

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

House of Assembly

For the period:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Wednesday, March 9, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries, in the first instance, two delegations of students from E.J. Pratt High School at Brownsdale, thirty-nine grade ten and eleven students accompanied by their teachers Mr. Lloyd Snow, and Mr. Melvin Walsh, and from Gaultois Victoria High School, thirteen grade eleven students accompanied by Mr. Wayne Kendell and Mr. Wade Prior. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these young Newfoundlanders and their teachers to the House of Assembly this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We also have in the galleries two municipal delegations; a delegation from the Community Council of Comfort Cove-Newstead, with the Chairman, Mr. Dave Eveleigh and the Town Clerk, Mr. Head and also from the communities of Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove, we are pleased to welcome Mr. Leo Shea, Chairman of the Local Improvement District for that area and accompanied by other members of the Council. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these municipal representatives to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, today if I may, I would like to bring the members of the hon. House up to date on the status of the strike by members of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees at Waterford Hospital and as well to outline the negotiating stance of the parties to the dispute. The strike has occupied much discussion in the House and I would like to clarify the situation.

MR. DOODY: The strike at Waterford Hospital commenced, Sir, at midnight on February 17th., seven days after a strike vote was conducted by the unit. It is significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that only a minority of the employees in the bargaining unit attended the meeting in which the strike vote was taken. At the time the strike vote was taken, apart from discussions on the pension issue, there had been no negotiations at all on any of the items to be included in a new collective agreement. The Union adamantly refused to even consider the other matters and it was a straight-forward case of straight-forward clear cut ultimatum that pensions must be settled first. Our negotiators were not given the opportunity to discuss the many other items in the contract before the strike vote was taken. The salary question had not even been discussed. There was no money on the table and still the Union took a vote which resulted in the current strike.

Mr. Speaker, the strike at Waterford Hospital has been in progress now for almost three weeks. Government has been continually monitoring the situation with the Administration with the Department of Health and with the Board of the Hospital to ensure that the desired level of patient care is maintained. Since the start of the strike, Sir, approximately 100 of the 400 patients have been discharged. The remaining 300 patients are being cared for by the Nurses, the Allied Health Professionals, medical staff, management personnel and volunteers from various areas in the Public Service. Security is being provided by members of the Newfoundland Constabulary. Mr. Speaker, it is as a result of the dedication and an all-out effort on the part of all of these people that I can assure this House that all of the patients at the hospital are being well treated and well cared for, and will continue to be for the duration of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, since the strike, we have met with the Union on several occasions and their position has not changed. While they still refuse to discuss the contract, we have presented proposals on a multiplicity of Articles. For instance, we made

MR. DOODY:

the same salary proposal to the group that has been accepted in every other hospital in the Province to date. This was done before the strike started but the union refused to present it to the membership and they refused to discuss it further with us, Mr. Speaker, the union say that they are prepared to talk but they are only prepared to talk on their terms. They will agree to talk with us after they have been offered the exact pension benefits that they requested at the outset. They have told us there is no room at all for compromise on the pension issue.

We find it difficult to believe the extent of their inflexibility but unfortunately it has now been reconfirmed to our negotiators on several occasions, to the Honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations last week and to myself over this past weekend. The only area the Union is willing to discuss is which employees should be entitled to be covered by the plan once Government has totally conceded to their demand on the content of the plan.

Mr. Speaker, the strike at Waterford Hospital is indeed unfortunate. Government, and I am sure all of the members of this hon. House are anxious to see it ended. In an effort to accomplish that end, our negotiators have again asked NAPE to come back to the bargaining table today. We will be proposing improvements to the special pension benefits previously offered and we will propose extending these benefits to additional employees. In addition, we will bring the proposed collective agreement in line with all those signed by other hospitals in the Province. Of course, it will contain the special provisions for contract pay which are peculiar to the Waterford.

Mr. Speaker, there is always an easy solution to any public service strike and that is to concede to the demands of a union, especially in difficult circumstances. It is easy to sweep the long-term ramifications of immediate action under the carpet. Government, however, cannot lose sight of its very real responsibility in relation to all of the 30,000 public employees in the Province, to maintain an appropriate balance in salaries, working conditions and pensions.



MR. DOODY:

Government must ensure therefore that no one group is able, because of some particular leverage it may have by disrupting essential public services, to enforce its demands in a disproportionate manner.

In this case the Union claims that Psychiatric Nursing Assistants at Waterford Hospital should be entitled to the same pension plan as is available to Warders at Her Majesty's Penitentiary. They are attempting to identify circumstances at the Hospital with those of a prison. The Union claims the Hospital is unique in Canada. Government is unable to accept this position and we know of at least 12 hospitals across Canada where patient population and the work situations of their employees parallel those of the Waterford Hospital here in Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Up to the Waterford Hospital?

MR. DOODY: Yes. Not one of these hospitals has a special pension plan for their employees. In every single case the pension plan available to the employees is the same as the general plan for other categories of public employees in the respective provinces. The employees currently on strike at Waterford have taken an adamant position to obtain a benefit unprecedented in Canada for employees in comparable institutions. This Government has agreed that in certain instances their stand is justified but this approach has not been successful. In an effort to resolve the dispute we will, this afternoon, be offering further concessions to the Union. We would hope that NAPE will also approach the bargaining table in a conciliatory frame of mind and I express the sincere hope that the Union membership will be given an opportunity to consider Government's latest proposal. Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me first of all say, Sir, that we appreciate the statement by the minister because I believe it is the first time since this strike began that the minister has made

MR. ROBERTS:

a ministerial statement. I believe there was one about the day the strike began or a day or so thereafter. So we do appreciate that. I do regret though, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has not in his statement given the information which he has not been able to give in the House in response to quite a number of questions. And while I have not looked at the Hansard carefully on this point, Mr. Speaker, I would think that there have been more questions asked about the situation with respect to the Waterford Hospital than there have been about any other single issue that has arisen during this current session. The minister

Mr. Roberts.

has given some information in response to those questions. He has not given information in response to a number of others. I regret that he has not done so in this statement today. I regret further, Sir, several aspects of the statement, and while I will say a word or two in support of an aspect of the minister's policy or the policy of the administration as outlined by the minister, I do want to say specifically that I think some of the statements made in the Ministerial Statement are provocative. They may or may not be correct. I am not allowed to debate that at this time, but I think they are provocative and I submit needlessly provocative, and I do not think that is anyway in which one should approach this situation. The strike at the Waterford Hospital is a lawful one under the legislation enacted by this House at the request of the present government. The men and the women who are on strike are exercising their lawful rights and as far as I am aware they are doing so lawfully. There have been no improper incidents. There was the usual confusion over picketing, the usual injunction issued in due course from the Supreme Court and as far as I know that has been honoured. I have heard no reports of any incidents. And I think both sides to the strike, Sir, should be congratulated on that, because this is a very emotional strike. Any strike has emotional overtones, but this one more so than most. The minister's statement is needlessly provocative, and perhaps even the fact it is made here - I am not sure whether the parties have actually met as yet to discuss these further advances, these further concessions, the administration are prepared to offer. If they have met then well and good. If not the mere fact of the statement being made at this moment as opposed to tomorrow or yesterday or later today is in my view again needlessly provocative.

We do not need, Mr. Speaker, more provocation. One of the difficulties in this strike is that both sides have dug in and dug in publicly and that is going to make the resolution infinitely more

Mr. Roberts.

difficult whenever it comes. It must come and when it comes it will be all the more painful, Sir, because we are fast getting to the point where one side or the other must lose some face.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say more but I suspect I am about to reach the line which I should not cross into the order of debate so I will not. Let me say though in conclusion, Sir, that we on this side welcome the news that negotiations are resuming. Whatever will be their outcome we welcome the fact that they are resuming, because, Sir, in a phrase which Sir Winston Churchill once used and which I think is both apt and appropriate, and this states the position quite succinctly, I think, Sir, "Jaw, jaw, jaw is better than war, war, war." As long as the two sides to the dispute at the Waterford Hospital are talking, there is some hope that it will be resolved. We all want to see it resolved. We all want to see it resolved fairly and amicably. We all want to see it resolved as quickly as possible. To that let me add just one sentence, Sir. I hope the minister will make further reports, and I hope they will be more complete and more forthcoming than the one he has given us now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 360 residents of the communities of Comfort Cove - Newstead in my district of Lewisporte. The prayer of the petition is basically that the road from the Road to the Isles down as far as Comfort Cove, passing through the communities of Turtle Creek and Newstead, be paved this coming year. Now, Mr. Speaker, this prayer is not a common ordinary prayer that we get from a lot of communities this time of year in terms of requests to pave roads. This comes from a community that is turning out to be probably what is a model

Mr. White.

community in terms of rural development in this Province. The town of Comfort Cove today has located in it the most modern canning operation in this Province. Recent expansion there cost in the vicinity of close to \$500,000. And as the Minister of Fisheries pointed out in the House a couple of weeks ago, this is the place now where an experiment is being carried out with seal meat, in the packaging of seal meat in steaks, roasts and chops and other forms. Also, Mr. Speaker, members will recall that the well-known Green Leaf Turnip Top Brand is canned in Comfort Cove and now experiments are going on with respect to other products such as; beans and different other things, rabbit, and seal stew and a number of other things that I could go on and mention. I say



MR. WHITE: this because to pave this road this year this government would be carrying out its policy of spending the available funds it has on resources of the Province. Currently the raw material for this plant at Comfort Cove is being carried over this road. Turnip Top is being brought in in open trucks and it gets dust on it. Cans that are shipped out arrive at supermarkets and are competing with Mainland brands and often there is dust on them and that kind of thing. So it is imperative this road be paved as quick as possible so that the quality of the product that is being produced in this canning operation be maintained and be improved and that is why I support the prayer of this petition, Mr. Speaker.

The attempts by the people in the community to have this road paved are well known. The Minister of Transportation and Communications visited the area last year. He met with a group of people, a very orderly group of people who presented the case to him. Besides the canning plant, Mr. Speaker, we also have Carlson Shipping there who have just opened a seal-pelt operation and are becoming more involved in that. There are two parks located there, one of them a Beothuck park as a memorial to the Beothuck Indians. So it is really one of the busiest roads in Newfoundland and a road that badly needs pavement because as I said when I started it is a model community when it comes to the rural development of Newfoundland and the kind of thing we hope to see in future. Mr. Speaker, I table this petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates for action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend the member for Lewisporte on behalf of 360 of his constituents in the Comfort Cove - Newstead area. My hon. friend, Sir,

MR. NEARY: made a very strong case on behalf of his constituents and you know, Mr. Speaker, you would want to be unpatriotic if you would not support the prayer of the petition after listening to my hon. friend. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this particular community of Comfort Cove is developing into a very fine community. They have now a solid foundation on which to build up the economy of that part of Newfoundland and this is the sort of thing, Sir, that the government should be doing, putting its money into roads to resources. So I support the prayer of the petition, Sir, and if for no other reason - I would not want to see all these wonderful seal steaks, choice meat that the Minister of Fisheries was talking about the other day turning into stew going over that rough road down there - so if for no other reason I would support the petition for that reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister of Transportation and Communication.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the petition. The delegation that brought the petition to the hon. member for the district met with me and the officials of the department this morning. The road they refer to in their petition is a road that was reconstructed in 1974 or 1975 at a cost of almost \$1 million totally by the provincial government, this administration, and now the request is to have this section of road approximately eight miles from the intersection of the Road to the Isles to Comfort Cove and Newstead-Comfort Cove - having seen that road last summer and having travelled over it to Comfort Cove and having met with a delegation in the community there at that time I am fully aware of the need to have it paved. Also my colleague the Minister of Fisheries on his visits to the area, he did not travel over that same piece of road but he is aware of the road and the need to have improvements made

MR. MORGAN:

because of the industry there in connection with the fisheries and we have discussed this. Taking into consideration that there are many roads around the Province, some of them similar to this road and others not, that need reconstruction and paving the only comment I can make at this time is that hopefully funds can be found in 1977 to pave the section of road that we reconstructed in 1974-1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in support of the petition which my friend and colleague from Lewisporte has presented and I think, Sir, in presenting it he made a very strong case. I understand

Mr. Roberts:

the Minister of Transportation in speaking in support of the petition as well too said that the request will be considered. That is really, I guess, as far as we can go now.

I do hope, Sir, though that the result of the consideration of the request is a decision to go ahead with this work this year. It is very hard to assign priorities with respect to roads, because everybody whose road is not paved feels, obviously, that that should be the priority, the paving of his particular road. And we all know as well that there are many considerations other than simply the length of the piece of road in question or its cost that must be taken into account.

Even so, Mr. Speaker, I think the case made by the gentleman from Lewisporte (Mr. White) in behalf of the people who signed this petition, the citizens who live in the Comfort Cove area, it is a compelling case, Sir, and I would hope it is taken with the great weight that should be attached to it.

There are a lot of petitions presented in this House, Sir, and all of them are well meant, and all of them represent the genuine wishes of the people who sign the petitions, but, Sir, I think this one, if this is not a bad use of grammar, is even more legitimate than all the others we have. And I would hope this year when the minister comes to divide up whatever sum of money is allocated to him by the House for the construction of new roads and the reconstruction and paving of existing roads that he would put in this particular road.

Along those lines, Sir, this just shows the value of something which the minister has undertaken to do but has never done, nor have his predecessors unfortunately, and that is producing a two or a three or a five year plan so that the people in Comfort Cove and in the area would know where there road stood in the overall scheme of things. Indeed we do not even know how many requests the minister is considering this year, nor do we know the relative

Mr. Roberts:

merits. And since we have not debated the Transportation and Communications estimates in this House for the last two or three years there has been no opportunity to discuss it. Even so, Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister will treat it with the great merit it deserves.

And I want to say just one other thing that I think it is particularly appropriate that the member from Lewisporte, I believe, is a native son of the Borough of Comforts Cove and I think that gives him a certain extra pleasure in presenting the petition today. I do not think he is any longer a resident in Comfort Cove, so we-

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a pocket borough.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not - the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) tells me it is not a pocket borough, I had not thought it was. I would think though a very determined and a very free borough because I believe they have given their overwhelming support to the gentleman from Lewisporte, who is not only a native son, but makes an extremely effective member for the district of Lewisporte, including the community of Comfort Cove.

I support the petition, Sir, in behalf of all my colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member from the Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: I also take great pleasure in supporting this petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: What I want to say about the member is that - the member from Lewisporte is certainly a model speaker in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: In fact he really speaks well, and I think that this really adds to the dignity of the House of Assembly. And that is really one thing, I think, that this House and Newfoundland can be proud of. And I also noted that the petition comes from 360 of his constituents and this represents a large number of people in his riding. It



Mr. Woodrow:

also is doing something for a model community, even the name itself Comfort Cove would make one feel like going there.

