity. And I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, that one thing in this agreement, together with another one, gives the people of my district, the people of an isolated community in Petit Forte the right, which they deserve, the rights that everybody else has, and that is to be free of isolation.

I am proud that that is there, that the people of Petit Forte will now, in this agreement together with another one that is in place, \$6 million will be spent. Hopefully, we can get it going as fast as we can and get the engineering work done, get the bulldozers down there, and give them people the right to get in their cars and drive out of their community.

I say something else, Mr. Speaker, Petit Forte, because of the determination of the hardworking, dedicated, sincere Newfoundlanders who live in that community, if it were not for them, Mr. Speaker, we would not be building a road to Petit Forte.

Where was the Leader of the Opposition when the people of Petit Forte were being resettled? Where was the Leader of the Opposition then, Mr. Speaker, when they were offering them \$1500 a

year to move for three in a family? Where was the Leader of the Opposition then? He was not doing what this government is doing and that is protecting the rights of people to live where they want to live.

He was out there killing communities, Mr. Speaker, denying people the right to stay and live where they were born. That is what the Leader of the Opposition did. I was reminded of that this evening in a conversation with some people from Petit Forte. They have not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, where he stood, together with some other people.

Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, he talked about a maintenance clause for the railway when he tried, when he was part of the government, which forced people from the soil they were born on, uproot them and skuttle them across the bay wherever they could go. Give them a barge and throw land at them!

He talks about maintenance, Mr. Speaker. The maintenance of the railway was more important to him now than it was when the Argentic track came up, or when he was moving people from Petit Forte and Southeast Bight and these places.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And Merasheen Island.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Tell us about when Harry pulled EPA out of Gander now.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in 1967, with the strong arm of the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in government, they

almost achieved that. There were sixteen families left in Petit Forte, Mr. Speaker. There are approximately forty there today. Just across the Sound, Mr. Speaker, in Southeast Bight they were reduced, I believe, to six.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Port Anne is gone.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. Port Anne is gone, Merasheen is gone, Little Paradise is gone, Great Paradise is gone, and Red Island is gone, Mr. Speaker. He achieved all that. I am sure he is proud of that, Mr. Speaker. I am sure he achieved all that, Mr. Speaker. He is proud of that.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was reminded of this this evening by people from Petit Forte who were very upset with the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party being opposed to them having a road.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we saw the depths of hypocrisy, when the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) comes into this House, Mr. Speaker, bringing in petition after petition every day, trying to get the road paved to Burgeo.

Mr. Speaker, through the hard work of the MP for Burin - St. George's we were successful. The people of Burgeo are successful in getting the road paved. But how can a member stand in this House with \$12 million approved to pave the road in his district and be opposed to it? I think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Burgeo deserve better representation.

I can tell the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that in a press conference in Marystown this

morning with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), we reminded the people of the South Coast where the Leader of the Liberal Party and his caucus stood as it related to what was happening here.

Mr. Speaker, why do the people from Coomb's Cove, another part of the South Coast, deserve their member in the House of Assembly, former member of Parliament, to stand up here and be opposed to \$8.8 million being spent in the Coomb's Cove area. I happen to know that area too, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the people of Burgeo and the people of Coomb's Cove, like the people in other parts of this Province, have a right to expect pavement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, indeed it is sad, when they elect people to represent them in the House of Assembly like the two hon. gentlemen they have now and they get up, Mr. Speaker, and criticize an agreement that is going to give that kind of pavement and road work to the area.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed today, from a statement by the minister, that tenders are now being called in my own district, from Red Harbour to Marystown, for pavement, \$4.5 million worth of resurfacing from Red Harbour to Marystown. That, Mr. Speaker, will be beneficial to the people from Rushoon and Parker's Cove and Bold Harbour and Brookside, and all the other places. It is the heaviest traffic area on the Burin Peninsula.

They deserve that, Mr. Speaker. They deserve to be able to drive over a decent road, and the Liberal Party of this Province is opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying here is they can cut the pie how they like. They can cut the cake how they like. The facts remain clear that these projects, Mr. Speaker, the amounts here, including the pavement for Burgeo and the road to Petit Forte, Mr. Speaker, and Coombs Cove and Colinet to North Harbour, and paving from Plum Point to Englee and \$10 million for Bonavista, paving Red Bay Road, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Liberal Party in this Province is opposed to this deal and are opposed to these projects taking place.

MR. BAKER:  
Do not be so silly, boy!

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, these are the facts, and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), is against it. I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, I will be in Grand Falls tomorrow morning for a press conference, as a matter of fact, and I will be telling the people out there in Windsor - Buchans where the Leader of the Opposition stood on some issues I will be addressing tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
I will be telling them that too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have the railway that started to go down as a result of this letter that was written here, which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) is part

of, that is the Argentic line.

What about the passenger train, Mr. Speaker, when they took off the passenger trains and put on the CN buses? How much money was allocated by the Federal government then to improve the Trans-Canada Highway? How much money was put in place then to improve the Trans-Canada Highway because of the demands that were going to be placed on the Trans-Canada by the road cruisers? How much money, Mr. Speaker? Where was the Liberal Party then? Which party was in government then when that closed down?

MR. BAKER:  
What about the Depression?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman one thing, there will be no depression in the Liberal Party as long as big business continues to throw bucks at their leader. There will be no depression there, Mr. Speaker. There will be riches, Mr. Speaker. They will be from rags to riches, there is no doubt about that about the Liberal Party. He does not have to worry about a depression there, Mr. Speaker, as long as some of the business people in this Province can get their talons in the right people and can control the levers. There will be no depression in the Liberal Party. The bucks are too big for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:  
That is right, Mr. Speaker.

My good friend, my colleague for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) just reminded me of another one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is this a filibuster?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

It might be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the freight service on the South Coast of this Province? Who remembers that? Does the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) remember that?

MR. GILBERT:

(Inaudible) ferry service on the South Coast.

MR. TOBIN:

I am sure the member for Fortune - Hermitage remembers it.

MR. WARREN:

He is not here tonight.

MR. TOBIN:

No, I am sure he remembers it. When they put the flag half mast in Petit Forte, Mr. Speaker. When they flew the flag for a whole year in Petit Forte half mast when he was the MP, when he was the Member of Parliament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

I am sure he remembers that.

MR. WARREN:

No, no that is not right.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, when they took off the coastal boat; which was synonymous with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. TOBIN:

Talk about about a situation. We resettled them, Mr. Speaker, and when that did not work, what did the Liberals do then? They took away the coastal boat.

MR. WARREN:

No, that was not the Liberals. No!

MR. TOBIN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, thank God things have changed. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, governments have changed and attitudes have changed. Instead of trying to resettle people and instead of removing their coastal boats from them, like the Liberals did, this administration is going to see to it that there is a road built through their community.

Mr. Speaker, as I said today, we happened to be in Marystown last night and today myself and my colleagues, the Minister of Development and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). All we got, Mr. Speaker, were positive comments, very positive comments on this agreement, including, Mr. Speaker, a call from a very prominent Liberal in my district, who is known quite well to some of you people.

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), Mr. Speaker, he might as well say what he is going to say because the House is soon going to close and there may be an election and he will never know what this place looks like again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

According to the polls, he is gone.

MR. TOBIN:

He will never know, Mr. Speaker, what this place looks like again.

And I do not blame the member from the Straits clapping his desk at the fact that the member for St. Barbe will never know what the House looks like again, because when you look at the funding allocated in this for the member for the Straits (Mr. Decker), Mr. Speaker, and the way that it has been criticized by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), then there is no doubt as to how he feels about it.

MR. WARREN:

Do not worry, the member for the Straits has been already told he cannot run any more. He has already been told. Mr. Roberts wants to come back there. He cannot run there any more. Eddy Roberts wants that job, make room for Eddy Roberts okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I say that this agreement is a good agreement for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a good agreement for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I know, Mr. Speaker, it is welcomed in my district.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

On the South Coast and the Burin Peninsula! I do not mind saying it, on the Burin Peninsula, we did not have a railway down there. The railway did not mean anything to the Burin Peninsula, Mr.

Speaker, it did not mean anything to us.

So why should we be against the railway, Mr. Speaker, something that was never on the Burin Peninsula. Projections for the use of it this year was something like 11 percent of the traffic.

So, Mr. Speaker, what is all the fuss? Why are the Opposition opposed to this? Why? Why? Everybody knows why, because they are afraid of it. They are afraid of this Province doing well. They are afraid the people in this Province are going to become treated like other people. They are afraid, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Burgeo is running scared in his district. That is why he is against the pavement going down there, that is why, Mr. Speaker. The member better be. Probably he should talk to the MP a little bit more and not the mayor and then he will know what is going on down there.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Burin - Placentia West, we support this deal. We think it is an excellent deal. We look forward to the people of Petit Forte, the people that the leader of the Opposition tried to resettle, and then the member for Fortune - Hermitage came on the scene, the federal member, and tried to deny them the coastal boat service they had, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He tried.

MR. TOBIN:

He did not try, Mr. Speaker, he did.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Simmons, is even (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, oh, that is why he is not here. Oh, I thought he was not here because I told him this evening.

MR. WARREN:

No, he was afraid. He was told not to come.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he was. We did it in the 1984 elections. Do not you ever kid yourself. As a matter of fact, my district contributed more than any other district to his defeat in 1985 and I was very proud to be part of that.

As a matter of fact, I headed up the campaign in Burin - St. George's. It was the most votes ever got in Burin - Placentia West by a PC candidate when Mr. Price won the district. It has since grown in the last election for me and that was the most votes ever gotten.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He has changed it since then.

MR. TOBIN:

He has changed it since then. Well you never know, Mr. Speaker. We were down this morning and strolled through the shipyard with the Minister of Development, where 641 employees were working directly as a result of this government.

MR. BARRETT:

And they were some delighted to be included in that highways agreement.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the people get to talk about it.

Let me say on behalf of the people

we are proud of this deal. It is a good deal, and it is too bad the Liberals are burying themselves as a result of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I find myself becoming more and more enlightened as hon. gentlemen from the other side speak. I did not realize the influence Liberals had on past history. Hearing of the devastation the Liberals wrought on this Province, I am almost ashamed to belong to the party anymore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I am going to have to have some research done, Mr. Speaker, to see if there is any truth in any of those positions.

MR. MORGAN:

You ought to be ashamed. You were totally ashamed last week.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. the member for Bonavista South is aware of it or not, but my nomination is over and I am the Liberal candidate in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) your own detriment.

MR. DECKER:

If the member knows something I do



not know, I think he should get up and say it.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement by the hon. the Premier which he made on June 20. On page 2 he makes a very valid point. He says, referring to the announcement, 'Today's announcement is an historic stride in our transportation future. Together with Mr. Crosbie, I am proud to be a part of this forward-looking, comprehensive improvement to the transportation system of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Now, Mr. Speaker, because we are on this transportation bill, we are taking advantage of the bill to discuss this particular agreement. But the thing which never ceases to amaze me is how hon. members on the opposite side, whose leader just announced this historic stride in our transportation future, are so reticent in debating this particular bill. Members on this side of the House have had to do everything in our power to force government members into debating this comprehensive stride in our transportation system.

One would wonder if the Premier actually meant what he said. One would wonder if this is a comprehensive stride in our transportation system or, Mr. Speaker, is this another attempt, similar to the attempt which was brought on by a former Tory Government in Ottawa, to break the Terms of Union of this Province with Canada. I am talking about the Diefenbaker era, Mr. Speaker, when they tried to break the Terms of Union as layed out in Term 29.

It never ceases to amaze me why, every time we get a Tory Government in Ottawa, they try to

put the shaft to Newfoundland. They tried to do it with Term 29, and they are trying to do it again today with Term 31. We, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals in this House, are not going to let this go through without putting up a fight, and a gallant fight it is. Let the people of Newfoundland know, let history know that when this administration attempted to take away our constitutional right, fifteen gallant men stood strong. And we are prepared to fight, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to give it all we have, so that when someone tampers with our constitutional rights, we will fight for Newfoundland. We will not posture, we will stand firm, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, maybe I should tell something about my personal feelings about railways. I never saw a railway, I never saw a train until I was seventeen or eighteen years old, and I was not particularly impressed with it when I did see it. I have no nostalgic feelings toward railways, but I do have nostalgic feelings toward the Terms of Union with Canada. When we became a part of Canada, the nation had a national transportation system and we used the rail; the rail was our extension of that national transportation system. Experts tell us, and I agree, that today, in 1988, the most efficient way to transport freight is by road. There is no argument there.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) Ottawa, mostly.