And also it brings out another factor and that is the example of how Rural Development is helping in the rural areas of the Province. And I also, before I sit down, I want to say how proud I am that our Minister of Transportation and Communications has stood up and given his support, I have found him always to be extremely fair and honest, and he must realize as he stands to reply to any petition that he has fifty-one districts. But there is one thing about it he certainly tries to help every district regardless of what they represent to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, this may be the day for native sons to present petitions. I have one signed by 410 residents of Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove. And as a native son of Fleur de Lys I would like to present the petition. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is rather a common prayer that we get in petitions in this House. But I think the overtones of the petition are probably more important than a number that we hear taking into context the situation.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, asks that the sixteen mile stretch of road from Fleur de Lys and Coachman's Cove to Baie Verte be upgraded and paved. Now in its own right, Sir, the prayer is a good one. There are 150 or so men who travel from those two communities to work in Advocate Mines in Baie Verte. There are a couple of hundred school children who travel that road daily, twice daily to commute to school in Baie Verte. And, of course, since Baie Verte is the service center of the Peninsula everybody in those two communities one time or another during the week travel to Baie Verte for groceries, banking services, hospital and so on. Besides that there are a million pounds or so of fish to come out of those two communities each year to be transported over that road and down the Baie Verte Peninsula to the fish plant in LaScie. That, Sir, would be case enough to have the road upgraded and paved.

But there is a greater case and a greater fact to be taken into consideration, and that is that the preliminary reports from the experts who came down to the Baie Verte area last Spring, in June, from the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York indicate very strongly that the asbestos fibers in the dust of that road can be and are very hazardous to the health of the people of that area. That I believe, Sir, makes the case more strong than anything else could. There are school children travelling that road along with the adults and the experts feel that those people are exposing themselves daily to the harmful asbestos fibers that have become imbedded in the road dust in that area.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The people are therefore concerned about it. They want the government to take action because of that very fundamental point that the health of the people in that particular area could be in a hazardous condition because of the asbestos fibers in the road. Mr. Speaker, I support the petition whole-heartedly. I hope that the minister and that the government will see fit to act on this particular petition this year. The need is justified certainly when we look at the health aspects. I support the petition. I table it and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition which was presented by my friend and colleague from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who presented it on behalf of 410 residents of Fleur de Lys and Frenchman's Cove.

MR. RIDEOUT: Coachman's Cove.

MR. HODDER: I am sorry, Coachman's Cove. Frenchman's Cove is in another area of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one of the areas where the Department of Transportation and Communications must be able to take prompt action. This road, as my friend and colleague pointed out, is one which is used by the majority of the people. It is a road over which fish products are carried, it is a road over which school children go and it is a road which has been shown to be a health hazard.

Now I realize that the Minister of Transportation and Communications has many priorities. But in this particular case, in a case of a health hazard in the Province, I think the Department of Transportation and Communications and the minister must act quickly to see that this problem is overcome. I heard of this problem many months ago. And I think that the member should not have to be up speaking on this particular problem now because I think that that problem should have been looked after for long ago. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout). It is a very, very important petition, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman presented because of the health implications, because of the health hazard involved in driving over that road, Mr. Speaker. Only a couple of days ago we heard the Minister of Transportation and Communications, I think, reassure the House that there was no health hazard from the asbestos fibers that are flying around in the air in and around the community of Baie Verte. But, Sir, there seems to be a difference of opinion. My hon. friend says that the experts from the Mount Sinai School of Medicine indicated that there was a health hazard. The Minister of Transportation reassured the House a few days ago there was no health hazard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, personally I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from the Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

MR. NEARY: I, myself Sir, lived and worked in a mining community practically all my life. I worked with a mining company for twenty-one years over on Bell Island when we had iron ore stockpiled on the surface, they had conveyer belts moving around and a concentration plant where you had all kinds of dust, and I can say to this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that I think it was possible to get silicosis on the surface.

A report was done recently out in Buchans that indicated that not only get miners contact silicosis in the mine in Buchans but the people who lived on the surface, who had never been underground in their lives could get silicosis on the surface and I -

MR. YOUNG: You were never underground in your life.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would probably like to put me underground. The hon. gentleman will never get the chance.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, Sir, there is a very definite health hazard involved in this sixteen mile stretch of road. It is something that the government should take into consideration when they are looking at their priorities for reconstructing and paving roads next year. I believe this particular stretch of road, Sir, should get the number one priority.

Mr. Speaker, you can go down to Baie Verte today and if nobody thinks that the asbestos fibres are not floating around everywhere, when you wake up in the morning with the wind in a certain direction you can write your name on the windshield of a car. Mr. Speaker, by the same token, are not these fibres settling on the road and when a car or a truck or a bus drives over the road are they not stirred up and people inhale them into their lungs, little children going to



MR. NEARY: school? It is a very, very serious situation, Mr. Speaker, and something that has to be rectified at an earlier a date as possible.

Another reason I support the petition I believe it was the Fleur de Lys School that the School Board down there closed down a year or so ago and I think I had to give my hon. friend a hand to get him to keep it open, the elementary school. Did they not close it down and then eventually they changed their mind and kept it open. The people refused to send their children over that road into the -

MR. RIDEOUT: Tilt Cove.

MR. NEARY: In Tilt Cove? Well I thought I had some dealings with Fleur de Lys too.

MR. ROBERTS: The same coast but the wrong road.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition, Sir. My hon. friend made a very strong case but I believe, Sir, that every member of this House, on either side of the House, should get up and support this petition, because, Sir, the lives, the health of the people who live in that area are in danger every time a car or a truck or a bus goes over that stretch of highway. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is our duty as elected representatives of the people to see that that road is reconstructed and paved at an early a date as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, although not a native son of Fleur de Lys I would like to stand in support of the petition presented by my colleague for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

There is no question that whenever the question of health or safety of people are involved then I think that the government should show top priority, give top priority in any government programme of any nature. I think in the case

MR. STRACHAN: of the people of Fleur de Lys to Baie Verte, the reason—because of the mine being so close, the dust hazard, and the attendant risk from asbestosis, that the Department of Transportation should, with utmost speed, bring about the paving of the road as requested in the prayer of the petition.

We have similar situations elsewhere in the Province. I know that a great many of us would like to see many roads paved. We have similar situations in many other parts of the Province where the health and the safety of the people is involved, and a similar situation being on the Labrador Coast where we require airstrips, not highways, and the safety of the people involved there because every time they try to move or transport back and forth they take their lives in their own hands, not due to the airlines but due to the flying conditions and landing conditions.

And it is exactly the same in this case here. The people of Fleur de Lys and Baie Verte should get that road paved quickly, speedily and hopefully as soon as the Winter is over. I support the prayer of the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel it is imperative for me to speak on this petition based on the comments made so far and particularly those comments made by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I would like to correct the statement that was made by the hon. gentleman, because it is an incorrect statement, a statement to the effect that I told this House of Assembly that there was no health hazard because of the potential asbestos dust in the road dust in the section of road from Baie Verte, Coachman's Cove, Fleur de Lys and also out to Seal Cove. What I did say, Mr. Speaker - and I repeat now - is that tests carried out by the Department of Transportation and Communications could not determine that there was asbestos dust in the road dust. I did qualify the statement by saying that the Department of Transportation will await the report of Dr. Selikoff before they will determine, as a department, whether or not there is asbestos dust in the road dust.

I will refer to statements made last Fall to the effect that there was a health hazard, and the reports in the media were attributed to Dr. Selikoff. An official of the Department of Transportation, a senior official, the deputy minister, contacted Dr. Selikoff to enquire with regards to statements made to the media. In a very polite way Dr. Selikoff told us in the Department of Transportation to mind our own business. The report was not being compiled for the Department of Transportation and Communications, it was being compiled for the Department of Health. So, Mr. Speaker, until a report is received from Dr. Selikoff to my colleague, the Minister of Health, and until that report indicates conclusive evidence that there is asbestos dust, we should not surmise or indicate in anyway at the present time that there is a health hazard.

Mr. Morgan.

There is a potential health hazard but it has not been proven to date. So we will deal with the road and the petition, forgetting about the potential health hazard, because if there is a proven health hazard, I am sure that my colleagues in Cabinet will deal with in the same view that I will deal with it as a very serious urgent matter. But now we have to deal with the road and with some other roads around the Province, roads that need repair and reconstruction and paving. The road is approximately sixteen miles in length which will cost, according to the engineering estimates of the department, more than \$2 million. The neighbouring road at Seal Cove will cost a further \$2 million to reconstruct in preparation for paving. These roads are the same as many other roads around the Province except with one exception, and that is I am of the opinion that there are more people travelling back and forth to work because of the asbestos mines in Baie Verte. But we have hundreds of roads around the Province used exclusively every day, each and every day by school buses transporting students back and forth to school and also people going back and forth to work daily.

So, Mr. Speaker, this morning I met with a delegation from the Coachman's Cove - Fleur de Lys. In fact this morning I met with five delegations from around the Province which indicates the activity of ministers in this administration, and I assured the delegation that number one, we will include these roads on the Baie Verte Peninsula in our discussions and submissions to the federal level of government in the upcoming DREE agreement which we hope to sign in 1977, because we feel it is an extension of the road to Baie Verte known as Route 410. And hopefully the federal government will be sympathetic to our request and include these roads, and in particular, the road to Coachman's Cove - Fleur de Lys in the upcoming DREE roads agreement. I also assured them if the funds cannot be found provincially this year, because of - I repeat - the potential health hazard that we will this Summer again, in the early part of this Summer, do the same as last Summer, we will spray the road with liquid calcium

Mr. Morgan.

as a dust control measure. These two commitments were made. And I also said - and I repeat now in the House of Assembly - consideration will be given, as the other roads around the Province will also be given, consideration to upgrading this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I realize a number of hon. gentlemen have spoken on this matter, but perhaps I might be allowed a word or two and, of course, we have not heard as yet from the member for Bay of Islands who I expect will have a word or two to say as well. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition. I think it has been well-presented by my friend and colleague from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), and I think a number of very worth-while points have been made by the gentleman from LaPóile (Mr. Neary) and the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Transportation and Communications. My friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has always added light and reason and heat



MR. ROBERTS:

to the debate, Sir, in his own inimitable style. Mr. Speaker, the issue really raised by this petition is not simply one of paving a few miles of road as important and as desirable as that may be. I think it has been made quite clear in the comments back and forth by individual members that they view the issue as being more than simply whether a few miles of blacktop should be laid on the road between Baie Verte going down as far as Coachman's Cove and Fleur de Lys. Rather, Sir, it is a very serious health question. We all know that asbestos is a very dangerous substance and poses an imminent threat to health and well-being. We do not know as yet whether there has been any significant damage done to anybody exposed to the asbestos mines as Baie Verte and the fibers and the dust that comes from those mines. We will not know that until Dr. Selikoff has made his report.

But as I understand the issue here - and perhaps the minister can confirm it - it is essentially this, that if Dr. Selikoff and his team at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine in New York confirm, whenever they make their report which I gather is fairly soon, confirm that the road to Coachman's Cove and Fleur de Lys has in its road bed, in its road surface, dust of a nature and of a type that gives rise to asbestos fibers thus presenting a danger far beyond, you know, any other road in the Province and if in fact that is the case, then the administration will undertake to lay the pavement this year and thus keep the dust down. Now I think that is the sensible thing. I think that everybody in the Province could understand that and everybody in the Province would accept it.

MR. MORGAN: We must reconstruct before we pave.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister makes the point which I think is a valid one that we must reconstruct before we pave. But in reply I must make the point which I have often made before, that the minister's officials have a mania for reconstruction. I wish they would replace that with a mania for paving in addition to just reconstruction. I sometimes think we are building roads in this Province that are far beyond

MR. ROBERTS:

any standards we need and the result of building them to that high standard, overly high standard is that we have to do without the blacktop which after all is the comfort and the ease in a road.

The road to Coachman's Cove and Fleur de Lys is not a trunk highway and never will be. It is a road that serves those communities. It is very important to them. But what is very important is that they have an adequate road with blacktop, and I think they would prefer that to a super highway without the blacktop. Certainly from the health point of view the essential thing is the blacktop because that is what keeps down the dust and removes the dust menace.

So I take it we have the minister's confirmation on that point. The question now will be, what Dr. Selikoff and his team recommend and we will know that very, very shortly. I would hope as well, Sir, the minister does not build up the hopes of the House and people with respect to the DREE agreement. The DREE agreement for this year is signed. The minister last year signed a two year agreement and the second year is this year. The tenders, some of them have been called, others will doubtless be called shortly. And there will be no new work undertaken this year other than that which is in the agreement which was made public last year when it was signed. So we are at least a year away. Of course the minister would have to agree as well that DREE have accepted only trunk roads. I do not think by any standard now employed it is possible to conclude the road from Baie Verte out to Coachman's Cove and Fleur de Lys can be called a trunk road.

The definition of trunk road may be like beauty, it may lie in the eye of the beholder, Mr. Speaker. But, you know, there are trunk and trunkier and trunkiest, and on that scale of trunk, trunkier and trunkiest I would think this would be a trunk road and not the trunkiest road.

MR. MORGAN: It is the continuation of a trunk road.

MR. ROBERTS: True it is the continuation of a trunk road, Sir, as the

MR. ROBERTS:

minister tells us but then again in that sense the road to St. Julien's population fifty-seven is a continuation of the trunk road which runs from the Northern Peninsula Highway. I mean you can take any point and stretch it to an absurdity, and I suspect we are in danger of doing that here.

The important thing, Sir, is we should not rely on DPEE for this purpose. We are entitled to rely on DPEE for other purposes and we should and we do and we must. But in this case if Dr. Selikoff and his officials say that in their opinion there is a definite hazard to health, that road must be paved this year because we are playing with something that we cannot play with and should not play with and I know the minister will not play with, and that is the health and well-being of the people who must use that road, young and old alike.

So I take it we have the minister's assurance, Sir. What we need now is Dr. Selikoff's report and that report will determine the action. Thank you very much, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow beg leave to introduce a bill "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

MR. A. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide Uniform Minimum Standards Of Conditions Of Employment In The Province", and also, "An Act To Style The Department Of Manpower And Industrial Relations Act As A Department Of Labour And Manpower."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Wind Up The Permanent Marine Disaster Fund."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. W. DOODY: There are two here, Your Honour, both questions from the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). One is Question No. 101 dated February 14, Who were the present members of the Public Service Commissions? The present members are Mr. Alfred J. Gosse, Chairman, Mr. Jack Burt Commissioner, Vice-Chairman, Mr. Vincent J. Rossiter, Commissioner. What are their individual salaries? The present salaries are Chairman \$31,500; Commissioner-Vice-Chairman \$27,566, Commissioner \$25,719. What are the terms of their appointments? Each Commissioner holds office during good behaviour in line with the Public Service Commission Act of May 1, 1973.



Mr. Doody:

The other Question is No.131 dated Monday, February 21. Inquiry from the member from LaPoile regarding total amount paid in subsidies to the Newfoundland Transportation Company for the months of July, August, September, 1976. The total subsidy was for eight weeks, a total of \$11,200 a week, that was for July and August. There was no subsidy paid in September and there were no other remunerations or expenses paid. There were many other - yes, I will table them - there were many other questions which the hon. member had directed to me which relate to other departments; Industrial Development, the Premier's office, Labrador Affairs and so on, and I have sent them on to the various departments to which they relate. I have other answers for you coming up.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to answer Questions on the Order Paper Nos. 47 and 49 both asked by the hon. member from Fogo (Capt. Winsor).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to Question No. 198 asked by the hon. member from LaPoile on today's Order Paper.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier I see is still absent. Out mortgaging a large part of our future, I guess, to the blue-eyed Arabs of Alberta, and so I must direct the question to the Minister of Justice in his capacity as the deputy leader of the administration. Can the minister tell us, Sir, whether his reflection overnight has led him to conclude whether it was proper or improper for the government party to have accepted and perhaps even to have solicited a donation of more than \$50,000 from the Scrivener firm during the 1973 calendar year, or 1972 calendar year I am sorry, said donation being evidenced by the receipt which I understand Mr. Richard Greene has now confirmed having issued?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that I did not reflect upon the problem overnight, and my answer is the same as I had given yesterday, that on tomorrow, tomorrow I believe being Friday, when the hon. Premier returns -

MR. ROBERTS: Is he not due back until Friday?

MR. HICKMAN: Well he is signing a mortgage today -

MR. SIMMONS: Is he getting another loan?

MR. ROBERTS: Another holiday?

MR. HICKMAN: - from the great Canadians, these great Canadians, the Albertians, the Government of Alberta, a great Canadian Government, with a great Canadian concept, proud of our credit rating and when he returns, Mr. Speaker, I shall direct it to the attention of the Leader of the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Go West young man go West.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Can the minister tell us whether this is a question on which he feels it necessary that he must await the administration to take a stand? My question has been directed to him as an individual . Does he

MR. ROBERTS: feel as a member of the government and as the Minister of Justice that it is proper for a company doing business with the government to have solicited or to have accepted or both more than \$50,000 in the circumstances in which this particular gift-donation was made.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to give my own personal opinions on any matter coming before the House. I do not think it is the prerogative of a minister to give his own personal opinion. I have to confess an abysmal lack of knowledge as to how party funds are collected for any of the recognized political parties in this Province and I therefore should not, and it would be most imprudent of me, to arrive at personal decisions and personal conclusions based on practices that other people may have had more experience with than I.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, has the minister in his capacity as the Chief-Law Enforcement Officer of this Province taken any steps to enquire into the circumstances which surround - and this, Sir, is not a question I have asked before - I now ask if the minister in his capacity as the Chief Law Enforcement Officer of the Crown has looked into, or caused steps to be taken to look into the circumstances of this admitted donation of more than \$50,000 of which he tells us he has no personal knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my responsibility as Minister of Justice, and I always do it assiduously, quickly and without delay, order any investigation into any matter where there is prima facie evidence of criminality or a breach of the law. I have not seen any evidence thereof and unless and until I do

MR. HICKMAN: I feel that I would be going beyond the bounds of my duty and responsibility to conduct an investigation and if indeed-

MR. NOLAN: Well done Alec.

MR. HICKMAN: -any matters have been investigated then I would suggest to this House that it would be incumbent upon me to keep that an absolute secret. Confidentiality, it must be the order of the day on any investigation that is ongoing

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board. It relates again to the matters I have based questions on in the last couple of days the Labrador Linerboard.

I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether the government and/or the board has authorized any formal investigation into Lab Linerboard expenditures over the past two or three years either investigation by the police or by an outside investigating agency ?

MR. DOODY: There is an annual audit done each year by a recognized accounting firm. They have never brought forward any evidence to indicate to us that an investigation should be conducted. There was one RCMP investigation with which we are familiar with a certain individual and I do not know what has happened to that particular individual, quite apart from the fact underway, that \_\_\_\_\_ gentleman is no longer with the firm. So, the answer is no there have been no investigations other than these things which I have mentioned. There really was no reason.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the minister that the only investigation that he is aware of is that one which relates to one former employee?

MR. DOODY: It is the only one that I can recall of the top of my head, yes Sir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: Is the minister then aware of an investigation, not necessarily one launched by his department or his board of directors, is he aware of any investigation into the DREE funding involved in Labrador Linerboard?

MR. DOODY: In the DREE funding?

MR. ROBERTS: All the DREE money that has gone in and has being misspent.

MR. DOODY: No, I did not know that there had been any DREE money misspent, Your Honour, nor am I aware of any investigation into any alleged misspending of DREE money.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker-

MR. ROBERTS: They are not telling you very much from Stephenville.

MR. DOODY: That could very well be.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the minister a moment ago referred to a former employee who is under investigation. Will he indicate to the House whether that is the same employee whom he identified, not by name but by function, yesterday when answering the question relating to the contract involving

MR. SIMMONS: J. G. Bailey? He referred yesterday to an employee who had been responsible for the expediting of that contract and who is now no longer with the company; are these two individuals one and the same, the one he has mentioned today and the one we talked about yesterday in the earlier line of questioning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: The individual whom I mentioned yesterday as being the signator of that particular agreement is no longer with the company but that is an entirely unrelated thing and it has got nothing to do with any impropriety or any illegality that I am aware of.

The gentleman to whom I was referring to as being investigated by the RCMP is a gentleman who was allegedly removing some materials to help in a stadium renovation or some such thing as that. That is the one that I -

MR. ROBERTS: Not sort of a stadium, sort of a private home.

MR. DOODY: Well whatever, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Conception Bay South, to the hon. member.

MR. NOLAN: I am wondering if the minister could shed some light on information coming to us regarding the sale of equipment that was purchased, expensive equipment, for the Linerboard operation either in Stephenville or in Labrador - we have been informed that it is on sale in some cases now in Montreal for a fraction of the original cost - could the minister shed some light on this as President of the Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: As Chairman of the Board.

MR. NOLAN: Chairman, I am sorry.

MR. DOODY: That question is on the Order Paper by two different members and there are various sub-sections to that question. I have undertaken on two occasions to get the



MR. DOODY: information and find out indeed if there is some truth in the allegations and to what extent. As soon as I can get it available - I contacted Stephenville and asked them to get the information for me. As soon as I get it I will present it to the House.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize one further supplementary on this topic now.

MR. NOLAN: Would the minister consider in view of what my hon. friend mentioned in remarks yesterday or the day before here in the House, and others, about the matter of \$400,000 and some of the speculation in the press and so on, that perhaps there is a need for a royal commission on the whole Linerboard operation over the last three or four years? Would he consider setting up such a commission?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. DOODY: No, certainly not on the information that has been brought to light during the past several days. I have certainly no grounds or reason to recommend to government that a royal commission be set up to investigate -

MR. NEARY: A royal commission.

MR. DOODY: - or any kind of commission set up to investigate the Labrador Linerboard operation. At the present time there is an advisory group who are studying with their people the various facets of the operation out there. They will be presenting a report to us shortly. If they demonstrate to us some need for an investigation or suggest a certain course of action be followed then this government will then consider them. Certain the contract that you are referring to and which had some speculation about it in the press, as has been stated, does not

MR. DOODY: suggest any impropriety whatsoever. It was a contract that was entered into in good faith by two people. Subsequent events demonstrated the contract to be unfavourable to both parties, as it happened, and both parties appear to have lost a considerable amount of money. It was a judgement decision made by management both of the contractor and of the company and eventually they were forced to terminate it at a considerable loss to both parties. There was no impropriety that I am aware of and there was no legal advice.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. and punchy Minister of Finance and president of the Treasury Board if he intends to bring down a budget soon. The minister indicated to the House the budget would be brought down sometime in late February and we are about ten days overdue now. When can we expect the budget to be brought down?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the thought of the member for LaPoile being ten days overdue is absolutely delightful, Your Honour. As a matter of fact I think that is the first bright spot we have had in a couple of days. The budget will be brought down and presented to this hon. House just as soon as it is prepared and ready and ample notice will be given. The House can be assured of that and I have given that information to the House before and I am sure that we will just have to wait until the event presents itself. The happy event - it may be ten days overdue or it may come full-term, I do not know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister indicate to the House if the budget is prepared and ready and in the hands of the printers? Are the ministers finished now with going over the budget with a fine-toothed comb? Is this preparatory work done?

MR. DOODY: The question that the hon. member just raised shows

MR. DOODY: how far into the inner workings of government he was during the previous administration. He obviously is not very well aware of how the whole process works. No, Sir, it has not gone to the printers. It has not been fully prepared and when it does go to the printers the hon. member will know about it when it is tabled in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House whether the budget will be brought down before the end of the current fiscal year, the end of March?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule which prohibits the asking of questions with slight variations. And certainly I would regard that as a question with a quite slight variation to a former one.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. gentleman for an additional supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not make it clear whether all the preparatory work for the budget is complete yet? Is it complete? Does the minister now have the finished product? When I say, go to the printers, I know where it is printed, but is it finished? You know, when can we expect to have the budget? Will it be before the end of the present fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. punchy member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can just control himself, he will be given the information at the appropriate time. The members of government are preparing the budget, getting it ready, and will present it to the House. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will have to just contain himself if he possibly can.

MR. NEARY: I am not going to get it from the printers, you know.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Forestry. Is the minister now in a position to advise the House whether or not the areas for experimental spraying has been designated and if so where they are?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, we have identified the areas that we propose to do experimental field test spraying in this year, and within the next two days I will be presenting a detailed explanation to the House.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Is the minister aware of the paper companies intentions with regards to their future harvesting operations? And do the paper companies intend to concentrate on harvesting the over-mature stands or the seriously infested, budworm infested timber stands in their immediate future harvesting operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: The paper companies are generally following the same concept that government is following and that is resource roads to open up over-mature and insect infested timber stands so these can be harvested first. And they are working very closely with government on this from day to day. We have a Forest Management Joint Committee that is set up between government and the two companies, and this committee monitors all the operations carried out in the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Have the paper companies requested increased spending in the Provincial Government's Access Roads Programme? Would the minister advise the House as to whether the paper companies have requested increased expenditures in the access roads programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any request being made of that nature.



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River followed by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister tell us whether in the last few months - I refer from October last year to now - he has incorporated any new communities? I am referring to community councils, of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, not under the Community Councils Act. But the Local Improvement District of Buchans is obviously the only one up to this point.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us whether he is prepared to honour the public commitment he made to the community of Rigolet in which he was going to incorporate them before December 31, 1976? Could he tell us whether he has any intentions of living up to that belated, as it is?

It is now two months late.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman will please restrict to actual question.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the minister could tell us whether he is prepared to incorporate any further communities, including the community of Rigolet, as he previously stated?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the incorporation of several communities. At this point I do not know if Rigolet is one of them. I did not, to clear the point, promise any community, including Rigolet, that they would be incorporated by any date. I said that we would look at it and hopefully if we could we would, but

MR. DINN:

I certainly did not give any commitment. Any commitments which I give I look after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you permit me a supplementary?

MR. SPEAKER: As of right now the hon. gentleman would be precluded from getting back to it.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Justice. In view of the remarks made yesterday, with which he may be familiar, by Father Hickey to the Kiwanis Club concerning juveniles drinking in the various booze emporiums throughout the Province, has he given any consideration to the points raised publicly in the press on this matter? And has he considered in the past perhaps something with your driver's license or a picture or something to make it, for tavern owners, easier to identify people and so on in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the police have been instructed from time to time to enforce the laws and enforce them very, very rigidly as they relate to the serving of alcoholic beverages in a public place to minors. I know there are difficulties encountered in doing that. I have to confess that I have been party to debates in this House and listened to debates in this House and other discussions on the question of having identification. There are some pretty unfavourable and I think unsavoury overtones that go with that kind of registration. I believe there are other ways that bartenders can fairly accurately ascertain the age of a person who seeks to be served alcoholic beverages -

MR. NOLAN: Would you care to tell us?

MR. HICKMAN: - if there is some doubt. The police have a responsibility and they are doing it. You know, obviously they cannot go into every tavern every night, Mr. Speaker, but they have been instructed and they have been doing it and they have been enforcing it from time to time with respect to prosecuting those who sell alcoholic

MR. HICKMAN:

beverages contrary to the law to minors. Let me assure anyone who is listening that they will continue to do that.

I believe that there are some amendments presently in the process of coming before this hon. House this year to make the police job a little easier in certain areas of identification and in certain definitions of what constitutes a public place. That has been creating some problems, I understand, with respect to certain law enforcements under the Alcoholic Liquors Act.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister saying we are going to be asked to present identification now?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no, no, no, no. I said there are some other areas in the enforcement of the Alcoholic Liquors Act that has created some problems for the police. One is the definition of a public place.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it is only in relation to the Alcoholic Liquors Act?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh yes.

MR. NEARY: And drinking in cars.

MR. HICKMAN: That sort of thing, yes. And that would appear to, in my opinion, require some further amendments in order to better identify them, that is being done. And my colleague the hon. minister responsible or who answers for the Board has just indicated to me that that work is being done now, so hopefully - work done rather - we will have it before the House.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that there are cases, a number of cases that I know, but I am sure others where clergymen have actually had to go, at the request of parents, into some of the booze emporiums to get children out? And, I mean, can we be assured now that something will come before this House (1) to help to eliminate the problem; and (2) to provide some

Mr. Nolan:

funds from the Public Chest to help a situation that we have with alcoholism in this Province that is very serious, more than we are doing now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, well, the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South is on to two different issues, one is the question of law enforcement under the Alcoholic Liquors Act or whatever the Act is now called, and in particular the serving or selling in a public place of alcoholic beverages to those under age. That is not a question, Mr. Speaker, of bringing further legislation before this House.

MR. NOLAN: It is not?

MR. HICKMAN: No. That, Mr. Speaker, is a twofold problem.

MR. NOLAN: Does not the House have a right to know?

MR. HICKMAN: It is a twofold problem. It is not a question of the House having the right to know. I am telling the House right now what the twofold problem is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOLAN: Tell us now.

MR. HICKMAN: One is strict enforcement of the law within the capability and capacity of the police. And this they are doing. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, let me pose this question, any minor, any person under age drinking, buying liquor rather, and that is the operative phrase, buying alcoholic beverage in a place that is licensed so to sell, the question I ask is;



MR. HICKMAN: were are the parents, where are the parents?

MR. NEARY: They are not in the classrooms.

MR. HICKMAN: I think that is a very legitimate question to ask.

MR. WHITE: Take the responsibility, do not make a speech.