MR. DECKER:  
Ottawa is quite legitimate in transferring their obligation from rail to road. As long as they maintain it, and as long as it remains part of the Constitution,

there is no problem. In 1988, the road could well be the best way to transport freight across this nation. There is no argument. By the time this agreement is completed, the year 2003, fifteen years from now, blimps might be the most economical efficient way to transport freight across this Province. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then under the Terms of Union with Canada Canada is obligated, it is written in stone, it is part of the Constitution, it is part of the agreement we made with Ottawa in 1949, will change from rail, to road, to blimps. That is what is important. That is written in stone forever. By the year 2049, who knows how we will be moving freight across this Province? It could well be by rail again. But this agreement says we will never go back, because we have allowed Ottawa off the hook. And if the railway once again becomes an efficient way to move traffic, we can whistle Dixie, because with this government in cohorts with another Tory government have taken away that Term of Union, they have destroyed it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not soon get this government out, by the year 3000 horse and cart might be the only economical thing to use in this Province. Because they are tearing the economy down, nothing will be efficient except the horse and cart, because the horse can get a bit of grass on the side of the road.

No matter how the federal government decides to live up to its obligation, the fact of the matter is they have a contract with Newfoundland to provide a transportation service in this Province. It is not that long ago that the Premier's position was

similar to ours in that regard, and I cannot understand what brought on this about-face, this total turn-around, this 180 degree turn around. I cannot understand it, Mr. Speaker. It reminds me of George Orwell's 1984, that book which I am sure the hon. Speaker himself must have read, when there were three superpowers in the world, Oceania, East Asia and Eurasia. Now these three superpowers were constantly in a state of war: there was Oceania and East Asia at war against Eurasia, or there was Eurasia and Oceania against East Asia.

The Minister of Propaganda from Oceania was making a speech and he was attacking Eurasia the scoundrels, Eurasia the good-for-nothings, Eurasia was not fit to be on this planet, and he was praising up East Asia the good, East Asia the wonderful, East Asia the great, and somebody plucked on his coattail and said, 'We are now at peace with Eurasia and at war with East Asia.'

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:  
I am getting to the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is straying a little bit. I do not see the relevance, so would you please get back to the subject.

MR. DECKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If Your Honour will just bear with me a few more seconds I will tie it all in. I assure you, Sir, that is what I intend to do.

MR. W. CARTER:

Talk about Mother Goose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

In the midst of his speech with his attack on Eurasia, someone plucked on his coattail and said, 'We are now at war with East Asia. We are no longer at war with Eurasia.' And without missing a beat, the Minister of Propaganda engaged in a full scale attack on Eurasia, without missing a beat, Mr. Speaker, and I can relate that to some newspaper clippings I have. 'He would restore passenger service. Peckford chose this Central Newfoundland railway town to announce a renewed effort by the provincial government to restore the line to its original role.' We are at war with Eurasia!

He said, 'The federal government will be expected to provide the money required.' Eurasia the bad, the evil. I will give a direct quote, "Our policy, says Mr. Peckford, is not based on nostalgia but on the certain fact that we will need the railway in an energy expensive future." We are at war with Eurasia, Mr. Speaker. Peckford told supporters - another quotation - "The railway must be a permanent transportation system in the Province," and he reaffirmed his commitment to see that it is upgraded. We are at war with Eurasia, Mr. Speaker.

A statement by Premier Brian Peckford in May 1980, from a discussion tape on the bilateral issues, Canada/Newfoundland: "The railway in Newfoundland provides a vital transportation link and must be maintained and improved to provide residents and business in

Newfoundland a level of service comparable to other provinces. This is particularly so when the overall energy situation facing the world over the next number of decades is taken into account.

Mr. Speaker, what about this one? "Peckford vows to keep the railway." Yes, Mr. Speaker, right in the midst of his speech with his lambasting of Eurasia, someone plucked on his coattail and said, 'But we have a Tory Government in Ottawa now. We no longer have a Liberal Government in Ottawa now,' and without blinking an eyelash, the Minister of Propaganda from Eurasia says, 'Today's announcement is an historic stride in our transportation future. Together with Mr. Crosbie, I am proud to be a part of this forward-looking, comprehensive improvement to the transportation system of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Now, Mr. Speaker, there is doublespeak. Is that the word they used for it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Newspeak.

MR. DECKER:

Newspeak?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Double-talk.

MR. DECKER:

[I think the word I am looking for is doublethink. Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously and accepting both of them at the same time. Mr. Speaker, I would gather that this is doublethink, a classic example of doublethink.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the other things that went on when this press conference was

given yesterday. In all the hullabaloo, we have missed the speech by Mr. Ron Lawless. I suppose the key sentence in Mr. Lawless' speech is this: 'The boss is back.' The boss he is referring to, Mr. Speaker, is when CN brings their trucking system back into Newfoundland and begins to compete with the Don Pilgrims who have one truck, with the Carl Mays who have a couple of trucks, with the Newfoundlanders who are trying to take advantage of the deregulation in the trucking business and are trying to become small, independent businessmen. 'The boss is back now', he says. 'The initiative' -- he refers to this agreement -- 'will allow a highway orientated service to survive and to flourish.' How? 'We will pick up and deliver by road from dockside in Newfoundland.' What does he think the Don Pilgrims are doing in Newfoundland today if they are not picking up at dockside and delivering to the businesses of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

'We will give our customers more frequent and reliable service,' he says. 'We will offer them an intermodal customer service organization national in scope. We will connect them more effectively than can anyone else with the vast Canadian, U.S. and Overseas intermodal freight markets. And we will increase market share.' Where is he going to get this increase in market share? Is it the fourteen extra trucks the Premier talks about? No, he is going to put every small trucker in this Province out of business. That is what he is going to do, Mr. Speaker. This is

a declaration of war by a government subsidized company who is going to put our truckers out of business. 'The boss is back', Mr. Speaker, a declaration of war.

Mr. Speaker, some other points have been touched on and I want to reinforce them. When we talk about changing this national transportation from rail and putting it on the road, this agreement does not assure me that we shall have a safer and more efficient highway to drive over, not on September 1. I use the highway practically every weekend, Mr. Speaker, and I know that every so many vehicles I meet is a tractor-trailer. And I know that if I meet a tractor-trailer today, she will have a load of pulp wood on, she will have some furniture on, she will have flour or milk or cement or some other commodity. But after September 1, Mr. Speaker, when I meet that tractor-trailer coming toward me at 65 or 70 miles an hour, I will know that in addition to pulp wood or furniture or whatever, that truck could be loaded with dynamite and dynamite caps. That is what the fact will be after September 1.

MR. DOYLE:

There is dynamite on the highway every day, there is propane on the highway every single day. What makes it any different now? There is propane on the highway every day and dynamite on the highway every day. What is going to be different now? And also, a lot of these substances are hauled by water.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon.

minister gets up to speak, I would like him to reaffirm that there is dynamite and dynamite caps being transported on the road today.

After September 1, I will know that I no longer have the security of meeting commodities only, but there will be dynamite and dynamite caps.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think that the Premier in this agreement lived up to his past history of taking whatever he can get when he can get it, as he said about the member for Bellevue. He will take what he can get, when he can get it.

Mr. Speaker, after September 1 I will know that that tractor-trailer coming towards me at sixty-five or seventy miles an hour could, in theory at least, have nitroglycerin on board.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The theory was the same way two months ago.

MR. DECKER:

No it was not, it was all by rail, as the minister knows. As of September 1, the dangerous goods and chemicals will be transferred from rail to road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any argument with that if it were phased out. In the Pickersgill letter you will notice that Mr. Pickersgill referred to the fact that the road had to be put in place before the branch line was phased out.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Oh, the minister is threatening me now. Well, let history show that when the member for the Strait of Bell Isle was under attack and being threatened he did not flinch but he stood strong, Mr. Speaker. And he will stand strong, because he will not be muzzled by the Minister of Transportation or the member for Bonavista South, or whatever.

The logical reasonable thing to do, Mr. Speaker, with this railway was to phase it out. If hon. members have read the Liberal position on that, which we have had now for some time, we said that the rail should be phased out over a ten year period or whatever it takes. Now how much more secure would I feel, or any other members in this House who drives over that highway, if we could be assured that there would be no dangerous chemicals on the highway until a highway was put there which was capable of handling this extra traffic. It should have been phased out, Mr. Speaker.

This is what I see wrong with this particular agreement. There is no attempt to phase out the railway, it is going to be the big bang theory of creation. It is a big bang! It will happen just like that! One minute we have the railway, and the next minute everything is dumped on the highways and, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the highways will not be safe to drive over immediately.

Now, they will be in a matter of time.

MR. DOYLE:

(Inaudible) Englee.

MR. DECKER:

Speaking of Englee, Mr. Speaker,

when Minister of Transportation gets up, I would like him to tell me how many kilometres he is going to pave in Englee. If he wants to talk about Englee, although it is a bit irrelevant to the topic, just tell me how many kilometres and when. I would appreciate that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, part of this agreement includes a secondary roads agreement. That is correct, is it not? Members will agree.

Five years ago the previous Minister of Transportation stood in Roddickton and said - I was the mayor at the time and we were talking about this very road that the minister is talking about tonight. It is not in this secondary roads agreement, mind you - "The only reason the road to Englee is not paved is because we do not have a secondary roads agreement. But we are on the verge..." -

AN HON. MEMBER:

And he just (inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Five years ago. "We are on the verge of getting a secondary roads agreement not as good as the 90/10 one you had when you had a liberal government, but it will be 70/30 or 60/40, whatever."

MR. DOYLE:

Who got it for you? Who got it for you?

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, four years ago the previous minister got up and he said, 'The only reason we have not finished the road down to Burgeo, or we have not done the road across country from Plum Point to Englee is' - guess? - 'we do not have a secondary roads agreement.'

Three years ago, and even within the last few months, the present Minister of Transportation got up. Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Transportation got a secondary roads agreement for us, yes he did, but look at the cost. He sold out a Term of Union, something we could have had forever. It is normal to have a secondary roads agreement. The two are mutually exclusive. There should be no correlation between them. Many provinces have secondary roads agreements, but for us to get a secondary roads agreement, we had to give up our Terms of Union with Canada.

I believe my time is about to run out and I want to get to something because I do not want to leave this speech totally negative. I want to leave hope for Newfoundlanders, so I cannot sit down until I leave the positive part of this speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I said has been negatively critical, I suppose, of this agreement. We have criticized it. There has been some positive criticism and some negative criticism, and it is not a good way to leave a speech. I do not want to leave negative feelings, so I have hope for Newfoundlanders today whose rights have been sold out, whose Terms of Union with Canada have been broken, whose constitutional right has been taken away. Now, I have hope for Newfoundlanders and I hope that this gets out. I have here a communiqué from the Liberal Party in Ottawa and this is good news for Newfoundlanders who have just seen the Constitution broken. A federal Liberal government would consider the following:

MR. MORGAN:

Oh! Dream on! Dream on! Dream

on!

MR. DECKER:

Now, hon. members should listen to this.

MR. MORGAN:

A federal Liberal government? Dream on!

MR. DECKER:

'Respect for constitutional obligations.'

MR. MORGAN:

They might get in with Chretien, but not with Turner.

MR. DECKER:

Now, listen to this: 'The Liberal Party of Canada will not hold the people of Newfoundland and Labrador liable for Premier Peckford's signature re Section 10, Subsection 1 of the Memorandum of Understanding which relieves Canada of all constitutional obligations with respect to the Newfoundland Railway.'

Mr. Speaker, this is hope, that is a positive way to end off this speech. I have just torn the insides out of the agreement, and now I am giving Newfoundlanders some hope.

MR. MORGAN:

You are not giving Canada much hope. Not with a Liberal government, that is for sure.

MR. DECKER:

If I could go back to a former era in my life, Mr. Speaker, I learned at one time that even the most devastating sermon, no matter how negative it was, you should always leave the congregation with a bit of hope. So I am trying to leave Newfoundlanders with a bit of hope: 'The Liberal Party of Canada commits itself, as a future

government, to affect an amendment to the Terms of Union, Section 31(a), to transfer Canada's constitutional obligation to the Newfoundland Railway to a new federal obligation to maintain the Trans-Canada Highway.' That is hope. We almost saw this Province devastated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Transfer?

MR. DECKER:

Transfer it. Want me to read it again?

MR. DOYLE:

Yes, please do.

MR. DECKER:

'The Liberal Party of Canada, within months of becoming the Government of Canada, commits itself, as a future government, to affect an amendment to the Terms of Union, Section 31(a), to transfer Canada's constitutional obligation to the Newfoundland Railway to a new federal obligation to maintain the Trans-Canada Highway.' No wonder the Minister of Transportation is laughing. I would laugh also if I were Minister of Transportation, because he knows we just sold out. But he, too, sees hope. He is the first convert. He is the first one to see hope, Mr. Speaker. He knows there is hope.

If the Minister of Transportation wants, I can have this copied and sent over to him and, if he wants, we can have members of this party available to sit down and discuss it with him, because it is important to the future of this Province to undo the wrong which this particular agreement has done.

MR. DOYLE:

You send that over now, because I

want to see it.

MR. DECKER:

Listen to this: 'The Liberal Party of Canada recognizes that the present financial compensation package is grossly inadequate.' Now, that is an understatement if ever I hear one, Mr. Speaker.

'We pledge our government to renegotiating a more realistic and equitable financial package for the people of the Province.' Mr. Speaker, all is not lost. There is still a second chance.

This is the best one, Mr. Speaker: 'The Liberal Party of Canada recognizes that the present

MR. DOYLE:

Can you do the same on Churchill and get a reopener clause for us?

MR. DECKER:

Well -

MR. DOYLE:

You are making progress if you can do that.

MR. DECKER:

We did not have a recent communiqué on that item, Mr. Speaker, but when I get one, I will discuss it with the appropriate minister.

'The Liberal Party of Canada recognizes that the present financial compensation of \$15 million for community adjustment is totally inadequate.' I agree with them. Inadequate it is, is it not? 'We commit ourselves to renegotiating this amount with the provincial government, in consultation with those communities affected by the closure of the railway.' Let Port aux Basques, Bishop's Falls,

Clareville, Whitbourne, Badger, Deer Lake, all communities across this Province, know that tonight.

MR. MORGAN:

We know what is most important to you (inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. I am learning something new all the time. 'The Liberal Party of Canada believes in the principle of the reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway. The Labrador Highway must also be considered an integral part of any such highway system, and federal funding must be made available for its completion.'

I know the hon. member will want some badges. He is going to want some buttons. He is going to campaign for the Liberals. I do not blame him in the least. 'The Liberal Party of Canada believes that the phaseout of the railway' - here is what I was saying - 'must be done over a minimum of two years subject to review. The targeted closure date of September 1, 1988 is completely unacceptable with the subsequent, immediate diversion onto the provincial highway system of all present rail and freight cargo. As the Sullivan report noted ten years ago, roads and ports must first be improved before extra tonnage can be accommodated.'

I have to get this one in, Mr. Speaker: 'When Newfoundland joined Canada, one of the Terms of Union was that the federal government would maintain the Newfoundland Railway. There is speculation that the Newfoundland Government is considering' - well, it is a fact now - a one-time only cash payment from the federal government to replace it with a



highway. That choice is for  
Newfoundlanders to make.... and  
it goes on.

Now, Your Honour has just come to  
the Chair. My time is about up,  
and I will just summarize. I tore  
the insides out of this silly  
agreement, I tore the insides out  
of this sellout, but, in true  
style, I have left Newfoundlanders  
with hope that when the federal  
government becomes Liberal, which  
is within a few months, then we  
will fix the wrong and we will be  
able to stand up for Newfoundland  
once again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now,  
he will close the debate.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased  
indeed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No. No.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes. He was recognized by the  
Speaker.

MR. WELLS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the  
Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, how does the hon.  
member close the debate now? He  
did not start this debate.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, he did.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, he did not. It is not his

bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister -

MR. WELLS:

It is his bill, and he closed the  
debate on second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. WELLS:

He closed the debate on second  
reading. That was done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, other members  
want to speak on this side of the  
House.

MR. MORGAN:

Too bad! Too bad! The rules of  
the House apply here.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr.  
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon.  
the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

To the point of order, the hon.  
the Leader of the Opposition may  
be right in stating that other  
members want to speak, and that is  
their right. If they get up, Your  
Honour will ask the minister to  
sit down.

MR. DOYLE:

No, no. I was recognized, Mr.  
Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

However, we have to be clear that  
we are not going by the rules of  
Clyde here. If the hon. Speaker  
says 'If the minister now speaks  
he closes debate', that is the  
rule. It is not for the Leader of  
the Opposition to say, no, Mr.

Speaker, you do not make the rules around here, I make the rules. The Leader of the Opposition really has to get down and do some study as to what parliamentary practice is. You do not make the rules. There are rules that you go by. You do not make the rules and everybody else go by them, there are rules made that you go by. Now if you can get that through your skull in this debate, we will have achieved something. If the hon. Speaker says 'if the minister speaks now closes the debate,' that is the rule. We are parliamentarians here. That is the rule we go by. We do not go by the rule, Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, I am going to change that rule and I am going to say, I am going to decide how this House works. That is not the way this Parliament works. It is not the way British Parliamentary Practice is. Could you please try to understand that? Because if you can understand that, we will get along a lot better in this House.

MR. TULK:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour did recognize the hon. Minister for Transportation -

MR. MORGAN:  
He did recognize the minister.

MR. TULK:  
Keep your cool now! Keep your cool!

The member for Torngat Mountains, the Minister of Northern Development, was standing and the

member for Port de Grave was standing. If Your Honour did not see them, I am sure he will revert to that. Your Honour knows perfectly well that he is entitled to say 'If the minister speaks now, he closes the debate,' but, at the same time, if other members wish to speak -

DR. COLLINS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:  
He understood that. He rose on a point of order to point it out. The hon. gentleman is out to lunch. The Minister of Health is beneath himself. He is in the mud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
That is right.

MR. TULK:  
It is time for him to get up into Parliament.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK:  
He is in the mud.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am prepared to rule on that point of order.

I did recognize the hon. minister. It is the minister's bill, and he is certainly entitled to close the debate. But certainly anybody who has not spoken already can certainly speak for a half hour, if they so wish.

I recognize the hon. Minister of Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After the last two days debating the agreement that has been reached by the federal and provincial governments on the demise of the railway, I must say I am a little bit surprised at two particular incidents.

Last night we sat in this House for three hours and approaching the second hour tonight, and one of the major developments in this agreement was the completion of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, not only did the Leader of the Opposition not say one word about what was in there for Labrador, not only that, but the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) was been deliberately absent last night and deliberately absent tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why? Let us ask ourselves the question why.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

I know where the hon. gentleman wants to get. I know they want to attack people on a personal basis. I know they want to attack as they have been trying to do to the Leader of the Opposition on a personal basis because they have got no policy.

But I would remind, the Speaker, if he has not heard the hon.

gentleman, that it is unparliamentary to refer to the absence of a member from the House. I would ask, the Speaker, to bring the hon. gentleman to order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the member for Fogo is an experienced parliamentarian. We have known him for many years in this House. He used to never get up on such foolish points of order as that. Something has happened over there in the last few months which has even upset the hon. member for Fogo. I do not know what it is. Anyway, something radically difficult has happened over there and hopefully it will change. It is a foolish point of order that the hon. member has brought up.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I did not hear the remark, but it is not parliamentary to refer to the absence of an hon. member.

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will still say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Naskaupi is noticed by his absence. He has not been here last night and he is not here again tonight. I will say it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, did you hear him that time? He did refer to the absence of a member from this House. I ask Your Honour to bring him to order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member is quite correct, the hon. minister should not refer to the absence of a hon. member and I would ask him not to do so.

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will not refer to the absence of the member for Naskaupi, however, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is very, very difficult, and I am wearing glasses, but I do see an empty seat over there which is usually occupied by the member for Naskaupi.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Do not do through the back what you are not allowed to do through the front door. Stop the hon. gentleman now!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. House Leader of the Opposition gets up and makes some statement. Where is his reference for that last remark? 'You cannot go to the back door.' I never heard of that reference. Where is the reference? So, ignore it, Mr. Speaker. If he comes up and makes some bald statement, one does not have to accept that. If he does not quote references, one can ignore him.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the point is well taken. I think the hon. minister should just carry on with his deliberation.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I agree, and I thank you for your ruling. However, Mr. Speaker, I must say I have heard today since the House closed at five o'clock, that a particular member of this legislature, because he agrees with the agreement and with money for Labrador, because this particular member agrees with the money that has been allotted for transportation in Labrador and he does not want to get into debate because he will be going against his party, subsequently the hon. member is not here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help saying that because it is a fact the Leader of the Liberals has said the member for Labrador is absent because he is for the money for the Trans-Labrador Highway.

MR. TULK:

He has referred to the absence of the member again! Settle down!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have already drawn to the attention of the hon. minister that it is not parliamentary to refer to the absence of the member, and he is persisting in doing so. I ask him not to do so anymore.

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will try to keep my comments as clear as possible without referring to any particular member in the Legislature. I hate to do that, Mr. Speaker, because I think the member for Naskaupi is an outstanding gentleman, and the member for Naskaupi is in support of the money for Labrador, Mr. Speaker. The member for Naskaupi supports the money that is going to Labrador!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, that is a fact! Now, I do not know if the member was allowed to come in or not, but I know for a fact the member for Naskaupi supports the money that is going into Labrador and the Trans - Labrador Highway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, maybe the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues can give the reason why he is not here. I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:  
He is an outstanding gentleman but

tonight he is out standing somewhere else.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, a while ago, just before the last budget, I understand that the Opposition Party had what you would call a brainstorm. The 'man Leo' said the budget is going to contain, above everything else, a slush fund for an election. Maybe this is what this was today. I am going to refer to other members and then I will come back to a particular member who made some other comments in that particular caucus meeting.

The member here called 'Jim'. I do not know which member that was but he was called 'Jim'. He said, 'This government is going to play games with municipal capital grants.' Another member called 'John': 'No real effort to create permanent jobs.' Another member called 'Beaton' - just listen to what he was saying. It is amazing what goes through little kids minds sometimes. 'Inadequate funds for transportation,' and no mention of the railway. Mr. Speaker, is that not shameful?

Mr. Speaker, I will table this because this was in a recent edition of the paper, and yesterday the hon. Leader of the Opposition - I have listened to a tape from his conference yesterday and apparently he left the impression that our present Premier has not been treating Newfoundland and Labrador fairly. I would think that is a fair impression of what he left. I would say it is a fair statement, exactly what you said.

Just to show that the Leader of the Opposition is not the only person in this Province who has

some idea of what the Premier is doing, there are some other people who think the opposite of what the leader thinks. It does not take very much to change your mind anyhow.

However, in yesterday's paper there was a quotation and it talks about our Premier. "He is tough, proud to be a Newfoundlander and very proud of his Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, very proud of people, and very bound and determined that their fortunes will improve as they already have under his leadership.

"I hope you will be watching as our Province's good fortunes improve considerably over the next short while and I will then be looking forward to your very positive comments in the future."

That comment is from an individual in this Province who, I think, is very positive about what happened yesterday. I am very positive and very excited about what happened yesterday and I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, after having sat in the caucus over there a number of years ago.

Mr. Steven Neary, a very prominent Newfoundlander, a very popular person who has sat around the table on many occasions and has talked with Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Chretien and Mr. LeBlanc, and all the rest of the guys in Ottawa, saying, 'What time are we going to get rid of the railway?'

That was a Liberal philosophy up until yesterday. Up until yesterday morning, they wanted to get rid of the railway! In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only thing which changed their minds was the last two weeks when the Leader of the Opposition would get up - he would

only get one question a day - and he would ask the Minister of Transportation, 'What is happening? Tell us what is happening.' Because he could not find out what was happening --

MR. DOYLE:

And now they will not allow me to tell them what is happening.