MR. HICKMAN: I would believe that if anyone -

MR. NOLAN: There are two separate problems

MR. HICKMAN: -and that is the second problem, one is law enforcement and the other is the behavioural pattern, the behavioural leadership-

MR. NOLAN: Of our whole society.

MR. HICKMAN: that is shown in the home. And I say to this House that if a parent flaunts alcoholic beverages in front of his or her teen-age son or daughter it ill-behooves that parent to get up and scream the next day and say that same daughter bought booze in a licenced establishment when he or she was a year under age.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The original questioner.

MR. NOLAN: Has the minister considered perhaps raising the drinking age within government? Has any consideration been given to that at all or is it his intention, I mean the governments position to continue the way it is now? Perhaps the minister might be good enough to enlighten us on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously as one Minister of the Crown I should not and will not disclose what the government is presently considering at this time. I will draw to the House's attention that a few years ago the great demand was to reduce the drinking age and if you recall the cry that "If a man or woman is old enough to fight for his or her country then they are old enough to be able to buy booze." Personally -

MR. NOLAN: That is what you said when you were Minister of Justice at that time.



MR. HICKMAN: No, no I was not Minister of Justice. Personally-

MR. NOLAN: You were Minister of Health then.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I think I was sitting right where the hon. gentleman is sitting now.

MR. NOLAN: No, no, no. We have good memories here.

MR. HICKMAN: Personally, Mr. Speaker, and as a parent of four teen-age children, one I guess is now beyond his teens, I have grave reservations about the drinking age being down to eighteen. But if anyone is unwise enough to think that by increasing it to nineteen that this is going to affect to any noticeable degree that problem of drinking amongst minors he or she should take their heads from out of the sand and have a look around them-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: -and look at the society that condones it and promotes it.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member from LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay D'Espoir.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Transportation and Communication tell the House if the minister has been invited to meet with the Railway Unions and the Chamber of Commerce in Channel-Port aux Basques as a result of the threat that these people may loose their jobs in that community?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes I have been invited by the Chamber of Commerce and the members of the unions in the Port aux Basques area to meet with them. I have agreed to meet with them on March 18th, the unions in the afternoon and the Chamber of Commerce in the evening. It is not with regards to a threat to the loss of their jobs, it is because they are concerned with the possibility of some affect on the Port aux Basques area

MR. MORGAN:

with regards to the diversion of truck traffic from Port aux Basques to Argenteia. So I am more than pleased to meet with them and to outline to them the plans of the department with regards to transportation in the general Port aux Basques area.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Has the minister explored with Canadian National Railway the possibility of diverting the freight that the minister is concerned about being transported by tractor-trailers over the Trans Canada Highway, diverting this freight onto rail instead of carrying it over the Trans Canada Highway. Has the minister explored this possibility with Canadian National Railways?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not only explored that situation I have pursued it vigorously for the past ten months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Not only with the CNR senior officials but with the Federal Minister of Transport, the Hon. Otto Lang and his officials. The unions have also pursued the same matter-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The matter was also brought to the attention of the Prime Minister of this country with regards to the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: -downgrading of the railway services in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Speech day.

MR. MORGAN: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, unless we get the federal level of government to change their user-pay concept as it applies to the Atlantic region, as I mentioned yesterday,

MR. MORGAN: we are not going to get the freight back on the rails. To suggest, as I heard the hon. gentleman from LaPoile yesterday in the media and I think he also mentioned it here in this assembly, to impose a large fee on the tractor-trailers in order to force the freight back on the rails that would be at the expense of the consumers of this province. So rather than force the increase in two means of modes of transport - the rail has already gone up in their freight rates - rather than force up the freight rates being charged by the truckers the strong suggestion of this administration is for the federal level of government to again, in an overall review of the CNR's rail freight activity in this province, increase the subsidies paid to CNR to enable them to reduce the freight rates and put the freight back on the rails.

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

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister does not understand what the alternative is. It is rail and not diverting traffic. But, Sir, I want to ask the minister and I might say that - I know I cannot accuse the minister of deliberately misleading the House but only this morning I checked with CN and the minister has not been in touch with the local management of CN in connection with this freight thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. gentleman is directed to avoid debate.

MR. NEARY: I want to ask the minister, Sir, if he has explored the possibility with Canadian National of using a system that they have done a study on, a system known as piggy-back. ? In order words carrying freight so far by road and carrying it a certain distance by rail and maybe putting it back on the road again. Has the minister explored this alternative with Canadian National Railway of transporting freight across this island under the piggy-back method and if so what are the results of any negotiations they may have had with Canadian National?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will confirm that I have had no meetings, discussions or consultations or proposals put forward to the local management of CNR in this province because unfortunately the local management, who are indeed good individuals, good men, men like Mike Green and others who are involved with CNR in this province, do not make the decisions of CNR in this province. They are made in the plush offices in Montreal and other places in Canada. That is the unfortunate thing with regards to CNR in this province. But we have put forward a proposal to the senior officials who make the decisions and it has fallen on deaf ears.

MR. NEARY: What is the proposal?

MR. MORGAN: To give an example of CNR's attitude with regards to freight, the cost of moving freight by rail - Bowaters presently have to move all their pulpwood from Glenwood to Corner Brook simply because they could not come to an agreement with CNR to keep on using that mode of transport. That is an example of CNR's attitude with regards to rail freight in this province.

MR. NEARY: What about the piggy-back? Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer my question about the piggy-back system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to my earlier subject involving Lab Liner. I understand the minister might have some information now and I will ask so as to give him the opportunity to answer.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this is the information that the hon. member asked for yesterday and which I undertook to get for him as quickly as I could. It is in relation as to whether or not tenders had been called for the contract that was subsequently awarded to Guy Bailey Ltd., what were the costs and was Bailey, indeed, in the trucking business? The implication was that he was, I think, in the school bus business and owned perhaps a pickup truck or something to that effect. The message that I just got from

MR. DOODY: Lab Linerboard was that tenders were indeed called and there were four companies who tendered. Alton Budgell tendered at \$21.00 a cord, K and K Trucking tendered at \$20.50 a cord, Windsor Transport tendered at \$20.00 a cord and Guy Bailey Ltd. tendered at \$21.50 a cord which is \$1.50 higher than the Windsor Trucking and fifty cents higher than the above Budgell tender.

MR. SIMMONS: To the highest of the four?

MR. DOODY: Yes, the reason for giving it to Guy Bailey Ltd. was that his was the only contract that lived up to the specifications of the schedule that was requested for delivery and the other people were not in the position to meet the specs and so the most economical and reasonable tenderer was the Guy Bailey Ltd. tender. Apparently Mr. Bailey and his family have been in the trucking business for many years. Apparently they have been in the trucking business ever since IOC went into Labrador City.

---

---



Mr. Doody:

He, I think, also has a school bus business in Baie Verte, but make no mistake about it, Your Honour, according to my information this company has been in the trucking business and the transport business for quite a long while. And if there is further information - of course all of this as I am saying I am making it public now and it can be checked and verified and if there is further information needed we will try and get it for you.

AN HON. MEMBER: A further supplementary.

MR. HICKMAN: Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The time is up.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 2, the adjourned debate.

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. A. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a couple of moments to take part in this debate on this resolution: Be It Resolved that this House is gravely concerned with the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador, and, realizing that this has the most serious implications for the future of this Province." I think I can agree without reservation, Sir, we are gravely concerned with the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador.

My own particular experience with Labrador has been that for a few short months, Sir, I was Minister of Labrador Affairs while that department was just being phased out. I might say before I get into my remarks, from my own point of view I would like to say how much I enjoyed up to this point the debate that has taken place on this particular motion. It has been on the go now, I think, some five or six weeks, Sir, and the unfortunate part is that, you know, the first or second or third speaker sort of fades into the background and it is very difficult to keep note of everything that happened.

Mr. Murphy:

But I would say, and one does not like to single out people, but I would just like to pay a tribute to the gentleman who preceded me the hon. member from Fogo (Capt. Winsor), and as I tell him personally, I am always interested in his remarks on Labrador because he knows what he is talking about as far as Labrador is concerned, and particularly, Labrador North.

MR. MURPHY: And I would say again that I think the Premier's statement, and this is not how great thou art on my part, I think the Premier's few words, Sir, on last Wednesday were very excellently put. I do not think there is any friction or any other thing in this particular thing. I think the hon. member who represents that district has a very, very difficult task to do. And as far as this government is concerned I think we are trying to do the best we can with what we are facing. And what we are facing is not apparent to us all and I think everybody sees that there is something inside of all of the people. There is a feeling of something but to try and put it down on a page or in a word of a speech it is very difficult to do. It is a kind of an intangible thing that we are talking about.

Now my own experience with Labrador is basically with the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, Sir. When I was in another job than I am now I was travelling to Happy Valley-Goose Bay during the American occupation there, when the base was being constructed. And to look - and we talk about a few short years and what is happening. When I went into Happy Valley in the early 1950s there was no transportation, no public transportation as such. There only one hotel at that time where one could stay, Sir, that was the Airlines Hotel. Happy Valley as we know it now, of course, did not exist.

MR. STRACHAN: The Airline Hotel was where Hammond Innes started to write a book "The Land God gave to Cain".

MR. MURPHY: Yes. I remember the only place, I was going to say of habitation which is not right because there were a number of shacks and what not down in that particular area, was the Hamilton River Boat Club that was down in that particular area. And I remember walking over an area of land with Mr. Ted LaPoint who was personnel officer with the American Forces, and a Mr. - I forget this chaps name - and he showed me right where the streets were going to be, this type of thing, there was not a house there at that particular time in that area, as a town, and they had it planned to be laid out.

But when I was in Labrador Affairs, as I say for a few short months, I do not know how many communications I did receive by the telephone and this was particularly on Coastal Labrador. And I think when we are talking about Labrador now many factors have entered into it, and we talk about Labrador West which is perhaps the most affluent, if you like, area of this Province bar none. I think I can say that with the amounts of money being earned in there. It was a tremendous lift for Labrador. We had Chruchill Falls, the great development, and I recall with a great degree of pleasure the day the member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) blew the top of the mountain down there. And unfortunately the member from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) is not here now, but I recall

MR. MURPHY: when we did make that visit, we went up and it was suggested by the then Premier that we should walk up the path and have a look at the Falls itself because it might be the last look we would get. So we were just about up there and the sky opened up and everybody was drenched to the skin. And I remember a helicopter flying over and dropped us some slickers to keep it off, but my one thought - Well I had a couple of impressions and the first one of course was Mr. - He was the president of CN railway.

MR. NOLAN: Donald Gordon.

MR. MURPHY: Donald Gordon, about six foot seven with about a size fourteen shoe on him, and when the member for Conception Bay South and myself were walking up the path we met this gentleman coming down, and every step he took he drove streams of water out of his shoes, and he described his visit to Churchill Falls. I could not say it here the language he did use, but it was not that which you could put in public print. We got a bit of a shock from him at the time. I have a photograph home when we did get back to get the plane and the hon. member and myself were there and all we had on was a slicker and our shorts actually, because every bit of clothes we had were drenched and we had it on our arm. You know, that is one of the vivid memories and I think our hon. friend from Port au Port was I think one of our guides at that time or you were working there 'Jim'.

MR. HODDER: I believe I dispatched the helicopter.

MR. MURPHY: Was that what it was? Anyway I know -

MR. STRACHAN: I should remind you that Donald Gordon who is certainly one of the great Canadians was born in a community and brought up in a community only three miles from my community where I was born.

MR. MURPHY: Well I gather from that that all the great men lived within three miles of each other.

MR. HICKMAN: His first wife was from Barters Hill.



MR. MURPHY: His first wife was from Flower Hill.

MR. HICKMAN: No Barter's Hill.

MR. MURPHY: Her mother kept a beer shop.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no.

MR. MURPHY: That was a fact, is it? Se we get into Labrador and we are bringing them closer home all the time.

As I say again, these are some of the memories and when we talk about Churchill Falls and we talk about Happy Valley-Goose Bay and we talk about Labrador City, I do not think we are talking in essence of the true feelings of the Labrador people as such, and that is coastal Labrador. Now there is no great political gain in the P.C. Party talking about Labrador or giving them any great concessions or anything else, because I always said when an election came around that the Liberals could run a candidate and we could send the Holy Ghost up to run against that Liberal candidate and the Holy Ghost would get third. So as far as political impüt was concerned, and I see the hon. member for Twillingate sort of smile at that, but I think that is an actual fact. It was always a great problem.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister graciously permit me to ask him what he said that he thought I was smiling at? I just strolled in, and I was smiling from something that happened in the corridor.

MR. MURPHY: I see. It was the matter of the political impact of the P.C.'s on Coastal Labrador, and I always said when they were running a candidate there that the Liberals could run a man and the P.C.'s could run the Holy Ghost against him and the Holy Ghost would come third of the two man race. In other words, what chance P.C.'s had to get on Coastal Labrador was no chance in the world. Why I do not know. It is a kind of a background there -

MR. STRACHAN: We know why.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member agree that never a Tory has ever been elected to the House of Assembly from any part of Labrador?? Labrador West is a well-known Liberal, well-known Liberal, very prominent active Liberal.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member



MR. ROUSSEAU: has many times with all graciousness called me a confirmed Liberal. I have never stood before to reject that. I was not a P.C., I was not a Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just a Joey man.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Nowhere in the files of the Liberal Party could they ever find a card carrying Liberal by the name of Joe Rousseau, nor could the P.C.'s, by the way, until five or six years ago. I was a concerned Newfoundlander who decided to get in this, but I was not a Liberal and I would like to dispell any thoughts that the hon. member from Twillingate has in that connection.

MR. MURPHY: Another man has repudiated a very serious charge. I remember at one time, as a matter of fact I think it was one of the first speeches I made in the House back in 1962 or 1963, when the hon. Premier at that time said to me, "A great Liberal speech" and I threatened to sue him for slander at that time but these things happen.

We are talking now about a very, very serious problem and that is the problem of the feelings of the people of Labrador. Now I do not want to get political on this because I think we have refrained from it up to this point, but being one

---

Mr. Murphy:

who sat over there with two other people for a number of years in an opposition, and we saw this, and I do not know what it was, whether it was a bill introduced or not, or what it was, but this great idea someone had of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We fought it right from the start, and, in my opinion, I think it was the worst possible thing that could happen to Labrador to make them feel that they were not a part of Newfoundland, and that was the way we argued.

Now the other argument used by the Liberal Party at that time was to make them feel that they were. But I argued at the same time, well all right let us change the whole system, so we will have the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Province of Newfoundland and St. John's East Extern, the Province of Newfoundland and St. John's Centre. What was the difference. If they were a part of Newfoundland, let us make them a part of Newfoundland with all the rights and privileges that went to every citizen of our great Province.

MR. STRACHAN: Could I give a suggestion to the minister.