MR. WARREN:

Exactly, because he could not find out from the hon. minister, because you do not usually tell until everything is finalized.

MR. DOYLE:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:

You do not usually do that. It is not like Jean Chretien down in the Starboard Quarter one time. I can see the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) looking at me, because the hon. member knows what Mr. Chretien wanted to do.

DR. COLLINS:

How could he know what was going on when it was not in **The Sunday Express**?

MR. WARREN:

I find this very amazing. Last evening, John Turner, after he lost the by-election in Quebec, said the Conservatives bought the election. How funny and how ironic can things be, Mr. Speaker.

I should say to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) that I was offered more money to stay with the Liberals than they paid in Quebec for the by-election, but I would not do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I had calls, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Tobin, and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), to name just three. Mr. Speaker, I was offered more money than was paid for the by-election in Quebec to stay with the Liberal Party.

MR. J. CARTER:

How much?

MS VERGE:

Where were they going to get it?

MR. WARREN:

I must say a thank you to the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) who just asked where they were going to get it. I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is a very famous individual associated with the Liberal Party. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one of them took me on in the last election, challenged me in the last election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did he get a vote?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, in fact he almost got there. He lost by 126 votes. He went close. Now, I do not know exactly the cost of the election to Mr. Woodworth, but I must say, looking at the returns or the statements from the hon. gentleman, he did not spend very much money. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he never spent, according to his statement, as much as I spent but I must say I find it very unusual knowing that there were four rooms in a hotel blocked for twenty-one days, plus two helicopters travelled the coast for twenty-one days. To add it all together, especially when helicopters cost about \$500 an hour, well, however, the hon. gentleman did take me on and unfortunately, I suppose, for him, and fortunately for the people of

the district, I won.

Do you want to say something? If you want to say something you can say it. I know you must be hurting now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

because I understand that you gave away the Upper Churchill and you gave away the offshore. What else do you want to give away? I am surprised the Leader of the Opposition would have the gall -

MR. CALLAN:

What is his opinion of you?

MR. WARREN:

I would say, Mr. Speaker, to my hon. colleague from Bellevue, his opinion of me may be similar to what his opinion is of the hon. member for Bellevue. But then again, Mr. Speaker, it is almost equal to my opinion of him. So, Mr. Speaker, it just shows that unfortunately we get a leader of a particular political party come into this House and act as holy as thou. Mr. Speaker, to be part of a government that fought Newfoundland in the courts, this is unreal. I really think our media is not doing the job that they should do. He fought in the courts against Newfoundland having ownership of the offshore. I think it is ridiculous that the hon. gentleman would think about it.

I just wandered away from my topic, Mr. Speaker, because I was referring to a particular member for Labrador, and I apologize for that. But in The Evening Telegram on March 3, 1973 - I would like to go back to the file, Mr. Speaker. I want to read this

because this is very interesting. I am surprised this evening that a friend of mine for a number of years, and still is, by the way, Mr. Rompkey, was sitting here this evening but he is not here tonight. He has other things to do, of course. This is what Mr. Rompkey said in his maiden speech in 1973.

He said, "Labrador needs a great deal of attention" - now, I have not seen too much today from the Opposition on Labrador - "and should have a member representing them in the House of Commons, a member wholly and solely for Labrador as they have in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon."

In his maiden speech to the House Mr. Rompkey gave notice that: "I shall be introducing a bill in the House to provide a member for Labrador in its own right so that its problems and its potential are put in their proper perspective."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rompkey spent, up until now, I think, something like fifteen years in Ottawa. There was a Royal Commission on the electoral boundaries. There were twenty-three or twenty-four interveners at the Royal Commission. The member for Naskaupi was one; the member for Eagle River was one; the member for Torngat Mountains was one; and many, many others. But one was noticeably absent from intervening for Labrador to have its own seat, Mr. Rompkey.

Why would a man in his maiden speech said that Labrador needs attention? I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the monies that came in today from Ottawa through this government here and the Government in Ottawa, Labrador did get

special attention.

Mr. Speaker, come July 8 Labrador will have its own seat, if there is not an election called before July 8 in Ottawa. Labrador will have its own seat. I must say it is thanks to the member for Eagle River, the member for Naskaupi, and myself and some twenty others, but it is no thanks to Mr. Rompkey.

Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? I can see the hon. member for Twillingate looking at me now and I think he is a very sincere individual. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) - in fact, the member for Gander can ask his brother and his brother will tell him the same thing I am going to tell him now.

The reason that Mr. Rompkey never, never supported the resolution -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are wrong.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman, I could name him four people who were in my presence when Mr. Rompkey gave the reason why. The reason why was he wanted St. Anthony area to be part of the new district. The only reason why was because that was a Liberal stronghold. He figured one chance of winning that new seat was to have St. Anthony part of the new district.

Now, if I am wrong, I would suggest to the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) to ask his brother if that is correct and if that is the reason why. Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong on this one, then I suggest to him he should ask his brother why it was it was decided Mr. Rompkey would



not go to Labrador for his own seat? Mr. Speaker, here in the report, I should say this, see the money for the Trans-Labrador Highway, and see the money for the Red Bay Road. Mr. Speaker, just having come back from Labrador in the last couple of days and hearing the comments I heard up in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very tempted.

It all depends on when the election is called. It all depends on when that seat is declared. It all depends when the federal election is called, and unless Labrador can get better representation than they are getting now, I am going to look at it very seriously, I tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), I would think there are a couple of other members in Labrador who are a little bit scared. I believe the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) knows whose his opponent will be in the nomination. He also knows who our candidate is. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) knows he is in trouble because, Mr. Speaker, even today they are not standing up for the money that we got from Ottawa for the Trans-Labrador Highway. Here are two days in a row and neither one of the members have said one word! What is wrong?

The hon. gentleman said, 'it is a pittance.' Why do you not tell the people in Red Bay who are going to get their road paved that it is pittance. Mr. Speaker, there is the same hon. gentleman who never came into this government or asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) to get a road from Domino to Black Tickle. That is the same member

who never even requested it. Then he makes a phone call into Black Tickle and says, 'I am so proud we have a road from Black Tickle to Domino.' Mr. Speaker, there you go. I must say the letter written to member for Eagle River just shows he never had one thing to do with getting the road from Domino to Black Tickle. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see what he is saying is a pittance.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman could have read the papers on the weekend, tenders are called for major improvements to the roads in Postville and Makkovik.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Next year there will be more improvements to the roads. Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do so. Not only that, on top of the construction that is already happening on the Trans-Labrador Highway, the minister announced today another twenty kilometers.

I was hoping to get the communiqué that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) read this evening. I missed some of it. He was saying what the liberals were going to do.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot accelerate construction more than has been done this year. You cannot do any more. The equipment, the manpower, the machinery, nothing is available to do any more in Central Labrador than will be happening this year. It is just impossible to do anymore. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is happening so much now, the lack of employment or the lack of people to be employed there in the labour force, that we had to go to

Southern Labrador to get people to come in.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Import labour?

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, we had to import labour into Labrador, Mr. Speaker. In Goose Bay last year you had to import people in. People had to go into Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I got jobs for a number of people to go to Goose Bay to work because there was so much work to be done.

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

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

MR. HISCOCK:  
The member said that Goose Bay has to import people and he was proud of being able to make representation for people to get jobs. What is the unemployment in Nain, Makkovik and Postville, and how many of them were trained to go into the jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:  
I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order there. The hon. gentleman asked me a question. I should say to him, the unemployment in Nain, Postville, Makkovik, Cartwright - not necessarily Cartwright - Black Tickle, William's Harbour, Fox Harbour, St. Lewis, Lodge Bay, Charlottetown, and Rigolet, naturally there are a lot of

people there looking for work. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that last year I got a number of people from those communities to go to Goose Bay to work. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I got people to go to work, because they called me and asked could I find jobs for them, which I did.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman: How many people did he get from his district to go to work in Goose Bay?

MR. HISCOCK:  
They are independent people and can get it on their own.

MR. SIMMONS:  
They tell me there is zero unemployment in Hebron.

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I was in the Cabinet for only ten days, there would be zero unemployment there too.

MR. SIMMONS:  
You are good for the cabinet. You have the wood in all the right places.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, what a funny man from Fortune - Hermitage, who sold off the South Coast! Mr. Speaker, I must say to my colleague, 'How true!' There is a story about a Newfoundlander going up to the mainland and when he gets his ten weeks he comes back because he has his ten weeks stamps. The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage, when he had ten days, he thought he had ten weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I sympathize with the hon. gentleman. You have to get ten weeks in order to qualify. So, Mr. Speaker, you should try to get your ten weeks first.

I know I only have five minutes left, Mr. Speaker. I am sure right after I am finished - I know who the next speaker is, Mr. Speaker, because I sort of coaxed him out of his seat. He has to be the next speaker, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Naskaupi unfortunately, for some reason, is not here, and there is only one other member.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I ask the hon. minister not to refer to the absence of members. I would be obliged if he would do so.

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

That is four times tonight. Sometimes you get dragged into the fray, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I am sure after the last twenty minutes there is only one member on that side now who will definitely follow me, and stand up for Labrador is worth to this Province and Labrador is worth to the rest of Canada, it has to be the member for Eagle River. It has to be because there is no other member over there from Labrador. After me, there is only one member left over there from Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member from Eagle is going to be the next speaker. There is no choice.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, look! He is as bad as the member for St. John's

East (Mr. Long). He will leave as soon as the pressure gets hot. I am sure the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) will be the next speaker on that side. After him, who else is going to stand up for Labrador, if I cannot get my three colleagues to help me?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I need my three colleagues to help me.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I refer you to Beauchesne, page 103, Paragraph 316 (c), and Mr. Speaker, you will notice there, as my colleague from Fogo has mentioned, you cannot refer to the absence of specific members, but there is another exclusion in (c) that it is unparliamentary for a member in speaking to refer to the presence of specific members. His constants references to the member for Eagle River are also unparliamentary.

I got off the train there for a few minutes, I had to go outside, but Mr. Speaker, I wish he would get a little bit relevant. He has a few minutes left. Could he give us the benefit of his thinking on the wisdom behind this marvelous sell out of Newfoundland's interest?

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, I have

already drawn attention to the hon. minister about referring to the absence of hon. members. In regard to the presence of hon. members, even though it is in Beauséjour, in our precedents, we are referring to hon. members all the time and certainly I cannot see there is a point of order there.

The hon. the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have one minute left, and Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. In my closing remarks, I refer back to what the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage said, "What is the crux of the whole thing?"

Mr. Speaker, there are four members for Labrador and there is something like \$30 million going into Labrador. I would think, in all due respect to the member for Merihek, who is not allowed into this House at the present time, I would expect there would be enough decency with the other two members to at least stand up and support the money that is going into Labrador.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Yesterday morning when I had, not the opportunity, but the dismay to listen first to the statements made by the Premier of this Province and then to read the agreement he had signed with his federal counterparts, his Tory buddies in Ottawa, to sell out any hope Newfoundland had for the future in any decent mode of transportation, it was the most disgusting thing anybody could possibly hear in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

When I read it, I read it over, and I read it over, and still I could not believe what I was reading! At least three times while sitting at my desk I turned to my colleague for Gander (Mr. Baker) and I said: Is this fact? Is this actually what the Premier of this Province, the fighting Newfoundlander, the man who said he would stand up for the Province at all costs, is this what he had taken from his Tory buddies? Is this an insult that he had taken, a case of the FFTs, a case of a complete insult to every last human being in this Province, regardless of their political favours.

Mr. Speaker, the money coming into this Province was \$40 million a year deficit, \$30 million a year road agreements to rebuild the Trans-Canada Highway, \$70 million there. I mean, \$70 million over fifteen years is \$1 billion, \$50 million. What did we get? \$400 million.

MR. TULK:

Where is the \$1 billion?

MR. EFFORD:

The \$40 million deficit they are paying for the railway, \$30 million a year to build the Trans-Canada Highway, is \$70 million for fifteen years. Forget about the Secondary Roads Agreement, forget about all the other agreements, that is \$1 billion for the next fifteen years.