Maybe we could call it the -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please! I must point out to the hon. member that it is quite out of order to interrupt another hon. member. He may rise and ask permission. If the hon. member then takes his seat he certainly is in order to proceed, but to actually interrupt would be quite out of order.

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. MURPHY: I would permit a question if the hon. member wants to ask one.

MR. STRACHAN: You will permit a question? Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I took it when the minister sat down that he conceded to me. The statement I was making to the minister was had he ever considered that we should change the name of the

Mr. Strachan:

Province to the Province of Labrador and Newfoundland?

MR. MURPHY: No, I never considered that, and I never thought we could change the name to Canada either, because I am a Newfoundlander and very proud of being a Newfoundlander, and I do not think any other name would do it. I notice there are letters in the paper, and this type of thing. But I am a Newfoundlander and I say this wherever I go, and as a matter of fact on Monday I was in Halifax to a meeting for a few hours and there was a federal minister there and he was chatting about this and that, and I said to the boys there - Prince Edward Island was represented and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick - I said it must be wonderful for you people to be a part of Canada and share in the benefits that accrue to it. But I said, here is a minister here who has visited Halifax three times in the past three months and apparently there is a turn-around there like a swinging door that he goes right on back. And I said it is like the CN, a great advertisement "From Coast to Coast" a beautiful passenger service, from Halifax to Vancouver." You know, what are we? The great member from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) talks about us coming into Confederation, and Uncle Ottawa and this type of thing.

I believe myself, Sir, that we have got to reassess our own position now. And I am not talking about separatism as we hear some people have talked about Labrador, we hear it in Quebec. An extraordinary thing, it was only the last election, and I do not know if I told the story before, I was canvassing some of my constituents on Cabot Street, and I went to this particular house, and this old gentleman said, "Ank where are you going next? Oh I said "Next Door". "You are not going into Mrs. So and So", he said, "Sure she is a Confederate". This was in 1975. So you can see that the feeling is still the same, that one identifies with the other, the Confederation and the hon. member from Twillingate, the old Liberal Party. In other words, you wither had to be a

Mr. Murphy:

Conserative, or you had to be a Liberal, and a Confederate. I think that distinction was drawn back in those days.

But as far as Labrador is concerned, and I would just like to correct something now that crept into the press and I had letter or the Premier had a wire from a Mr. Hank Shouse in Happy Valley, who I know, to have me removed because of my great -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shouse?

MR. MURPHY: Hank Shouse, one other great Newfoundlander - to have me removed because of the fact that I made a statement with reference to Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: He was a P.C.

MR. MURPHY: And just to put the story in its proper perspective. One Saturday night at home, and John Baker from CBC phones me, and he said, "Mr. Murphy, as Minister of Provincial Affairs" - I said, "John look, Provincial Affairs went out last June, and I am now Minister of Consumer Affairs, but carry one." He said, "I want to ask you a question on a statement Mr. Rompkey made about the great swell of dissatisfaction in Labrador and the great feeling for separation." And I said, "John, quite frankly, you know, I said, I had not had any petitions or anything to separate." And I said, "As far as our government is concerned", I said, "Since I have been associated with the ministry, I think we have leaned over backwards to do what we can, and I think like the other government did' too. I was not trying to say that the P.C's had done more. I think we have leaned over backwards to do what we can for Labrador." And the next day in the paper I got such a blasting for being so arrogant and everything else, and all I did was just make that simple statement. I have a copy of the transcript actually from CBC,



MR. MURPHY: but I do not know how it was translated now in the Labrador station. I was rather amused at another statement and whether this was true or false, but the hon. member for Eagle River said that the nerve of a fellow from St. John's to talk about Labrador. Then I checked. I said, "Where was the hon. member born? In Happy Valley, in Nain or in Makkovik. No, I think he was born in Scotland actually." But I got a bit of a kick out of that where would someone dare from the City of St. John's talk about Labrador.

MR. STRACHAN: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: I do not know if that was a fact, but you were quoted as saying it.

MR. STRACHAN: Oh, I do not intend to argue with that. But the question of birthplace or the birthrights and so on indicates a certain type of patriotism, and a type of patriotism I believe which is only a defense of a bigot or a narrow-minded person. I think the fact is I live in Nain. The fact is I am a Canadian and I think the reference to one's birthplace has very little to do with the job that one has to do.

MR. MURPHY: That is the point I was trying to make, because I was born in St. John's I had no right to talk about Labrador which I think was bigotry and all the rest - Separatism in the true sense. Sometimes when I hear people refer to St. John's you would not know but they were some foreign tribe that were dropped in here by parachute or something. When I get into the Address and Reply perhaps I might tell some people, give them a little information about St. John's, who are not familiar with it, particularly some of the younger boys who are still a bit wet behind the ears and coming on, but they will learn anyhow.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to get back again to this, definitely no matter what we say we have a problem to talk about Labrador. But this Select Committee, Sir, to me is just, again it



MR. MURPHY: is amusing because the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir talks about all the studies were made. I was Minister of Labrador Affairs when the great Snowden Commission was set up. I was right in the middle of the thing basically when all this was going on. I do not know what it cost but it must have cost a fortune, quite frankly. I can think of people, and I say this now, like Mr. Frank Mercer, who was the government's representative in Happy Valley, I would say that Frank Mercer basically and in his little skull here knew just as much as going around asking people. Basically are we dealing with a million people? Are we dealing with thousands of people or three or four thousand people we are trying to assimilate into -

MR. STRACHAN: Forty thousand.

MR. MURPHY: On Coastal Labrador?

MR. SIMMONS: In all Labrador.

MR. MURPHY: All Labrador, yes. I am just saying the big problem is Coastal Labrador. The economic and social effects, the previous government I think started, or did we build it? Whatever it was, the building in Wabush, the government building there. I think in Happy Valley, Goose Bay pretty well every department is represented in one way or another. I would love to have a Department of Consumer Affairs in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, but there are other priorities. You listen to petitions for this road today down in Bay Verte. Should they give me \$50,000 to set up an office in Goose Bay to talk about the consumer affairs or should we send it down to Bay Verte or should we send it somewhere else? You know, these are problems, I think, that government must face and as far as I am concerned again as Minister of Consumer Affairs, we shoot a man in there every three or four months to listen to people. In Labrador South there is a committee set up that keeps in constant contact with my department. They monitor prices and this type of stuff. We do

MR. MURPHY: what we can for them and anything else that we can do. Environmentally there is this mining thing going on now around Makkovik, and we went out of our way to make sure that the peoples of Labrador were represented on that, three or four of them were represented and have an input into the thing. I think we are doing everything in our power to try to serve the people of Labrador. It is a matter of everybody working together. Now when it was mentioned about - No, I will not say it. I might say it some other time when I am in a bad mood. I am in a pretty good mood today.

Actually I think it boils down, Mr. Speaker, what do the people of Labrador want? What is the actual question? What do they want? I know when I was Minister of Labrador Affairs, and I look at now the member for Eagle River and I go back to my correspondence, God Help us Almighty! If there was one representation from Labrador there was fifty - from the hon. gentleman, there is a shortage of oil here, there is something else there, and he had me just about off my rocker trying to check with people and see all this. I think the hon. gentleman was with the university extension on that. Am I right, at that time?

MR. STRACHAN: No, just before.

MR. MURPHY: Just before that. So you know everybody - There are people, and

MR. MURPHY:

I think first of all there has got to be a little education in the sense, not the book-learning education, but the education of we are all trying to go the same way. We talk about Labrador. Sure, the isolation and remoteness is a big thing. And I look at Buchans, say. It is only a few short years ago that we could drive into Buchans. Those of us who travelled the railway can look back when we had to go up and get off at Millertown Junction and perhaps wait two and three and four hours to get a run into Buchans. Here Buchans was a way up in the hinterland, way off to itself. And anybody who knows Buchans thirty-five or forty years ago will agree with me the same thing. You know, we have come a long ways in this Province in the twenty-three or twenty-four or twenty-seven years that we are, we have come an awful long ways.

We look back and we criticize the previous administration for things. But let us look at the amount of effort that has been put into this in bringing in communications. I look at the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) here, and I think when I was travelling on the road I would go to Norris Arm - Norris Arm was a pretty prosperous place in these days - and I would take a horse and slide and go down across the ice down to Botwood in these days. And as I say, it is a matter of all hands coming together and instead of trying to move in and pry us apart, I think - and I say this quite frankly - that everybody on this side whether he be - well on this side of course we are all PC's - but everybody in this House, whether they be an Independent or a Liberal or a PC, you know, I think we all want to do it. But what do we want? What is the answer to it? I do not think a Select Committee is going to do any more good. I think it will be a nice trip for six or seven fellows to go down there. And if I was on that Select Committee I would ask them to go down perhaps in the month of July, because I have tried five times to take that trip from Happy Valley on the boat going North to Nain and each time I got fooled up one way or another. But I do not think it is going to accomplish anything.

But what I would like to see down here is the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) and the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and let us get all this

MR. MURPHY:

information out that has been gathered together. Certainly heavens we can look at that. I would like to see a Committee look at it and bring out some of the things that have to happen to it. Labrador is a place of residence now for people. But in the old days it was a place where people went to fish. I know in my own particular school back in St. Patrick's Hall there were two or three families that fished on the Labrador, and we were always jealous of them because they always left sometime in May, before we got our holidays, to go fishing, to go with their families and they never came back to October or something and they had that extra month. But this was the way we lived.

But Labrador has changed now. With the prospects we hope, please God, of gas find and all the rest, Labrador in another fifteen or twenty - who ever thought that Labrador West would be what it is today, who would ever have thought that twenty or twenty-five years ago? So as I say, let us look at what we have gathered together. And on that thing, this is perhaps just a little humorous thing that Reverend Lester Burry talked about on the hon. member's show one day about the invitations when Churchill Falls was officially opened. He talked about how he had not received an invitation up to a certain time. So he said, "I decided that I would phone my friend Ank Murphy and tell him that he heard that Monseigneur O'Brien did not get an invitation." And he said, "I am sure he will be very much upset." And when we discovered that Monseigneur O'Brien who had been associated with Labrador, he would certainly say to me then, "Well Reverend Burry, did you get one? And of course", he said, "I would have to say no." So Mr. Murphy would get one for Monseigneur O'Brien but he could not get one without getting one for Lester Burry. The whole thing pulled in anyway and he got his invitation. But, you know, it is just a little association that I did have at the time as Minister of Labrador Affairs.

So, gentlemen, there is not much else that I can add to it only to say how happy I am that the debate has carried on in the manner it has

MR. MURPHY:

and as far as my department is concerned, and I am sure every department of government - and I say this without any feeling of political affiliation - every department of government is bending over backwards to bring to Eagle River and the rest of Labrador anything we can do to help the people, communications and all the rest of it. So if there is anything that my department can do I want to assure any of the members feel free to come. We have visited as often as we can with our people there, and all I say, Mr. Speaker, in closing is that I hope that something that has been a very contentious and a very sore spot for a great many years can be brought to a head by this House of Assembly in this present year. But I honestly - and it is not that the other group suggested this Select



MR. MURPHY: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee, but I am against appointing commissions and what not. But I think there are other ways to do it by researching what facts we have and bring it up to date and let us sit down and do the best we can for Labrador.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, for a person from St. John's in the East, particularly representing a district in the far eastern portion of the Island to speak about Labrador, one has to have certain feelings of timidity about it in addressing one's self to the resolution, particularly because of the attitude that appears to be somewhat prevalent in certain areas to the effect that unless you live in Labrador or unless you are born in Labrador or unless you have relatives in Labrador that one should not trespass to speak upon it. But of course that really is not so.

Before addressing myself to the main part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this particular resolution, I would like to say it has gone on for a number of weeks, perhaps it might be presumptuous to note it but I think I would like to note how much I did enjoy the very informative speech by the hon. member for Fogo (Captain Winsor) last week, and he went on for forty-five minutes but it was the type of speech that one could listen to pretty well all day long, and a constructive one at that.

I think this resolution is really more or less consigned to a fait accompli, because the hon. the Premier spoke about it last week and indicated, I thought in a very reasonable way, his attitude towards it was that he felt that there was going to be any good really achieved by it, that there would be a select committee, but he cast doubts as to whether the select committee would achieve any real, worthwhile results. And I cannot say really that

MR. MARSHALL: I quibble with this observation. I think the time has come, with the mammoth Snowden Report we have, and the many other reports that have been done from time to time, instead of studying reports I think the time has come really to do things for Labrador as well as for other parts of the Province which finds themselves in this position.

What I want to speak about in this debate at this present time, Mr. Speaker, is to introduce a new aspect to it and to talk about the effect on this resolution, and indeed upon Newfoundland in general, of the apparent discussion by three hon. members of this House with the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Levesque, when they went to meet with him, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Eagle River, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons), when they met with Mr. Levesque and not only apparently, obviously committed what I consider to be one of the gravest errors that has ever been committed by elected representatives of the people of this Province, in apparently discussing with the Premier of Quebec an issue which in Newfoundland is regarded as a non-issue, but which in the Province of Quebec has for many, many years been regarded as a very, very vital and hot issue. The hon. members went to Quebec, saw Mr. Levesque, and discussed with him two aspects, number one - resource development in the Province, nothing wrong with that; but number two - they apparently, as obviously indicated by the conversation on Here And Now a couple of Fridays ago by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, discussed with Premier Levesque matters pertaining to the border as between Labrador and Quebec and this of course was verified by statements made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) in The Daily News to which I will refer to in more detail in a moment.

In doing this, Mr. Speaker, this has previously been unnoticed by the front benches of this government on this

MR. MARSHALL: side, and I think really that the type of speech I am making now could well have come from the front benches, but if it is not going to come from the front benches it surley is coming from the backbenchers.

It has previously gone unheeded really except, I understand, within the Liberal caucus itself. I understand the people in the Liberal caucus took issue with the situation, and also it was referred to indirectly, not specifically by Wayfarer of The Daily News,

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Albert Perlin, who remains the leading perceptive journalist in this Province when he said, "I suppose that the most surprising thing about the meeting between Ed Roberts and his two colleagues and the Premier, Rene Levesque, is that it took place at all." Surprising, Mr. Speaker, indeed; more than surprising, perhaps the biggest error in my view that any elected representative in Newfoundland has ever made. When this error is committed by a person who occupies the office of Leader of the Opposition, and presumably the alternate Premier of this Province, it takes on a much more serious situation.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition on Friday on Here And Now, two Fridays ago, indicated that there had been discussion about resources. He indicated that there were discussions on the Quebec boundary. He said that it was a non-issue and tended to play it down. But he certainly did indicate that the matter was talked about. He referred to the fact that Mr. Levesque had said that he might refer the issue to The Hague or some international court. Prior to that in The Daily News, in the Labrador edition of February 25, 1977 there was report of the the account of this meeting from the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). This account itself is startling, and since the hon. member has not risen to contradict the contents I presume it is correct and I propose to read this report. I have it here to table, Mr. Speaker, from The Daily News.