Now, there is not one member of that government, not one speaker from that side who has stood up and addressed the issue. They have talked about letters that were written by the former members twenty or twenty-five years ago, the government. Tear them up and throw them away, they do not mean anything! Forget about the promises Mr. Peckford himself made about widening the railway and keeping the railway, they do not mean anything. That was years ago. The railway is gone.

What matters is what lies in the future and what lies in the future is nothing for this Province. If we are to do away with the railway, while we have done away with the railway, and if we are to have a decent mode of transportation, the only thing left is to have a highway across the Province able to maintain the extra traffic and the extra work load which is going to be place onto it.

How can that be done when the \$400 million to be spent on the highway is not even going to start until 1992? The railway is going to be phased out completely by September and we are only going to have an extra fourteen tractor trailer loads per day on that.

But, if you listened to the comment made this morning by the

Mayor of St. John's in the study they have read, that each tractor trailer is equivalent to 4,000 cars going over the Trans-Canada and fourteen times 4,000 is 56,000 vehicles going over the Trans-Canada. That is extra load and we know, Mr. Speaker, if this government would just stop and think, take the railway away, that is an extra load. The increase in private business over the next several years, if the economy even grows at the slow pace that this government has allowed it to grow, but at the pace when the next Liberal government after the next election wins, can you imagine the transports that are going to go over the Trans-Canada Highway? Can you imagine what it is going to cost to build a highway efficient enough to keep that type of traffic? Can you imagine what it is going to cost to maintain a highway like that?

Mr. Speaker, one and one does not make three. This former Minister of Finance has been trying to tell the people of this Province that is how you add up the finances. This former Minister of Finance, the present Minister of Health and the Premier of this Province tells the people that we do not have enough money to give an adequate hospital health care system to this Province. We do not have enough money to give a decent form of education to the people of this Province. We have not had enough money to provide a decent road service to date. We have not had the money and we all understand that. The economy has not allowed us to have that type of money.

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, if we had not had that money up until 1988, now that the railway is gone and the extra work load is going to be put on the

Trans-Canada, across this Province, where is the money going to come from to maintain the highway?

Unless the Minister of Transportation and the Minister of Finance and the Premier of this Province now have planted money trees in their backyard, so they can go out and pick off the bills as they need them, Mr. Speaker, this highway is going to suffer. This highway, Mr. Speaker, is going to be even worse than it is today.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about twinning the highway going as far as Come By Chance and from Corner Brook to Port aux Basques. What happens after you pass the Argentic Access Road, then they have to dissolve. Donald Duck used to do it in the Walt Disney characters. He used to get off the cartoon, fold up his car, put it in his suitcase, and walk on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

That is what he has to do. He has to fold up the tractor trailers, put it in his pocket and go on the rest of the way on the Trans-Canada. What a stupid thing to tell the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely irresponsible for any government to even try and tell the people of this Province, tractor trailers are going to disappear. Fold them up and walk them in your hand across. What a thing!

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation brags about the secondary road agreement, the \$235 million. We have not had a secondary road's agreement in this

Province for the last five years. We should have had a secondary road agreement, we should have had that money five years ago. This is not money for the railway of Newfoundland. This is money to owed the people of Newfoundland. We would have gotten that money anyhow. That money belongs to the people of Newfoundland. That is the secondary road agreement. You cannot take credit for that, Mr. Speaker.

I can understand the Minister of Transportation not knowing the difference because all while the negotiations were going on he never, never took part of it. He never knew about it. He never left this House of Assembly. Your attendance record was 100 per cent here. You knew nothing about the negotiations. So obviously I would say to the Minister of Transportation, keep her down! Keep her down because you do not know what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, to look at this sort of an agreement there has to be something wrong because I still do not believe, I honestly, and I do not think the people in the gallery, I do not think people on either side in the galleries could believe the Premier of this Province signed this agreement. There is something desperately wrong. There is something yet that we do not know about.

Can you imagine a Premier who would fight until every last ounce of strength went out of his body for the people of this Province, he said that time and time again, why he would give away a mode of transportation for monies that we would have gotten anyhow?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Four hundred million dollars. Here we are it is 1988, the money is not even going to be started to be spent until 1992, is that correct? 1992, we are going to spend \$10 million of that amount of money. This year alone there is going to be \$30 million spent on the highway, but in 1992 we are only going to get \$10 million. How do you explain that? We are talking about the \$400 million. That, Mr. Speaker, is not a deal for the people of this Province. We are \$400 million below what we would have got even if the railway had stayed. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, it is no good for the people of the government to try and tell what they have done because it is against any logic. There is absolutely no logic to the agreement.

I would say the Premier of this Province was out to lunch. I would say he was in the limousine tipping his driver when this agreement was signed because he certainly was not a part of the agreement. If the Premier of this Province had any decency and any caring for the people of this Province, there is no way he would sit down and allow somebody to hoodwink him, somebody to bluff him into saying this is a package that the people of Newfoundland will accept. It is a sellout, Mr. Speaker, that nobody in this Province is willing to accept.

What you have there is past and history. What the Premier said on December 21, 1987: "Mr. Kevin Aylward, MHA, Stephenville district, House of Assembly. Dear Mr. Aylward." From the hon. Ronald Dawe, the then Minister of Transportation. It spells out

very clearly about the closing out of the railway in Newfoundland. That does not matter anymore. That is past history. We are not concerned about that. The then Minister of Transportation made a statement.

What matters to the people of this Province is what is happening today and what is going to happen in the future. That is what matters to the Province. The railway is no longer an issue. The roads and the Trans-Canada is the issue. It was touched on two or three times today by the ministers on that side. If this government, and if this Premier is so proud and have the confidence in themselves they are trying to display to us, and they think the people are behind them, why do they not call an election on the issue and see then where the people of this Province stand?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

You have already stated this is the best deal the Province could hope to have. This is a great thing. This is the greatest since sliced bread. That is what the Premier said. It is the best deal which could possibly be made for this Province.

If that is the case, then call an election on it. Bring it to the people. The people understand what is in here. The people understand there is no maintenance agreement, the people understand that we do not have money for health, we do not have money for education, we do not have money to maintain our roads now. They

understand there is not going to be money to maintain the roads. They will tell you when they mark their X.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is not one individual in this Province who has any confidence or any respect for the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) anymore in this portfolio. Not, one person in this Province, so your words are empty, Sir, your words are absolutely empty. It would be better if the Premier had said, 'No, I am not going to sign any agreement. Take the railway and throw it away, do what you like with it, but I am not going to sign the agreement.' We would have got the money anyway, perhaps more money than is coming in now. We would have been better off. The people of this Province would have said, 'At least he fought for us and he would not quit. He would not give up, he held out.'

We would have gained if he had not signed that agreement because the money that is coming in now and the money that would have come in over the next fifteen years would have been more money than what is in this agreement. The Premier himself would have at least played a political game he could have won on but the game he has played now is no way only lose, Mr. Speaker. There is no way he can possibly win. It is absolutely irresponsible for any Premier or anybody connected with this House of Assembly to even give the slightest indication that they are in favour of any clause in this particular agreement.

What about the secondary road

agreement? Conception Bay! The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) are not here this evening and they have not risen in their seats.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order!

MR. EFFORD:

I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I am not suppose to refer to that. The point, Mr. Speaker, is that I have not heard them make any reference to this agreement. We had a railway station in Clarke's Beach, in Bay Roberts, in Harbour Grace and in Carbonear. It was given up, understandably, given up for something better.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You agreed to that.

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, we agreed, the people of today and the people of yesterday.

DR. COLLINS:

What did we get in return?

MR. EFFORD:

We got absolutely nothing in return for it. Last year the the Minister of Transportation and the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities sat down and they agreed to have the tracks taken up with the understanding that in this agreement there would be a package for the area. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely not one penny for the people of Conception Bay, not \$1 in this agreement, not \$1 to build new roads, to widen new roads, or to even maintain the road presently running through Conception Bay.

Will the Minister of Transportation explain to me where there is \$1 in this for Conception



Ray? There is not one mention.

MR. DOYLE:

There is \$235 million (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

\$235 million! It goes no where! There is no where in that agreement to say it goes any where in Conception Bay or any where else in this Province! It is up to your political slush funds where you put it. There is absolutely nothing there in black or white to say where it goes and the agreement should not have been signed until that agreement was made. It is \$235 million we should have gotten anyhow and you are now going to use as a political slush fund, but make no mistake about it Mr. Minister of Transportation, your political slush fund will not work in Harbour Grace, and it will not work in Carbonear, and it will not work in Trinity - Bay de Verde, and I guarantee you it will not work in Port de Grave. I can assure you of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Make no mistake, everybody on that side knows that that is a fact. There will not be one district out there that will go PC the next election, and the \$235 million will not buy it. If you do not believe me, call the election and we will soon find out.

That is deceiving the people. Deceiving the people is what this government is all about. They deceived us in the FFT's, they deceived us in the offshore agreement, they deceived us in the 40,000 jobs the Premier promised after the last election. They deceived us, Mr. Speaker, in

everything that they have ever put forth. There is no question about it, Mr. Speaker, their deceiving days are over. This is the straw that has broken the camel's back, Mr. Speaker, no question about. This is the straw that has broken about it. There is nothing in this for the future of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, how can this agreement be accepted? The figures do not add up to what the Premier and the Minister of Transportation is saying, \$400 million dollars to be spent in the beginning of 1992 - 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, no money, only what is existing now. Why is not that money going to be spent today?

The \$400 million is not going to be spent until 1992. The \$100 million you are talking about has no connection with that whatsoever. That has got nothing to do with that whatsoever. The package is here, Sir, and the package is here and anybody with any open eyes at all can read it, a complete sell out.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to stand here in this House of Assembly this evening and repeat over and over again, stick to the facts of what is here! Forget about what had happened in the past, the railway is gone! Whatever statements were made by the Premier of this Province five years ago and by the ministers opposite matters not.

What matters is we have sold out the future of transportation in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have sold out the only mode of transportation left across this Province. We have one. Every other province has two. We have one, and that is not

going to be worth the paper that it is written on.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

No, I did not want to keep the railway. No one argues that. All we had to do was keep the railway until we got a decent mode of transportation, or sign a decent agreement, hold out.

Anybody with any intelligence whatsoever would have thrown that back in John Crosbie's face! Who would accept a piece of garbage like that an insult to every Newfoundlander and Labradorian!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

No. The roads are the responsibility -

MR. TOBIN:

Are you calling the road to Petite Forte and the rest of the Province garbage? You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. EFFORD:

Everybody needs pavement! I would not even entertain the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) because we all know what his capabilities are.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to go on and try to distract from the agreement, distract from the argument being put forth. We have nothing against people getting pavement. We need pavement. The people of Petit Forte, the people of Badger, the people of Corner Brook, the people of Port aux Basques, the people of Bonavista, everybody in this Province needs roads. That is what we are

talking about.

We are talking about a decent mode of transportation. What is going to happen? In Port de Grave district we have eight fish plants; in Harbour Grace we have one of the largest fish plants in the Island; in Carbonear the same way; and all the private business operations in that particular area. How in the name of goodness are the tractor trailers going to get over a road, if we do not have a decent road to travel over?

Going down through all of the communities now it is not wide enough for two tractor trailers or two vehicles to pass with any satisfaction. Why was there not something put in black and white in this to say, 'In 1989, beginning in the Spring of the year, the by-pass road is going to be started.' Why was that not in the agreement that the people could see?

Yes, the \$235 million is there for the secondary roads agreement, that is providing the Minister of Transportation and his colleagues can spend it where they figure they are going to get the most votes.

We saw what happened to the municipal grants in Port de Grave district. Not one dollar to any town council. We have four mayors, the mayor of Bay Roberts, the mayor of Clarke's Beach, the mayor of North River and the mayor of South River, strong Tory supporters who now were strong Tory supporters. They attended your conventions! And here the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Brett) in handing out the grants completely ignored them because they got a Liberal member. Well, what a slap in the face! What an

insult to those people who supported your party!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

The last time I won by 1,500 votes, that is 1,504 for the next election. Man, oh man! I gained an extra 500 votes because of that. People are not going to be dictated to. People are not going to be insulted. This is nothing only a form of dictation. John Crosbie and Brian Mulroney - this is all this is - they said, 'Take it or get lost.' It would be better if the Premier of this Province had not taken it. The people of this Province could have at least held their heads up with some pride and said, 'We are not going to take any insults or any garbage anymore from Ottawa as we have been taking all down through the years,' Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

What would you be for?

MR. EFFORD:

What would I be for? I would be for a decent mode of transportation, a highway across with at least a maintenance agreement, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

- with at least enough money to maintain the highway! That is all we had before. At least enough trouble -

MR. TOBIN:

Why was there not a maintenance agreement in Argentina?

MR. EFFORD:

Do not go telling me what happened

in 1967!

Why did not my grandfather have a diesel engine in his sailboats? I do not know. I was not around at that time. I am around today and we know what is good for the Province in future. Do not go talking about the past, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my greatest fear for the future is where the money is going to come from for the road agreements, probably from ACOA. That is my greatest fear, the money is going to have to come out of the ACOA fund for the future for our secondary roads and for the building of our roads in Newfoundland.

MR. TORIN:

He knows that is not true.

MR. EFFORD:

No, I do not know that is not true. With the confidence we have in this government today, there is nothing to tell me that they would not be foolish enough to sign anything, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if the railway had to close out and all Ottawa would have given us was the \$40 million which they were losing in maintaining the railway, it would have been more than we are getting here. All they had to say is, 'Take the railway, give us the \$40 million and maintain what we are getting now' and we would be better off.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) tried to say to us, 'Look, we are getting the \$400 million on top of what we are

getting now.' That is totally false!

There is nothing in this agreement. This is not going to start until 1992. If that was the case, why is not the \$400 million going to be spent today? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

What about the 155 seasonal workers of this Province? Do jobs not matter to the 155 seasonal workers, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, those people have to have jobs.

MR. DAWE:

They are going to be looked after.

MR. EFFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the question. They say they are going to be looked after. This is the summer of 1988. There is still a railway in this Province, yet there is not one of those seasonal workers working today. How are they going to be looked after, Mr. Speaker? Why are they not working today, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DAWE:

Why do you not wait 24 hours?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if this government had any consideration for the people of this Province, they would have thrown this back at John Crosbie. If they had any consideration, Mr. Speaker, for the workers of this Province, the full-time workers and the part-time workers who work seasonally with the railway, they would have thrown it back. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, they left an insult to the people of this Province and the only way the people of this Province will get even at that is after the next election, whenever it may be, and

the sooner, Mr. Speaker, the better. We will show what it is all about!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have heard of verbal gymnastics from time to time, and I have seen them performed on occasion in this House, but I have very seldom heard of mathematical gymnastics performed to the extent just performed by the hon. gentleman who took his seat. To be able to say, and in a public forum, in the legislature, with some people in the galleries, the media listening and so on, to be able to say with any degree of sincerity, Mr. Speaker, in a public forum without choking, that this Province would be better off by taking the \$40 million a year the Government of Canada loses on the railway in Newfoundland and Labrador and that is it!

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman got to be ridiculed, and he will be once it becomes known, from Cape Chidley to St. Mary's Bay for that kind of foolish logic!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if there was any group of people I have seen in the last number of months who have been whistling as they marched

past the graveyard, their philosophy was in the speech made by the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, and that is why this debate is on, Mr. Speaker. That is why it was on yesterday, that is why it was on last night, that is why it is on again today, because this hon. group, the official Opposition in the House, know that this particular government and the Government of Canada, in this package called **Towards 2000** holds out the future prosperity of Newfoundland and Labrador. They know it, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

They know, Mr. Speaker, that wrapped up in this agreement is prosperity, that the curse of isolation has been broken forever more for the people of Petit Fort. They know that it means improvements to the highway from Bay Verte to the Trans-Canada Highway. They know that it means improvements to the Bonavista Highway, Mr. Speaker. They know that it means an improved Trans-Canada Highway. They know that it means that finally the road from Roddickton and Englee over to Plum Point will be paved.

This is just not an agreement to get rid of the railway, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreement to make sure that every part of rural Newfoundland comes into the Twenty-First Century, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is all about, and that is why the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador have got to scratch and claw and beg and try to make sure that somehow or other they can set the seeds of doubt in the minds of the public of Newfoundland and

Labrador, that there is something wrong with this deal. That is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, and that is exactly what has been taking place here in this Legislature over the last couple of days. But it is not going to happen, Mr. Speaker, because there is not one person walking the streets of Ming's Bight tonight who are upset because the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada have struck a deal that is good for Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is not one person walking the street in Purbeck's Cove tonight who is upset because of that deal, Mr. Speaker. And what government, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this Province, of any political stripe, fought with more determination, turned over the last stone, Mr. Speaker, created new challenges where there were not challenges before, fought with the last remnants of its determination and wisdom and fortitude to try to save the Newfoundland Railway? It was the PC Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. It was this government, this administration, and previous administrations formed by this party, who stood by the railway of Newfoundland and Labrador. It was this administration. So we do not have to go out of this House and go to the people of Port aux Basques or the people of Bishop's Falls or the people of Corner Brook or the people of anywhere else and hang our heads, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This party fought to save the railway of Newfoundland and Labrador. We do not have to stand in this House, or in any forum anywhere else in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and take a back seat to any political movement for our defence and our efforts to try and save the railway, and we are not going to, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Make your point.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will get to my points in the debate at the point that I want to get to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We do not have to take a back seat as a political party to anybody, least of all the hon. gentlemen opposite, for our determined effort to try to save and make viable the railway of this Province. We do not have to do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

You say that with a straight face.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, Sir. And we have no reason but to have a smile on our face, Mr. Speaker, for all the world to see because everybody in this Province knows it. They know it in LaScie and Fleur de Lys and St. Mary's, and all around the Province, that this government has tried its very best through difficult times, Mr. Speaker, without the support of the Opposition, without the support of the Opposition's party and some of their members when they were the government in Ottawa, without their support we tried to do the

impossible. We tried what history has not been able to do since the 1800s, to save and make viable the railway in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. DECKER:

But you failed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks and months we had to make a decision. Mr. Speaker, looking at the statistics, with something less, I believe, than 20 per cent of the freight traffic now moved across Newfoundland and Labrador moved by the railway, and getting worse, do you sit back in your seat and allow the inevitable to happen? Is that being responsible, Mr. Speaker? Do you sit back in your seat and allow to disappear the jobs of 400 or 500 people, however many workers are engaged in that industry, and some of them coming to us and saying, 'For God's sake, Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, if you are going to do anything, try to get it done soon because the next thing the inevitable is going to happen and we are going to get nothing anyway.' That has happened, Mr. Speaker. With 20 per cent or less of the traffic, and it continuing to decline, do we close our eyes to reality? Do we close our eyes to reality and just let reality and the natural course of things take place and nothing happens?

MR. TULK:

You always have.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, they are the people so hyped up about decorum and so on, as I am sure you have noticed.

Do you allow yourself, Mr. Speaker, as a responsible

government to do that? I have to say that if I have to join in that decision the answer unequivocally has to be no. But you do not take the approach of the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave, Mr. Speaker. You do not take that approach where you say, 'Give me the \$40 million that you were paying in losses as a subsidy to the railway.' You do not do that and say nothing else. What you try to do, Mr. Speaker, is to negotiate a deal that is possible, a deal that will be good for Newfoundland and Labrador for decades and decades to come. In other words, you have to deal with the reality. You do not, as a government, have the luxury of the Opposition to be able to say no matter what the government does, we are automatically going to be against it. Oppositions have had that luxury for centuries, ever since there has been a parliament. We do not have that luxury. If we had sat back and let the railway take its natural course and die, what would be the debate in this House today? If a decision was announced 1 September 1988 that the railway was going to be closed down six months from that date, what would be the debate in this House next Spring, Mr. Speaker? Who would be leading the debate, who would be leading the charge, chastising and condemning the government for not having negotiated a deal? Who would it be, Mr. Speaker? It would be the same people who cannot see anything good in this particular deal today, it would be the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, the party which is against everything, the party which finds nothing good in anything and is totally negative. No, Mr. Speaker, we were not prepared to do that. We were prepared, and we did in fact take our responsibility seriously.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:  
More than the hon. gentleman got. Enough to be well ahead on the first ballot, Mr. Speaker, which is more than the hon. gentleman got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:  
And not a knife out.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
And not a knife out. That is right.

The hon. gentleman talks about constitutional responsibility. I am not learned in the law, I am certainly only a simple-minded person when it comes to the law, but I have to take advice from those who are, and those who are, Mr. Speaker, tell us that we do not have constitutional protection.

MR. WELLS:  
Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I did not invent that, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, 'Shame.' Well, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has been known from time to time to give good legal advice. He has been known from time to time to give bad legal advice. He has not been 100 per cent spot-on all the time in his legal advice, Mr. Speaker. There are corporations and entities in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who have sought the hon. gentleman's advice. Some have been successful, some have been unsuccessful. Most that have been successful, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, occurred when the hon. gentleman

gave advice against positions that the Province had taken. He has been very good at that, Mr. Speaker. That has been evidenced in the offshore, the Churchill Falls recall case, and things of that nature, where the hon. gentleman gave advice that obviously paid off for the clients he represented. I have no problem with that. That is his right to do, and he was in that business, and I assume he got properly remunerated for the advice that he gave. I assume he did.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the point I was making, the fact of the matter is there will probably be a lot of legal advice on either side of the question. But the best legal advice available to the Crown, to her Majesty -

MR. WELLS:

Table the opinion.

MR. RIDEOUT:

We did. The hon. Premier tabled it yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He did so table it. Mr. Speaker, it was tabled and the answer to the question was that the Province did not have, in terms of maintaining the railway, a constitutional guarantee. The Province did not have it.

So, Mr. Speaker, do you then, having the best advice that is available to you as a government responsible to the people who elected you, trying to provide the best government to the people of the Province, do you totally ignore that? Do you ignore that? Would it be responsible, Mr.

Speaker, for this government to ignore the best legal advice that employees of the Crown and outside lawyers gave us? Would it be responsible for us to do that, and to lead this Province into probably several years of litigation, which would be great for lawyers, Mr. Speaker, but where would the railway be at that point in time? Where would the employees of the railway be at that point in time?

That was an option, Mr. Speaker, that was available to the government. We could have ignored the advice of our legal employees and the lawyers, and said, "The heck with it. We think - Tom Rideout, layperson, Jim Morgan, Dr. Twomey, whoever, layperson - you are wrong, and we are going to forget your advice and we are going to pursue another avenue." We could have done that. That was an option. We do not think it was a responsible option. We do not think it would have been very responsible to the employees of the railway. We do not think it would have been very responsible to the travelling public of Newfoundland and Labrador. We do not think it would have been responsible at all, Mr. Speaker. So, therefore, with that advice in our back pocket available to us, we chose to do the only other alternative that was available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A sellout.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is not a sellout, Mr. Speaker. That is not a sellout.

Mr. Speaker, the artists of sellouts in Newfoundland and Labrador are represented on the other side of this House.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is a fact of history. You do not have to go very far in the pages of history, you do not even have to go back in ancient history in Newfoundland and Labrador to find out which political party represents the sellout artists. It is not over here, Mr. Speaker, it is over there. They are the artists of the sellout factor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Take \$40 million instead of \$835 million, or whatever it is, shut your mouth, go home and you will be better off. That is the Liberalnomics, Mr. Speaker. That is the Liberalnomics that have come from the other side. So you negotiate a deal, and I have no hesitation in going before the public of this Province, anywhere in the Province, particularly my constituents, and saying that this deal is good for Newfoundland and Labrador. I can say it, Mr. Speaker, with no fear of shame. Let those who have shame hanging around their heads bow in shame, Mr. Speaker, but they are not over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Let those who support a political philosophy that has the shames of the past around their heads bow their heads, but they are not over here, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We will be able to say to future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that even though fifteen years is not very much compared to sixty-five, we will be able to say that even though fifteen years is only a drop in the bucket compared to sixty-five, we were not even prepared to put our signatures on your behalf to that kind of an agreement. We are too cautious, we are too concerned for the future, we are too hyped-up with the fact that things might change too much on us over fifteen years, so we would not even ink that kind of an agreement. This government was so responsible that it would not contemplate signing that kind of an agreement, and it was not pushed down our throats to sign that kind of an agreement. We said, no, we will go about half way, we will go about eight years. Imagine if you had gone twenty on the other one, Mr. Speaker. We would have rights to negotiate today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You would not have to be humiliated sitting in this Province today with the Supreme Court or the country saying you cannot even sit down and talk for sixty odd years.