It is entitled, "Boundary Will Not Be Changed, Strachan assured that Labrador boundary will not be changed." It reads as follows, and I quote, "At least one Labrador MHA is reassured that the Labrador boundary will remain as it is despite the statements by Quebec Prime Minister Rene Levesque since his election last Fall that Labrador should have been part of Quebec and that he plans to dispute the boundary in the international courts should Quebec decide to separate." Notice the consistency between that and what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said on television.

"The Eagle River MHA, Ian Strachan, discussed the matter with Mr. Levesque Monday when a Liberal delegation went to Montreal. Mr. Strachan



MR. MARSHALL:

says he came away from the meeting feeling reassured that Mr. Levesque understood and accepted his point of view. 'Quebec has bullied us long enough territorially and in regards to resources,' Mr. Strachan said. The time has come - Here, here is right ! - for Mr. Levesque to change his attitude or they will get nothing but conflict from this Province." Nothing wrong with that. I say, "Hear, hear!" as well, Mr. Speaker. But we will come to what I do not say, "Hear, hear!" about in a few moments.

"Mr. Strachan said he reminded Mr. Levesque that he is able to sit in his Montreal offices and read because of power coming from Labrador, and he jokingly suggested that switches could easily be flicked off if the bullying continued." Hear, hear again! Mr. Strachan said 'Mr. Levesque has two reactions to the boundary dispute. One is a gut reaction that Mr. Levesque has always felt Quebec was done out of Labrador, but he also has pragmatic political feelings which tell him that the chances of Quebec ever making gains in Labrador are very, very slim. And he says it is not really a priority anyway, Mr. Strachan says!'"

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: No, not "Hear, hear!" to discuss an issue that was laid to rest in 1927. Not "Hear, Hear!" to elected representatives discussing this with the Prime Minister of Quebec. "Mr. Strachan suggested that Mr. Levesque should strongly consider making public statements to reassure especially Labradorians and Newfoundlanders that Quebec makes no claim on their Province."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: "Hear, hear!"? Where, where! Mr. Speaker, imagine an elected representative of this Province going and suggesting to the Premier of Quebec that he make public statements "to reassure especially Labradorians and Newfoundlanders that Quebec makes no claim on their Province." "The Eagle River MHA (Mr. Strachan) said Mr. Levesque is very sincere, a no-nonsense type of person and seems to have accepted my points well."

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine, certainly



Mr. Marshall.

through inadvertence - I know it would be through inadvertence, naviety or what have you. I cannot imagine any greater disservice done to the people of this Province by any elected representatives than going up to Quebec and discussing with the Premier of Quebec, be he Rene Levesque, be he Robert Bourassa, Jean Lesage, Daniel Johnson or any of his predecessors, an issue which is not an issue in this Province. Now let me make it quite plain that in -

MR. WHITE: Tell your colleagues that, that this land is our land.

MR. MARSHALL: - in 1927 -

AN HON. MEMBER: You tell your buddies.

MR. DOODY: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: Who started the issue?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor. You know, I will yield to questions, but I will not yield to people, you know, shouting across there. If he wants to ask a question the hon. member can. I will yield to him, but I do not expect to be shouted at. Now the situation here is, Mr. Speaker, that this issue was laid to rest in 1927 when a decision was made by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which everybody knows. Newfoundland at that time -

MR. NEARY: That is what the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) told us.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, we will just get back to this in a moment now, but the member for Eagle River and the Leader of the Opposition ought not to be discussing this at all. If the matter is settled, as it is settled, as it was settled in 1927, there is certainly no need to ask the Premier of the Province of Quebec to reassure Newfoundland as to its territorial boundaries. Now this was decided in 1927.

It was decided in the Terms of Union with Canda. Term 2 of the Terms of Union with Canada clearly states that the territory in Newfoundland, "the Province of Newfoundland, shall consist of the Island of Newfoundland and that part of the mainland of Labrador which has been set forth in

Mr. Marshall.

the decision that was rendered in March 1927 by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council! It has farther been settled by the fact of the delivery of Churchill Falls power from Newfoundland to the Province of Quebec. It has farther been practically accepted by many other instances, no need to go into here. But there is a danger, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, of even discussing this particular issue, particularly with the Province of Quebec. We have always held here that there is no issue, and I think that is quite plain. The Liberal senator, Senator Eric Cook in his senate speech on February 2, 1977, which was acclaimed in the press, the mainland press and here and which hon. members may well read - it is a very instructional one on the rights vis-a-vis Quebec and Labrador in the event of Quebec becoming a separate entity in our rights to the power. But he did touch on the matter of the 1927 case and the rights of Newfoundland to Labrador and also the Terms of Union with Canada, and he said "the foregoing facts, and in light of these facts, It is irresponsible for the present Prime Minister of Quebec to delude his followers by stating that he will submit the Labrador question to the Court of International Justice. First and foremost there is no Labrador question to submit to anyone." Now that is the position I think that should be taken. The disgrace for Rene Levesque to go and talk about the Labrador boundary with his people, I suggest it is the height of stupidity and naviety on the part of elected representatives of this Province to go to Quebec and talk about it with a Prime Minister of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Look, one of the worst things one can do when you have a settled dispute is go to the other side and discuss it at all. If you have any issue, anyone who has had any experience, as we all have, in the settlement and resolution of disputes, you know you do not go to the other side and indicate if you have any lack of confidence for whatever reason in your own side, This is one of the worst

Mr. Marshall.

things that you can do. You do not have to be necessarily in the practice of law for this. Anyone who has partaken in a labour dispute knows of it. Anyone who has played an ordinary game of poker, or the housewife who plays a game of forty-fives even knows it. You do not show the other side. And you do not give any impression to the other side that there is any weakness at all, as there is no weakness in our situation.

This also sets a precedent, Mr. Speaker.

The third thing that \_\_\_\_\_

MR. MARSHALL:           this has done is set a precedent that Quebec can now point to. Before, since 1927, we were resolute and we remain resolute that there was no issue ever to discuss. They would never accept it. Heretofore, they have only been able to rely on their own acts, their little maps that they have put out showing Labrador as being part of Quebec; their statements that they have made. They have never been able to point to any statement by any elected member in this Province before which they can latch on to, which can be pointed to by them to indicate that there is one iota of doubt in our minds as to the validity and the location of that boundary. At least they could not, Mr. Speaker, they could not until - and I hope they will not be able to in the future, but what a disservice and what a danger to the people of this Province by elected representatives going up to the Prime Minister of Quebec and discussing this.

AN HON. MEMBER:           You are twisting the facts.

MR. MARSHALL:           No, I am not twisting the facts. I am sure that former Prime Ministers of this Province would roll over in their graves if they knew it, if they knew what was going on. I know that the former Premier of this Province, the hon. the member for Twillingate, has a thorough record all the way through of taking a very sensible attitude with respect to this particular question, he would never discuss the borders of Quebec. We remember in 1966 in his debates with Mr. Lesage, at the time, he would not discuss the boundary of Quebec. It was an undiscussable item and so it should remain.

                                  This was incredible, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned. I do not think, obviously, it was done purposely by any member here, but I say it was stupid, it was naive on the part of the people concerned, and in years to come it might be the very thing that the Province of Quebec can point to to give a bow to their arrow. I certainly hope it is not.

                                  Why did they do it? Were they taken in?  
I do not know. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on television



MR. MARSHALL: indicated that Mr. Levesque was charming, he was able, he was competent, and certainly he is all these things to be able to do what the man has done, to win the election he did. But one thing he did not note, which is also equally well known is that the Prime Minister of Quebec is a very cunning individual and I had to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, whether Rene the Fox perhaps lured the hon. gentlemen into his den purely and simply for the purpose of getting them to give the appearance - which they did give the appearance - of discussing this very issue. If they did I think it is a terrible thing. Because after all the Prime Minister of Quebec obviously has his troubles now. He does have many problems which confront him daily. He has problems in financing in Quebec, of selling his bonds, and the myriad problems that occur to any province in Canada, but least of all Quebec which has economic problems, and with his new government he has it.

So the questions that I pose when I bring this up - and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they should be answered - I ask in view of this, will the Leader of the Opposition if he becomes Premier discuss with Mr. Levesque or his successors the boundary issue? Or will he discuss this in any size, manner or shape? Or will he take the obvious stand that must be taken that there is no issue to discuss and to discuss the issue weakens us in this Province? Who suggested this mysterious meeting? Why did it take place? Was it Mr. Levesque who suggested it? Why did Mr. Levesque agree to it? Because I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether this was a part of Mr. Levesque's grand design.

MR. ROBERTS: A diabolical distortion of what happened.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not distorting. The hon. member is well able to distort facts from time to time himself. But I am giving the facts as they are and my interpretation. If the hon. member sees them some other way in his efforts to get back with his former colleagues he can see them as he wishes.

Did the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Speaker - another question - agree to meet on terms such as discussion of the boundary? Was there an agenda set down for this meeting? Was this



MR. MARSHALL:                    one of the items on the agenda? How  
come it was discussed at all and why was it discussed? Will  
the hon. members stand in their places before the people of  
this Province, in this Legislature, and recount precisely and  
exactly, as I think they must, what exactly, letter, chapter and  
verse,

Mr. Marshall:

was said at that meeting particularly in relation to the boundary? Why was Mr. Levesque asked to reassure this Province as to the boundaries of this Province? We do not need any reassurance, Mr. Speaker. The only reassurance that we need is the fact that we are, and we remain part of the country of Canada, and if Quebec separates and attempts to do anything we will call upon the Canadian nation of which we are a part for our protection. We do not need any reassurance. You know, there are many other steps. Now I say this, and make these statements, Mr. Speaker, because I think myself that there are still some things in this world that are better left unsaid. And since Mr. Levesque, and there are various politicians there have voiced opinions from time to time about our boundary issue, and it has never been questioned here, that one of the worst things that any politician can do or any person in any, not just politicians, any Newfoundlander can do is to suggest in any manner, shape or form that there is any lack of confidence on the part of Newfoundlanders or any uncertainty on the part of Newfoundlanders as to the boundaries.

Now I make these statements, Mr. Speaker, because I think they have to be brought out. As I say, I think they ought to come from the frontbenches of this government. I think it should have been the government that really should have seen this and really made it the issue that it is in this Province, but failing this it will come from the backbenches. And I regret having to bring it up, particularly with respect to the member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) who with the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the member from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) have done so well in representing the Labrador portion of this Province, and I think we are fortunate in this Assembly that we have on the one case the hon. member from Naskaupi, who is a native of Labrador, in the other case the hon. member from Menihek who is a native of the Island, and has gone to settle in Labrador, and the hon. member from Eagle River who comes from outside of the Province and has

Mr. Marshall:

settled and is welcomed in Labrador. They are three very wide viewpoints and they all express it very well. And the hon. member from Eagle River certainly has not taken a back seat in that particular trio.

And I regret I think it is a mistake, an inadvertance, but as I have had occasion from time to time to mention to various people in connection with government, when you are elected you are not elected as a member of a service club or a debating society, the issues are very serious, grimly serious, becoming more grimmer as the days and years go by, and one has to accept responsibility for their actions. And in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, I think that what was done, the visiting of the Prime Minister of Quebec and the admitted discussion with Mr. Levesque of the boundary issue, discussing the previously unmentionable, perverting into places where nobody else went before, I do not know why it occurred. As I say, I do not know whether it is the naivete or stupidty or what, or unctuous presumptuousness on the part of certain people who, you know, want to give the impression that they are in the position of leadership or because their leadership is so shaky they think they have to go up to Quebec to push themselves forward or for whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, a grave disservice, in my opinion, has been done to the people of Newfoundland. Where else, Mr. Speaker, and what other time could we ever point to, and I never thought we could, when duly elected representatives of this Province, people who are duly elected to this Legislature, representing people of this Newfoundland could go up to the Prime Minister of Quebec and discuss an issue of such vital importance to the people of this Province which ought not to have been discussed at all, and which, believe you me, is the first instance where the people of Quebec can now point to where the matter has been discussed by elected representatives?

Mr. Marshall:

Now if anybody thinks that that is not serious, and that is twisting facts, and that is something that we should not even note, that we should just let go on and this was a great act of sensibleness and patriotism on the part of the person concerned, well I do not feel that anybody who has that impression really appreciates the facts, because, as I say, I cannot conceive of a greater disservice to the people of Newfoundland than what has been wrought by the three hon. members, and I think they owe it to the people of Newfoundland to stand in their places and explain their conduct before the Prime Minister of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - now that we have had that effusion of bile from the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), perhaps I may say a word or two,

MR. ROBERTS:

not in defense, because I do not think there is anything that needs any defending, but I would like to say a few words about the motion which has been put down by my friend and my colleague and my fellow Labrador member, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan). Before I do so, however, I guess I do have to say a word or two about the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who is certainly entitled to his opinion and who certainly gave us his opinion. He said several times that he could not conceive - I only wish, Sir, that had been through of his parents because we would have been spared a great deal of needless, needless, needless distortion.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly below the dignity of any member of the legislature, the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. They are very derogatory and condemnatory and I think he should withdraw his remarks.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit there was nothing I said that was derogatory of the legislature or of any member. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has just delivered himself of a forty minute tirade which consists of a personal attack on my integrity, my motivations and those of my colleagues, and everything else. And I have simply said that I - and I have some harsher things to say about his opinions - I have simply said, Sir, that I wish to reply to these and I in so doing used words that I believe are parliamentary and I have no intention of withdrawing them unless and until the Speaker so rules. But I do not think there was anything derogatory. I made a witticism which my colleagues and I feel is of some amusement. Hon. gentlemen opposite may or may not like it. I do not particularly, Mr. Speaker, like sitting here and listening to a personal attack, a distortion of views and twisting and an attempt to misrepresent, mislead and the other -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a point of order -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to a point of order.



MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Stick to the point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) made an attack on me and I would like to say a few words in my defense. I had said a few and I was interrupted on a point of order. And in my submission, Sir, no word which I used in this House is out of order.

MR. MORGAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I cannot think of anything more derogatory or inflammatory about a member of this House of Assembly than when another member of the House of Assembly stands and says that that man should never have been born. That is a very derogatory statement. That was exactly what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said about the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). And I, Mr. Speaker, feel the House of Assembly should demand that the hon. Leader of the Opposition retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think a ruling is required from the Chair and I believe I am in a position to make it. Before making it, I should point out of course that I have always considered the hon. Leader of the Opposition as holding the traditions and the privileges of this House very close to his heart and he has always acted in a very correct position in regard to the House. I think that in the heat of debate often words are said which perhaps on a closer and more mature reflection might have been phrased another way. I think that the remarks that I heard do bring us into an area that could be considered unparliamentary, and in view of the lateness of the hour and the desire to have the debate continue at the level it has I would call upon the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would withdraw those particular remarks and continue with his address.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course I follow your ruling and I withdraw the remarks and I do hope, Sir, the debate does not continue at the level to which it deteriorated. I hope, Sir, that

MR. ROBERTS:

it raises considerably above the level to which the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) lowered it in my estimation.