MR. MORGAN:

You would not be worried about maintenance costs.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You would not be worrying about maintenance costs, Mr. Speaker. A little small agreement like a fifteen year agreement, a government that was so politically determined to protect the future of its residents that it said, no

way are we going to sign that without a reopener so that we can compare, have a look, reassess, and see if the deal is working the way that we envisioned it would work in 1988 when we signed it. That is why that I have no hesitation in saying that this particular agreement is an agreement that has a vision for the future in it. It is not an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that was signed with blinkers on, not worrying about whether tomorrow is going to change, get the fast political boost out of it and the heck with what happens ten or fifteen years down the road. That has never been the approach of this party, Mr. Speaker. That has been the approach of other political parties in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, but it has not been the approach of this party, and it is not going to be the approach of this party, Mr. Speaker. We have protection. We have accomplished what many would argue in the courts of this land - and the hon. gentleman might on behalf of somebody if he were still out in the private sector - we had no right to accomplish. There would be many, I think, who would argue that we accomplished what we had no right to accomplish under the law, what we had no right to accomplish under the constitution, what we had no right to accomplish for the people of this Province. There would be people who would argue that, but this government stuck to its guns, Mr. Speaker, and made sure that future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians were not going to be penalized. If there was one shred of a chance, if there was one shred of an opportunity that we could negotiate a package to improve the transportation system in Newfoundland and Labrador that was

the position, Mr. Speaker, we adopted, that was the position that we carried into dialogue and negotiations with the Government of Canada on this matter. Even if that shred was only moral, even if there was no shred of constitutional responsibility, but even if it was only moral you have an obligation to ensure that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are provided with an enhanced transportation system. You have an obligation to ensure that the employees are taken care of, you have an obligation to ensure that certain towns in this Province that were historically dependant on the railway have a fair degree of development opportunity offered to them, and, Mr. Speaker, we were able to accomplish that.

And what do you hear from one end to the other of Newfoundland and Labrador today? The vast, vast majority of people I have talked to over the last several hours have been saying it is time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when governments have to govern, and this government does not mind accepting its responsibility to govern.

That is what we were elected for. If and when, Mr. Speaker, the people want to change that, this is not South Africa, Mr. Speaker, this is not Nigeria, where you have to go with a gun and say vote for that person. Despite what you hear from the Opposition, we are willing to put our names on a document after careful negotiation and consideration, and we are willing to put the reputation of

the government behind it and take it to the people, Mr. Speaker. That is what democracy is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDFOUT:

So what we see from the other side, Mr. Speaker, is a whole bunch of fears. There is the fear of this railway deal. They used to, very cautiously in Question Period over the last several months, ask little questions about it. They never delved very much or never spent a lot of time at it, but very cautiously because that could interfere with the grand design of the hon. leader of the Party opposite. There was the fear of the Province being flukie enough, being able to negotiate a good transportation deal for Newfoundland and Labrador. That was the fear, Mr. Speaker.

There is a fear on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker, and there is a fear in high corporate places in this Province that those things might come about including the one I just mentioned. There is nothing worse than paying for something, Mr. Speaker, before you get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDFOUT:

So there is that fear.

There was a fear that this government might somehow or other, by hook or by crook, by fluke or determination or good government, or a combination of all three, negotiate a transportation package for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. There was a fear, Mr. Speaker, that this government, by

hook or by crook or by good government, might be able, with the help of the Government of Canada, pull off Hibernia. They are trembling in their shoes, Mr. Speaker, that we will pull off Hibernia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDFOUT:

There is a fear, Mr. Speaker, that somehow or other this government, by co-operation with the Government of Quebec, might pull off some kind of a coup in terms of that infamous Churchill Falls Agreement, and create further development in Labrador. That is a fear, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDFOUT:

And there was a fourth fear, Mr. Speaker, that even if the government could not succeed on any of those, or on one or two or, God forbid!, all three, even if that did not happen there was another fear, that somehow or other -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about the Sprung greenhouse?

MR. RIDFOUT:

I am not worried, Sir, about campaigning in the streets of Baie Verte on the Sprung greenhouse, not one bit.

Mr. Speaker, there was another fear. There was a fear that somehow or another the government would make sure that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador saw the real Liberal Party under the new Liberal Leader. That was a fear, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And, Mr. Speaker, it has been done, it has been accomplished. Two of those fears have turned out to be the worst fears that the Opposition party could have dreamed of. Two of those fears turned out to be the worst fears that their investors could have ever dreamed of; Mr. Speaker.

Now they are not sure any more. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been questioning the leader of the Opposition for several months, Mr. Speaker. They have been wondering is this really the person we want to entrust with our future direction? They have been asking questions about the trust factor, whether they could really trust the future direction of Newfoundland and Labrador in the hands of that hon. gentleman.

We know, for example, of candidates who have been interviewed and grilled and hauled over the coals and brought back in for a second interview, who promised to run but are now getting in touch saying, "No way! I am having nothing to do with that party."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there was a time over the last few weeks when I thought that the worst kept secret in Newfoundland and Labrador was the future of the railway. But over the last week or ten days, on the political scene of Newfoundland and Labrador, the worst kept secret is what has been happening to the star candidates that the hon. gentleman lined up. They

have been falling, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Speaker, two of their worst fears have come about. There has been a good, dependable, legitimate, honest, rational deal on the future of transportation in Newfoundland and Labrador negotiated by this government. That has happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Secondly, the people have seen the real Liberal Party under the leadership of the hon. gentleman. The people have seen that and they are talking about it no end. I hear it everywhere I go.

And it just might be, Mr. Speaker - God forbid! - that history will not be too kind to this party in the next few weeks and months; for the sake of the hon. gentleman, it just might be, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

It is time to adjourn.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have the right to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman's speech because we intend to settle him down another

way. But on a point of order, the Government House Leader has asked this side if we would consent to a ten o'clock meeting tomorrow morning of the Legislature. I say to the hon. gentleman that we have a couple of more people who want to speak on this issue. Before Your Honour leaves the Chair at 10:00, as he has to, I want to seek a bit of information from the hon. gentleman as to whether we are meeting at ten o'clock or not. The ball is entirely in his court.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I gave the answer both to the House Leader opposite and to the leader of the Opposition. The arrangement was we had private discussions whether we would come back tomorrow morning, in the interest of the people of this Province, at 9:30 and get into legislation to pass some bills, and we got a negative answer from the members opposite. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is saying no, but we got a negative answer, and this is what we get all the time.

MR. TULK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman can stand in his place all he likes, I say to the hon. gentleman that the business of the people of this Province is what has recently gone on as much as any bill he wishes to put on the Order Paper.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is a sellout!

MR. TULK:

A sellout! It is as much the business of the people of this Province as anything the hon. gentleman wishes to put on the Order Paper. And I say to him that this party stands ready, the Opposition stands ready to debate that issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no prima facie case. It is now 10:00 o'clock. The hon. minister's time has elapsed. The House stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow.

MR. TULK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

**Index**

**Answers to Questions**

**tabled**

**June 21, 1988**

RESPONSE TO THE WRITTEN QUESTION BY  
MR. PETER FENWICK,  
MHA FOR THE DISTRICT OF MENEHEK,  
TO THE HON. LEN SIMMS,  
PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD

QUESTION DATED: APRIL 18, 1988

QUESTION:

MR. FENWICK HAS REQUESTED THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. WHAT PLANS THE DEPARTMENT HAS TO PROMOTE THE HIRING OF HANDICAPPED PEOPLE IN THEIR DEPARTMENT OVER THE NEXT YEAR.
2. WHAT FUNDS HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED TO HELP IN PROGRAMS LIKE THIS.
3. WHAT FUNDS HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED TO MAKE THE DEPARTMENT ITSELF, AND THEIR PROGRAMS, MORE ACCESSIBLE TO HANDICAPPED PEOPLE.
4. ANY OTHER PROGRAMS THAT THE DEPARTMENT ITSELF MIGHT HAVE TO HELP THE HANDICAPPED.

*And answer given  
148 to 170.  
Simply Same question &  
Answer.  
Same as*

IN SEPTEMBER, 1985, GOVERNMENT APPOINTED A TASK FORCE ON EMPLOYMENT EQUITY TO STUDY THE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT CONCERNS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES. IN MID 1987, CABINET APPROVED THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE, AND MY COLLEAGUE, THE HON. NEIL WINDSOR, THEN PRESIDENT OF TREASURY BOARD, ANNOUNCED SPECIAL INITIATIVES TO PROMOTE THE REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES WITHIN THE PUBLIC SERVICE. THOSE INITIATIVES INCLUDED:

- DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A TRAINING PLACEMENT PROGRAM (SINCE RENAMED A CAREER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM);
  - RECRUITMENT OF AN EMPLOYMENT EQUITY OFFICER;
  - EFFORTS TO IMPROVE BUILDING ACCESSIBILITY;
  - MANAGEMENT TRAINING TO PROMOTE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ABILITIES OF THE TARGET GROUP;
  - AND OTHER SPECIAL EFFORTS TO ENSURE THE PUBLIC SERVICE WORK ENVIRONMENT MEETS THE NEEDS OF THE TARGET GROUP.
1. IN ORDER TO ENCOURAGE THE PLACEMENT OF MORE PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN PERMANENT POSITIONS, GOVERNMENT IS IMPLEMENTING A CAREER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM. THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS PROGRAM IS TO INCREASE THE REPRESENTATION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES WITHIN THE PUBLIC SERVICE THROUGH THE PROVISION OF ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS. THESE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE DESIGNED TO LEAD TO PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT. THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS PROGRAM AND FOR



OVERSEEING THE PLACEMENTS. FUNDS HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO HIRE THE FIRST GROUP OF TRAINEES (12-15 PEOPLE), STARTING IN SEPTEMBER OF THIS YEAR.

2. APPROVAL HAS ALSO BEEN GIVEN FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO HIRE AN EMPLOYMENT EQUITY OFFICER. THIS PERSON WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OVERSEEING THE CAREER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM, AND FOR PROVIDING OTHER SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT RELATED SERVICES BOTH TO THE TARGET GROUP AND TO GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS. THE POSITION HAS BEEN ADVERTISED, AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION HOPES TO HAVE THE SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT IN THE JOB BY THE END OF JULY.
  
3. SINCE 1979, WHEN THE ACCESSIBILITY ACT WAS PROCLAIMED, CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS LEGISLATION. THERE ARE, OF COURSE, A GREAT MANY GOVERNMENT-OWNED PUBLIC BUILDINGS THAT WERE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO 1979. THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT UNDER THE LEGISLATION THAT THESE BUILDINGS BE MADE ACCESSIBLE. NEVERTHELESS, GOVERNMENT RECOGNIZES THAT SPECIAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS TO HIRE PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES WILL ONLY BE EFFECTIVE IF POTENTIAL EMPLOYEES CAN HAVE ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS. IN ORDER TO FACILITATE THIS, GOVERNMENT IS NOW REVIEWING THE CURRENT LEVEL OF ACCESSIBILITY OF ALL OF ITS BUILDINGS, AND IS ASSESSING

THOSE RENOVATIONS WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED. OUR GOAL IS THAT GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS BE MADE ACCESSIBLE WHERE IT IS PRACTICAL AND COST EFFECTIVE TO DO SO.

I WILL CONCLUDE BY SAYING, MR. SPEAKER, THAT GOVERNMENT IS FULLY COMMITTED TO THE CONCEPT OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY WITHIN THE PUBLIC SERVICE. TREASURY BOARD IS EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT'S EMPLOYMENT EQUITY INITIATIVES ON AN ONGOING BASIS. THESE POSITIVE STEPS WILL ENSURE THAT PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES BECOME BETTER REPRESENTED WITHIN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, JUNE 6, 1981

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES

185 - Mr. David Gilbert (Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services, to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- QUESTIONS:
1. When was the tender or tenders originally called for space, which resulted in the leasing of the Eastern Canada Building?
  2. What was the amount of space acquired and its cost per square ft.?
  3. Would the Minister provide a detailed listing of each subsequent leasing arrangement, outlining the difference in square footage, cost per square foot?
  4. What has been the total cost to date for renovations and/or setting up costs to the Eastern Canada Building paid for by the Provincial Government since the original tender was leased?