Mr. Speaker, I made a note listening to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) in which he said there were - and I quote him, Sir, "There were some things better left unsaid." Well, Sir, obviously my opinion of the hon. gentleman is in that category and so I shall leave it there. Let me simply say, Sir, that in my view there is nothing that does less service to the House or to the people of this Province than those who choose to distort actions by others. My colleagues and I went to see Mr. Levesque. We announced publicly, I did some time in December, that I had sent a telegram to him asking if he would see me. And I find it interesting that the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) nor nobody else in this Province raised a voice against that nor should they have.

On our return, not only were there public statements but I sent word to the Premier that my colleagues and I would be very happy

MR. ROBERTS: to meet with him to brief him fully and completely on what went on at the meeting, and we stand ready to that. The Premier has not accepted our invitation, but that, Sir, is the Premier's decision and not ours. But if it will help the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, if anything can help the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, who is filled with bile that he cannot resist pouring out, his own political career has been so incredibly frustrated that he has no option to stand up and criticize not only me but the government which he supports. He supports them, Sir, with his vote but not with his words. He stands up and he pours bile and contumely on the floor of the House for forty or forty-five minutes without offering any constructive suggestions or criticisms, let me say though if it is of any use to the hon. gentleman to say anything, because, Sir, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink and I would say in respect of the hon. gentleman from St. John's East, you can even lead half a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. But I can tell him again, unless -

MR. NEARY: Which half?

MR. ROBERTS: I say to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that he and I have seen many hon. gentlemen opposite and we may feel which half of the horse they are but we are not allowed to say so. What I do say, Sir, is that whether the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) likes it or not, the present Premier of Quebec is Mr. Rene Levesque and the government of Quebec, elected under the rules, elected under the same system by which the hon. gentleman's colleagues got into office - No, no, with a little more honour, and a little more dedication to principle, as objectionable and as unacceptable as that principle of the PQ is, that they are into office. And they are going to be there for a period of time, set forth by the Constitution of Canada, as much as five years. And whether we like it or not they are there,

MR. ROBERTS: and whether we like it or not the Province of Quebec is a neighbour of ours. Whether we like it or not the facts of geography are there. And whether we like it or not we must have intercourse with that Province. And whether the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) will accept reality or not - I do not think he does accept reality. I think he is so consumed in his own mind. We have seen him up in this House time and time again spinning his own fantasies, his own webs - but whether he likes it or whether he accepts it or not, they are there.

And so since the Premier and the government made no effort to find out the attitude of the Government of Quebec with respect to certain matters, my colleagues and I took it upon ourselves, and we did, and I would do it again. And of course I said that I found Mr. Levesque a charming man. I did. I also said, although the hon. gentleman did not have either the courage or the courtesy to quote me correctly, that I found Mr. Levesque not only charming, but a dangerous man. The hon. gentleman from St. John's East has not even got the integrity to quote accurately. He chooses only the words that suit his purpose.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I think it is quite clear in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, that it is out of order to question the integrity of any member, and I would ask that Your Honour require that that remark be withdrawn.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is equally out of order, Sir, to quote a member inaccurately. I question the hon. gentleman's integrity in debate. I do not question his integrity as an individual. I am not allowed to do that, whatever I might wish to do, and so I do not do it. But I question his integrity in the debate

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in misquoting - no I did not say it - misquoting time and time again, remarks which I made and made quite publicly. And I submit, Sir, that is not out of order. That at best is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, the hon. member said distinctly that this hon. member did not have the integrity to quote him properly. It was a reference to this hon. member, not to the statements made by the hon. member or his inaccuracy in quoting the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but he said that this hon. member did not have the integrity, and as a member of this House I am entitled to a retraction of that statement and I now ask for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And an unequivocal one.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. The words I used were along the lines that the hon. gentleman did not have the integrity to quote me accurately, Sir, that could only refer to his speech, it could not refer to anything else except the integrity to quote. That is one phrase and I say again he did not have the



Mr. Roberts.

integrity in his speech to quote me accurately nor has he quoted me accurately, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And if that is out of order, Sir, then, of course, I will withdraw it if it is so ruled. But I submit, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is out of order in not quoting accurately and in not trying to maintain integrity in his speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY : This is shocking.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

I think by way of guidance I can best refer to Beauchesne, Chapter 155, part of sub-section (2) which states in part, "No member will be permitted to say of another, that he is guilty of gross misrepresentation." There may be other aspects to this section which bear upon this, but on quick perusal I would say that that probably comes nearest to the point at issue here. It is not the exact phrase used, "Guilty of gross misrepresentation." I would take the view that that is close to integrity of remarks and I, therefore, by using this guide do have to consider that this would be an unparliamentary phrase, again likely given in the heat of debate, but nevertheless it does fall closely akin to this phrase in Beauchesne and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would, therefore, withdraw in that frame of point.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, of course, Mr. Speaker. And, of course, I am delighted to accept Your Honour's ruling and to withdraw the remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the hon. gentleman did not quote me accurately. I have said, and I say again, that the Prime Minister of Quebec is a very charming man, but also he is a very dangerous man, because, Sir, the principle which he espouses - and I have no doubt, Sir, that Monsieur Levesque, if he has his way, will implement this principle - the principle which he espouses would see the

Mr. Roberts.

break-up of this country. And, Mr. Speaker, to ignore that reality is to court disaster. And one of the reasons this motion has had to be put down is that the hon. gentleman opposite and his colleagues, Sir, have ignored reality for far too long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And if that carries on, Sir, then this Province and this country are in the gravest of dangers, in my view. Ignorance, Mr. Speaker, ignorance of the sort put forward by the hon. gentleman, that is the reason, Sir, that is the reason why we have the problems we face today in Labrador. And if the hon. gentleman does not think there are problems, let him go there, and let him listen and let him learn, if he can.

Mr. Speaker, the Parti Quebecois, the Government of Quebec, the government party, say in their platform - and I find it worth-while to become familiar with the platform of a party that espouses the government. The hon. gentleman opposite supports a government that accepts \$50,000 donations from companies despite clauses in their platform that they would bring in anywhere of morality.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: That is a sign, Sir. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should be familiar with those who are in power in a neighbouring province. And I believe that that is in the best interests of the people of this Province. And I will continue so to believe, because I think, Sir, we should know what the government of a neighbouring province thinks. And that is why when the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir,

(Mr. Simmons) and the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and I met with Monseieur Levesque, a fortnight or a month ago in Montreal, the question of the border came up. I do not know whether we brought it up or whether he brought it up, and it does not really matter. It came up in passing, and we made it quite clear our view. And the hon. gentleman opposite may say what he wants about that. He has the right to be wrong as he

Mr. Roberts.

has frequently shown us, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that we wanted to know exactly why and how the Government of Quebec would approach this. And Monsieur Levesque made it quite clear that in his eyes it is not an issue. He said, "If and when we become independent." But, Sir, that is a long way down the road, and if we have our way it will never happen. If hon. gentlemen opposite, if the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), carries on with his course of conduct that may come to pass. But not, Sir, if the voice of sanity and reason prevails, and if the people who care about Canada and who care about the integrity of this Province have their way.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite dislikes me intensely. Over the years

---

---

---

Mr. Roberts:

he has shown that, and he may feel that he has reason to. He has attacked my family in the House, he has attacked me. Well let him, because, Sir, if I had any doubts about the wisdom of going to see Mr. Levesque, they were removed when I heard the hon. gentleman opposite attack me for doing it, because his political career has consistently been one of opposing all of those things which ought to have been done, and then changing and double tracking.

He used to talk, Mr. Speaker, about not borrowing without approval of the House, and then we saw when the crunch came where he stood on the Alberta loan question. We have seen now - there will be in due course discussion in this House, I hope, of the Scrivener donation. And then we will let the hon. gentleman measure up, Sir, when a test will be put and we will see where he stands with respect to that. And then in due course there will be an opportunity to discuss the renting of space and various proposals and we will see where the hon. gentleman stands in relationship to that.

MR. NEARY: Calling public tenders.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, calling public tenders. We will see then where he stands in relationship to that. He stands, Sir, and he makes words but when the votes come, that, Sir, will be the test.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman opposite, the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), is entitled to his view, of course, but he is as wrong as can be in my view, as wrong as he can be if he feels that we should ignore Quebec. Sir, I think it is very much in the interest of the people of this Province to know exactly what the Government of Quebec feel. And also the fact that they are prepared, obviously, and I think that subsequently has been confirmed in public statements by ministers in the Government of Quebec, to discuss the question of power.

Sir, talk, discussion does not prejudice our rights.

MR. MORGAN: On behalf of whom?

MR. ROBERTS: On behalf of whom? They speak on behalf of the Government of Quebec. I only wish to heavens we had a government that spoke in our behalf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: If we had that we would be better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Crawl out of that one now -

MR. ROBERTS: We, Sir, have a government here that should be speaking for us, and let the Government of Quebec speak for Quebec.

MR. MORGAN: Who do you think you are talking for?

MR. ROBERTS: And, Mr. Speaker, let the Minister of Transportation be quiet, Sir; that is the most dignified and useful thing he can do, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The biggest contribution he can make -

MR. MORGAN: Who are you speaking for?

MR. ROBERTS: -the biggest contribution he can make, Sir, to the debate in this House is to be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: That is the best contribution he can make as well as the biggest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure he is speaking on behalf of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman asked me if I am speaking in behalf of my colleagues? I ask him if he is speaking in behalf of his colleagues when he announced the start of the fish plant in Bay de Verde?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Transportation has been a perpetual and a continual and a prominent embarrassment to his colleagues ever since he entered the Cabinet. And he continues to be that. And so I say, Sir, that in his own best interest -



SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: And so I say, Sir, that in his own best interest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: -as well as those.

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

MR. SPEAKER A point of order! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that we are debating a resolution put forward by the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) with regards to the conditions as they now exist in Labrador, and the viewpoints and the feelings of the people living in Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask the member from St. John's East.

MR. MORGAN: And I fail to understand why the personal attack on the individual member from St. John's East, first of all, number one, and now the personal attack on myself, number two, relates to in any way or form the viewpoints and the ideas and feelings of the people now residing in Labrador. I would ask the Speaker to ask the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, if he is going to continue his speech in this debate to at least be relevant to the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I submit I am quite relevant because the theme of my remarks, as I will show, is that it is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite as exemplified by the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) that has led to the present grave state of affairs in Labrador. It is his refusal, for example, to honour his written commitment to go to my district, not a commitment to me, a commitment to the people from the district. That, Sir, leads to his being called probably not parliamentary, but being called in the public prints not a man who keeps his word, not by me, but by the citizens of part of Labrador who happen to be in my district. That is the reason, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues do not keep

Mr. Roberts:

their word. And I submit that is in order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The specific points of order brought up by the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications was with respect to whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition was being relevant, and he also made reference to personal attack upon the hon. member from St. John's East and upon himself.

I am not aware of any personal attack. With respect to relevance, the last couple of minutes or so of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks were, as I understood them, in reply to interjections from the hon. gentleman. And while obviously not an example of relevance, when hon. members make interjections which they are not suppose to do, then it is difficult then to complain if those interjections are referred to. So in my opinion the hon. gentleman is in order.

---

---

---

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to Your Honour. I confess that I do tend to get somewhat sidetracked by the brains of the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), Sir, and I apologize to the House. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has already been told by Your Honour that if he wants to play with fire he cannot complain about being burned. Now he insists upon coming back again, Sir. If ever there was a bear for punishment, if ever there was a man, Sir, who led with his head because it was the least dangerous part of him, the part that could not be hurt, it is the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now he has already, I believe, spoken in this debate. Has he spoken in this debate?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: And his contribution, Sir, did nothing in my view to advance the state of public opinion in the Labrador part of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you read the speech?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir, and not only did I read the speech I had the misfortune to hear it, Sir. So I am twice cursed, not twice blessed, as Shakespear said, but twice cursed. I had the misfortune to hear it and a further misfortune to read it. Now if only, Sir, I could understand it! But some things passeth all human understanding. And the speeches by the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) time and time again, Sir, fall into that category.

MR. MORGAN: Stick to the motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, here he comes again. Mr. Speaker, I would far prefer to talk about Rene Levesque, Sir, because Rene Levesque is a man of some achievement. That differentiates him from the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). He is a man of some principle. That may or may not differentiate him. He is a man of some charm, Sir, and that may - but they are the same in one thing, Sir. Mr. Levesque in my view is a dangerous man. So is the

MR. ROBERTS:

gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). And he has proven that in his tenure of office. His colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, gets choleric. All we have to do over here, my friend from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) has simply to sort of make a question -

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman's referring to statements made by myself as the Minister of Transportation in connection with a fisheries development, a potential development in Old Perlican, has no relation to conditions in Labrador.

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

I am not aware of any point of order. I will not hear any further argument.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I said that I am not aware of any breach of a point of order by the hon. Leader of the Opposition so there is no need to hear any further argument. I will impress upon the hon. gentleman that when an hon. member of the opposite side makes interjections when an hon. member is speaking, then it is requiring a very fine hairsplitting to then take exception to a reply to an interjection that was out of order in the first place because that reply might not be in the strictest sense relevant to the motion before the Chair. That is to get into a semantic activity which I certainly do not feel inclined to participate in and I do not think it is my job to do so. I would now ask the hon. gentleman to my left not to interject any further and then this question of replying to interjections will not come up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I understand Your Honour correctly what Your Honour is saying is if there is tit from that side he cannot complain about tat from this side, Sir. I would commend that to the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan). Sir, let him -

MR. ROBERTS:

what is the phrase? - contain himself in patience. Sir, he may learn something which I realize would be a new experience for the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

Mr. Speaker, I think this motion is a very important one and I think my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), Sir, has done the House and the Province -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE: He cannot shut up yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), Sir, has twice been advised by Your Honour to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name him.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I would not name him and I cannot anyway. I am not allowed to use the name I would. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has a very loud voice. He brays, Sir, b-r-a-y-s. He is also other things, but I am not allowed to say those.