- ANSWERS:
1. Space originally leased January 1, 1973. Tenders called.
  2. Rental Rate - Original Lease - \$6.10 per square foot.
  3. Original Lease

Rental Area - 7,000 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$6.10 per square foot  
Term - 2 years effective January 1, 1973  
Authorization - M.C. 1376-'72

Space originally leased for the Department of Mines and Energy in connection with Government restructuring.

Additional Lease

Rental Area - 2,600 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$6.10 per square foot  
Term - 2 years effective June 1, 1973  
Authorization - TBA 10142

Additional space required to accommodate the following additional staff:

Geologists (5)  
Mining Engineers (2)  
Stenographers (3)  
Dept. of Mines and Energy

Renewal of Original Lease

Rental Area - Same  
Rental Rate - \$8.25 per square foot  
Term - 5 years effective  
January 1, 1975  
Authorization - TBM 179-'75

Renewal of Additional Lease

Rental Area - Same  
Rental Rate - \$8.25 per square foot  
Term - 4 years, 7 months  
effective January 1, 1975  
Authorization - TBA 30270

Sublease from Bank of Nova Scotia (A)

Rental Area - 2,784 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$5.50 per square foot  
Term - 14 months effective  
February 1, 1977  
Authorization - TBA 31789

Sublease from Underwriters Adjustment Bureau (B)

Rental Area - 442 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$7.75 per square feet  
Term - 2 years, 3 months effective  
October 1, 1977  
Authorization - TBA 32602

Additional Sublease from Underwriters Adjustment Bureau (C)

Rental Area - 1,295 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$8.06 per square foot  
Term - 15½ months effective  
September 15, 1978  
Authorization - TBA 33526

The above sub-leased space indicated as A, B and C above were acquired to relieve overcrowding, e.g.

- (a) insufficient space for Registry files
- (b) storage of rock samples in corridors
- (c) insufficient space in General Office
- (d) to accommodate additional staff hired under Federal/Provincial Mineral Development program. (All for Department of Mines and Energy).

Renewal Lease Incorporating all of Above Space

Rental Area - 14,121 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$9.00 per square foot  
Term - 5 years effective  
January 1, 1979  
Authorization - M.C. 1595-'70

Sublease from Iron Ore Company of Canada (D)

Rental Area - 550 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$16.00 per square foot  
Term - 3 years effective  
October 1, 1982  
Authorization - M.C. 1024-'81

\*Subsequently extended to January 31, 1987  
at the same rate

Sublease from Central Trust (E)

Rental Area - 1,900 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$14.00 per square foot  
Term - 3 years effective  
February 15, 1983  
Authorization - M.C. 1024-'81

\*Subsequently extended to December 14, 1986 at  
the same rate.

The above space indicated as D and E above was subleased to relieve ongoing overcrowded conditions in the Department of Mines and Energy.

Additional Sublease from Iron Ore Company  
of Canada

Rental Area - 1,734 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$16.00 per square foot  
Term - 2 years, 9 months effective  
May 1, 1984  
Authorization - M.C. 1024-'81

\*Additional Space required to accommodate 15 extra staff hired under the new Federal/Provincial Mineral Development Agreement, for Department of Mines and Energy.

Renewal of Lease on 14,121 square feet of Space

Rental Area - 14, 121 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$16.00 per square foot  
Term - 2 years effective  
January 1, 1985  
Authorization - TBM 329-'85

Renewal of Lease Incorporating all of Above Space

Rental Area - 18,305 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$13.00 per square foot  
Term - 3 years effective  
January 1, 1987  
Authorization - TBM 900-'86

Additional Space

Rental Area - 926 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$13.00 per square foot  
Term - 2 years effective  
January 1, 1988  
Authorization - M.C. 1320-'87

\* Additional Space required to expand Computer Room for Department of Mines and Energy.

Lease - Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal  
Acquired by Public Tender

Rental Area - 2,523 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$14.85 per square foot  
Term - 3 years effective  
August 21, 1987  
Authorization - TBA A2416

4. Cost to date for renovations and/or setting-up  
- \$801,626.00

7  
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, JUNE 6, 1988

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES

186 - Mr. David Gilbert (Burgeon-Bay d'Espoir) - To ask the Honourable Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- QUESTIONS:
1. When was the tender or tenders originally called for space, which resulted in the leasing of the medical arts building?
  2. What was the amount of space acquired and its cost per square ft.?
  3. Would the Minister provide a detailed listing of each subsequent leasing arrangement, outlining the difference in square footage, cost per square foot?
  4. What has been the total cost to date for renovations and/or setting up costs to the medical arts building paid for by the Provincial Government since the original tender was leased

- ANSWERS:
1. Space originally leased June 5, 1978 - No tenders called.
  2. Rental Rate original lease - \$9.80 per square foot.
  3. Original Lease

Rental Area	-	2,180 square feet
Rental Rate	-	\$9.80 per square foot
Term	-	5 years effective June 5, 1978
Authorization	-	M.C. 505-'78

\*Space leased in order to relocate drafting and cartographic functions of Department of Mines and Energy from Eastern Canada Building.

Additional Space

- |               |   |                                   |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Rental Area   | - | 4,694 square feet                 |
| Rental Rate   | - | \$9.50 per square foot            |
| Term          | - | 5 years effective<br>June 1, 1980 |
| Authorization | - | M.C. 453-'80                      |

\* Additional Space required for:

(a) extra staff for Department of Mines and Energy hired under Renewables and Conservation Agreement

(b) relocation of Energy Branch from the Eastern Canada Building

Renewal of Original Lease

Rental Area - Same  
Rental Rate - \$11.00 per square foot  
Term - 2 years effective  
June 5, 1983 (expiry date May 31, 1985)  
Authorization - Departmental - renewal option exercised

Renewal of Original Lease

Rental Area - Same  
Rental Rate - \$13.00 per square foot  
Term - 1 year effective  
June 1, 1985  
Authorization - TBM 329-'85

\* Extended on monthly basis to December 31, 1986 to coincide with expiry date of Eastern Canada Building lease.

Renewal of Additional Lease

Rental Area - Same  
Rental Rate - \$13.00 per square foot  
Term - 1 year effective  
June 1, 1985  
Authorization - TBM 329-'85

\* Extended on monthly basis to December 31, 1986 to coincide with expiry date of Eastern Canada Building lease.

Renewal Lease Incorporating Original Lease and Additional Lease

Rental Area - 6,874 square feet  
Rental Rate - \$13.00 per square foot  
Term - 3 years effective  
January 1, 1987  
Authorization - TBM 900-'86

4. Total cost to date of renovations and/or setting-up costs \$170,051.00.



Verbatim Report of the Proceedings of the House of Assembly  
June 8, 1988 (Hansard Vol. XL. No. 51)

Question - Mr. David Gilbert, M.H.A.

The Minister of Public Works, in a response to a written question from me regarding renovations to leased premises, advised that \$42,016 had been spent to renovate the Eastern Canada Building for the Department of Mines. Now a check with officials in his Department failed to show tender documents for this \$42,016. Will the Minister tell this House why the work was undertaken without going through the public tendering process?

Answer

The renovations carried out by the Department of Public Works and Services at the Eastern Canada Building in fiscal year 1987/88 were undertaken partly by contract and partly by a combination of own forces and service contractors.

The original contract was valued at	\$19,800.00
Subsequently a Change Order was issued for	\$11,770.26
Additional Change Order was issued for	<u>\$ 460.00</u>
Total Value of Contract	\$32,030.26

The balance of the work was undertaken by Department of Public Works personnel and by Service Contractors. (Service Contracts are awarded as a result of public tenders).

Eastern Canada - Medical Arts Building had been occupied by the Department of Mines and Energy under a lease arrangement for a number of years. Various headquarters functions in recent years had been moved to the newly completed West Block of Confederation Building. This move necessitated some minor functional changes throughout the building to properly accommodate the Divisions of the Department of Mines who have remained there.

The original contract of \$19,800 was publicly tendered and awarded for the installation of a computer room. After the contract was in place, the Department of Mines wished to expand the computer area at a cost of \$11,770.26.

The balance of the work carried out in the building was a series of unrelated minor functional changes to permit the occupants to operate more efficiently in the remaining space. This work was carried out by own forces, contractors and service contractors publicly tendered.

## CONTENTS

TUESDAY, 21 JUNE, 1988.

<u>Ruling on House Procedure:</u>	
Mr. Speaker.....	3322

### Statements by Ministers

<u>Transportation Projects Worth \$26.5 million:</u>	
Mr. Doyle.....	3322
Mr. Gilbert.....	3325
Mr. Long.....	3326

<u>Annual Report of Offshore Petroleum Board:</u>	
Premier Peckford.....	3326
Mr. Wells.....	3327
Mr. Long.....	3328

### Oral Questions

<u>The Newfoundland Railway Closure:</u>	
Assistance for Badger. Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	3329
Claims no provision for seasonal workers. Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	3330
What is the provision. Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	3330
Assuming \$7 million is fair for Bishop's Falls, is the same amount adequate for Port aux Basques. Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	3330
Suggests the \$7 million fund for Port aux Basques may have to be revised upwards. Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	3331

The Newfoundland Railway Closure (Continued):

What mechanism will be used in relation to Marine Atlantic employees who might be affected. Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	3332
Has the Province given up responsibility for St. John's workers who may be affected. Mr. Long, Premier Peckford.....	3332
Will CN employees be obliged to move out of the Province to protect their collective bargaining rights. Mr. Long, Premier Peckford.....	3334
Wants a special assistance plan put into place to allow workers to remain in the Province if matter not resolved in three months. Mr. Long, Premier Peckford.....	3334
Specific assistance sought and received from Ottawa. Are they in writing and is Ottawa legally bound. Mr. Furey, Premier Peckford.....	3335
Do opinions between Ottawa and Newfoundland diverge on the reopener clause. Mr. Furey, Premier Peckford.....	3335
Is there no security in the reopener clause. Mr. Furey, Premier Peckford.....	3336
When will railway lands be transferred to the Province. Mr. Gullage, Premier Peckford.....	3336
What lands and properties are involved. Mr. Gullage, Premier Peckford.....	3337
Will representatives of towns and cities involved serve on a committee to be struck. Mr. Gullage, Premier Peckford.....	3337
The agreement has no provision for Ottawa being responsible for highway maintenance. Mr. Efford, Premier Peckford.....	3338

The Newfoundland Railway Closure (Continued):

Where will the Province get the funds needed for highway maintenance. Mr. Efford, Premier Peckford.....3339

Since the government lacks sufficient monies to properly fund Health, Education and other necessary services, how will it finance highway maintenance. Mr. Efford, Premier Peckford.....3340

Trans-Labrador Highway:

What portion of the \$19 million will be spent on upgrading a 20-kilometer section of the road. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Doyle.....3341

**Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given**

Tenders for Medical Arts and Eastern Canada Lease:

Dr. Twomey.....3342

Employment Equity Program:

Mr. Simms.....3342

**Orders of the Day**

Third Reading:

Bill No. 14 (Continued):

Mr. Wells, resumes debate.....3343  
Mr. Morgan.....3354  
Mr. Gilbert.....3362  
Mr. Mitchell.....3367

Agreed that debate resume at 7 p.m.....3380

Debate resumes at 7 p.m., on procedure.....3381

(Evening)

Mr. Tulk, a point of order.....	3381
Dr. Collins.....	3382
Mr. Wells.....	3383
Mr. Speaker, ruling.....	3384
Mr. Morgan, a point of order.....	3385
Mr. Wells.....	3386
Dr. Collins.....	3388
Mr. Speaker, ruling.....	3389

Bill No. 14 (Continued):

Mr. Gullage.....	3389
Mr. Tobin.....	3393
Mr. Decker.....	3400

Debate on procedure.....	3409
Mr. Speaker, ruling.....	3410

Bill No. 14 (Continued):

Mr. Warren.....	3411
Mr. Efford.....	3420
Mr. Rideout.....	3428

Adjournment.....	3437
------------------	------