Now, Sir, I have what I believe are some remarks that would contribute to the debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite, including the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), may or may not believe that. That, Sir, is his problem.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Here he goes again. It is just like the people, you know - who was correct when he walked out on the delegation that came from Bunyan's Cove? I mean, if he says one thing, people say the other. I could talk about Red Cliff on the Trans-Canada Highway where we had a death which the magistrate found was the responsibility of the minister and his officials, and he is



MR. ROBERTS: responsible. But, Sir, I do not want to talk about those things now. I want to talk about the motion that is before the House. But if the hon. gentleman insists upon braying, and interrupting, and interjecting, then I try to resist him, Sir.. The Lord's Prayer says, "Lead us not into temptation." But, Sir, the temptation offered by the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) Sir, goes -

MR. MORGAN: Get on with your speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Because they have got no leader over there.

MR. ROBERTS: No, and furthermore the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will never be that leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For the orderly progression of debate I think it is essential that I repeat again, and I will draw this specifically to the attention of the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, and that is a direction not to interject any further; and having said that, in my opinion the certain liberal application of the doctrine not necessarily sanctioned by the learned authorities but one that common sense seems to at least suggest in certain circumstances, the doctrine of tit for tat has now been exhausted, and that the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak on the resolution and the hon. gentleman to my left will cease interjecting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I understand what Your Honour is saying because we have had sufficient tat for the tit involved,

There was a lot of tit but I think there has been enough tat, Sir. And if I could carry on as I was saying, I think the

MR. ROBERTS: gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) has made a substantial contribution to this session of the House, Sir, by putting down this motion for debate. I think it is a fine motion. I think it raises an important problems. And I think as well there have been some excellent speeches made.

I do not agree with all that has been said by the members who have spoken in the debate, of course not. I do not expect them all to agree with everything that I intend to say in this, Sir. But I do think there have been some excellent speeches made by people who are concerned with the state - what is the word used - with the state and sentiment of public opinion in that portion of our Province known as Labrador, or known historically in a phrase which I have always liked as "the Labrador," that great part of our Province, three times the size of this Island in geography, immensely rich, immensely vital, very much part of our culture and our heritage, very much part of making us what we are today, Sir, and there are serious concerns.

This House is the place where they should be debated, Sir. Because this House, Sir, is the House of Assembly for Newfoundland and Labrador and this House, Sir, a number of years ago, adopted a bill which has not been repealed. It is still law and I venture to say it will not be repealed. My friend from Menihek (Mr. Rosseau) nods acquiescence because he shares my view. No matter what the gentleman from St. John's Centre, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, may feel, and he too is entitled to his view, the fact remains that -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not in his seat so he cannot even be heard.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. MURPHY: See now, I am not the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, just that.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I apologize to the hon. gentleman for getting his affairs wrong, Sir. He is a man of so many affairs that it is hard to keep them straight. The gentleman from St. John's Centre, the little fellow from Flowers Hill as he calls himself.

MR. MURPHY: Flower Hill. Flower Hill.

MR. ROBERTS: Flower Hill.

MR. SIMMONS: Corner boy.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, no matter what he may feel about the name of this Province, cannot deny the fact that the administration of which he is a part have not seen fit to ask this Legislature to repeal the act which was put on the statute books back in 1964 or 1965. I know it was before I became a member, and I first was elected to the House, as was Your Honour, in the general election in 1966, some time before then.

But according to that Act, this Province is known as the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I forget the words of the Act, but insofar as it is within the perview of the government of this Province that shall be the name of the Province. The government sometimes honour it. I saw a note today, interestingly enough it came from the Minister of Transportation's departed, dated - who had it, Graham, I think you. You had a note from somebody in the Highways Department, a highways form dated within the last few months, headed Government of Newfoundland. Now I know the gentleman from Menihék (Mr. Rousseau) will be as upset as I am at that. But the gentleman from Transportation and Communications is defying the law, the law passed by this House.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It may not have been printed here.

MR. ROBERTS: No, he may not have gotten it printed in Printing Services but the fact remains and the gentleman from Menihék, whom I know has often fought this battle with his colleagues in the Cabinet, would be well advised to check into it. It is an official government form. The note was sent what - December, 1976,

MR. ROBERTS: as I recall it. And it was sent to an individual in the Province who in due course sent it forward to my friend and colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) who happened to show it to me and we

---

---

Mr. Roberts.

talked about it. But, Sir, let me deal with this main question and dispose of it. A part of my constituency is within Labrador. While I do not pretend to be expert in Labrador, I have a certain acquaintance with my constituents, and I try as best I can to judge their feelings and their sentiments. My friend from Eagle River does the same, and while the gentleman who represents the other two constituencies, which are entirely within the Labrador, do not sit on our side of the House, we have friends in their districts, and we hear what they say, and we know what groups say, and what is said publicly. And I understand it to be the feeling of the people of Labrador that they like the name of the Province to be the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. And my friend from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) nods acquiescence again. He has gathered the same feeling. So I say - and it has been our party's position and continues to be our party's position, Mr. Speaker - that until and unless the people living in the Labrador part of this Province want to change the name of the Province I do not think we should change it, and no administration which I head will change it, Sir, unless and until a request comes from the people of Labrador. The present administration, I think, honours that policy, although individual members sometimes do not. Mr. Speaker, it should not be an issue. We have far more important issues than this resolution raises.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached a turning point when it comes to discussions about Labrador. I do not think the turning point has been brought about by us in this House or directly by the government. I think it has been brought about by events, by great forces, some of which are the responsibility of the government, others of which are not.

A number of years ago the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Harold MacMillan - I believe he is now Sir Harold MacMillan - but anyway Mr. Harold MacMillan went to Cape Town in South Africa on an official visit to the Union of South Africa,



Mr. Roberts.

which at that stage was still a member of the Commonwealth, and he made a speech there which was one of those speeches which will be remembered for a long time, and so it should be, because it had in it a memorable analysis of the state of public opinion in Africa, or a policy with respect to African affairs, and that view was summed up in a phrase with which I am sure Your Honour is familiar, and the phrase was that, "The winds of change are blowing through Africa." And in sixteen years since Sir Harold MacMillan made that speech, Sir, the winds have changed, have blown through Southern Africa, and in fact are still blowing, still blowing strongly and mightily and wreaking great changes.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, the winds of change are blowing through Labrador as well. And if we in this House, Sir, representing as we do the electorate of this Province, if we ignore that fact, if we do not take it into account, and if we do not try to shape public policy to respond in a positive way to the realities of the situation then, Sir, I think we are contributing, knowingly or not, we are contributing to the growth of forces and beliefs and opinions and causes with which none of us would wish to be associated.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House wants to see this Province disunited. We all want to see it united. Even the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), as mistaken as he may be in many of his opinions, I do not think would be that far mistaken. He will probably accuse me of wanting it, but as I say, if a man is known by his enemies politically, I am proud to be the enemy of the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains - and I think anybody familiar with Labrador will concur - that there are today strong forces growing within Labrador - and I do not say a majority. They are not. They are only a small minority - but, Sir, it was not so many years ago that the Parti Quebecois, or the Rassemblement d'Independance Nationale - what was it called? - the RIN - Rassemblement d'Independance Nationale

Mr. Roberts.

was just a splinter group to be laughed at at Quebec. Today they are the Government of Quebec, power to be taken seriously, a government that has come to power by the rules, by the electoral process. And there are forces in Labrador, Sir. There are forces. I was at a meeting in Happy Valley a month or so ago, the Labrador Resources Advisory Council, government-funded, interesting enough. The gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) was there. The member for St. Barbe, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, was also present. And at that meeting, Sir, there were opinions expressed. They may not have been germane to the topics.

MR. ROUSSEAU:           What meeting?

MR. ROBERTS:           I am talking about the meeting in Happy Valley, the LRAC, a meeting in which

---

---

---

MR. ROBERTS: very real sentiments expressed - I think the gentleman from Naskaupi who just returned to his seat will confirm it - that there are some people who feel that the best interests of the people of Labrador lies in a form of government that takes them out of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I do not agree with it and neither does the gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), although I think he came perilously close to flirting with it at one stage. But I think he has seen the light and returned to the true path. But, Sir, there are those, and let it be said, ignoring it is not going to be any answer. If there is a boil you just do not let it fester, you lance it. I feel, Sir, that we as a House of Assembly, a deliberative Assembly, as a debating Assembly, must deal with this and that is why this resolution was put down, that is why I am going to support it, Sir, because I think it is a positive step forward.

A combination of factors have joined to produce this state of opinion and I do not think it is really too germane. It is of historical interest, it would make, perhaps, a dandy doctorate thesis for some aspiring graduate student to say what has caused this, what has brought it about. I think there is a growing recognition of disparities between Labrador and the Island, a feeling that people in - I know in my district where there is not a mile or not an inch of paved road between the border of L'Anse au Clair and the road fifty miles North at Red Bay, that sort of disparity. The situation in Fox Harbour where children are going back and forth to school on boats and through the ice with risk of life and limb; the growing realization of disparities has contributed to this state of opinion. The growing sense of grievances, Sir, a sense - we have all heard it said that the resources of Labrador are being taken and being exploited, not only not in the best best interests of the people

MR. ROBERTS: Labrador but against their best interests, and the benefits are coming to the people of this Island. We have all heard that said. There are many in Labrador who believe that to be true and they have some evidence. I am not saying it is conclusive, I am not saying it is convincing but they do have evidence.

Then there is the fact, Sir, that the people of Labrador are becoming articulate, they are becoming eloquent and forceful and they are finding spokesmen. The gentleman from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the gentleman from Nain, from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) although not a native - his mother did not happen to be physically within Labrador, she was North of Labrador. The hon. gentleman's home is North of Labrador in Aberdeen, North of Nain. The hon. gentleman has made his home in Nain. He came across the sea and made his home there, built his house there, his wife and his child live there. Other spokesmen, many, many I could name, articulate, eloquent, young, forceful, educated. It would do every member of the House a world of good, Mr. Speaker, to go to Labrador and listen to some of these people. I do not think we would agree with many of them. But when I look at some of the places where ministers have been, courtesy of Her Majesty's generous public chest, and I think, if only they would go to Labrador and listen for a bit. If only they would go to the Coast of Labrador and do something beside fish at the Adlatok Camp. If only they would go down in my district.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications is not a dishonourable man. He may be a foolish one, but he is not dishonourable. He told the delegation from Red Bay last year in his office - a delegation, I accompanied them - that he intended to go to Red Bay - and no doubt he did so intend and he subsequently sent a letter to say that. I do not doubt he meant it, I have no doubt for a minute, but he did not go. He never did and that was nearly a year past, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: I travelled the Northern Coast, though.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the hon. gentleman may have travelled the Northern Coast, I mean, I do not know where the hon. gentleman - the hon. gentleman has been lots of places, Sir. The unfortunate part is he comes back. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains he did not keep his word, did not keep his word to the people of Red Bay. They have a problem which they feel was very, very serious and so it is. But whether it is serious or not in a global perspective, there is the matter of word, a matter of honour. It is no trouble to get there. The minister and his official maintain an extremely efficient transportation service and I testify to their efficiency. They do me the kindness to give me lifts around once in a while and I appreciate that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You may not get it anymore.

MR. ROBERTS: I may not get it anymore, I mean, if they want to be that small, have at it. I mean, they can kiss a certain portion of my anatomy that normally I do not present for kissing purposes, if they think that will influence me.

But, Your Honour, you know the fact remains that ministers do not go, they do not go and listen and the people in Labrador are becoming articulate and becoming forceful and they are saying, We are not going to put up with this.

Then communications



MR. ROBERTS:

are so much better, Sir.. The effect that has come in Southern Labrador in my constituency by the simple little innovation of a Gestetner that publishes a fortnightly newspaper, a news bulletin, a revolution in itself; the newspaper in Nain, which is published in Inuit and in English. The effect of Here And Now which is sometimes there and then, but Here And Now which has made an effort to interest itself in questions about Labrador and which is carried into many homes in Labrador - in fact one of the grievances is it is only CBC they can get - but that has an effect. The press pays some attention. I will bet, Mr. Speaker, you know there have been more federal ministers in Labrador in the last year than there have been provincial ministers, leaving aside fishing trips. We agree we cannot count fishing trips.

Romeo LeBlanc was there a week or ten days ago. Warren Allmand was there. Judd Buchanan was down, was he not, in Goose Bay affecting many of the people who live in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Marcel Lessard was there to sign an agreement. The Minister of Justice made one of his rare trips out of St. John's to Happy Valley to attend it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am being as nice as I can to hon. gentleman opposite, Sir, and they should be grateful, Sir, that the parliamentary practice and rules prohibit me from saying what I really think of them, and furthermore what the people of Labrador really think of them, Sir. Because if you think I have been out of order - and I have been on occasion, the Chair has so ruled - but Sir, if I were to use some of the phrases that my constituents have used in good faith to describe hon. gentlemen opposite, Sir, it would be so unparliamentary that we would not even need a point of order, the microphone would explode.

Mr. Speaker, the Quebec situation has also had its effect in Labrador. The people of Labrador are just as much au fait with what is happening as are the people anywhere else in this Province. And now they see a neighboring Province that has elected a Separatist Government and that makes it respectable. Rene Levesque's election

MR. ROBERTS:

shows that it is not just a bunch of crackpots, a bunch of fanatics wandering around. By heavens, they are not crackpots and fanatics any more. They are now ministers just like hon. gentlemen opposite, members of the Executive Council of the Province of Quebec. All of a sudden they have taken on a respectability. All of these factors have their place, all of them have their effect. And the effect is, Sir, that the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador is such that it should cause grave concern to the people of this Province.

It behooves us all in my view, Mr. Speaker, to take this seriously and to act upon it. Let me state our party's position clearly. I do not think there is any doubt about it. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have doubts but, you know, you can only explain. You cannot hammer it into them, Sir. We feel very strongly - and we do not see how anybody could argue with this, we do not think anybody does really, not in the House - that a united province is of the essence, that Newfoundland and Labrador together will be a far greater province for her people than would a separate Newfoundland and a separate Labrador.

But we say further, Sir, that Newfoundland and Labrador will stay as a united Province only if all of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador want it to be so. A marriage, to use an analogy that is common but I think accurate, a marriage can endure, Sir, only as long as the two parties to that marriage want it to endure. A century ago, a generation ago, divorce might have been unthinkable, but it is not today, Sir, either in legal terms or in social terms. We believe in a united Province. But, Sir, to make our Province truly united the people of every part of that Province have got to want it to be, and they have got to believe that it is in their best interest because, Sir, that is what most people, that is what all of us, in fact, advocate, what is best as we see it.

I think it is not unfair or inaccurate to say that there are many people in Labrador today who question seriously whether it is in their best interests to stay within the present arrangements. Some say that

MR. ROBERTS:

they must leave. Some say they should leave Labrador or leave the Province - I am sorry - and take Labrador out of the union we now have. Some say there should be major changes made within the union. I say to the gentleman for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), who are both in the Chamber, am I not correct when I say there are many of substance who believe quite genuinely that the present arrangements are not in the best interests of Labrador and its people. That is a correct statement of public opinion. It may not be a nice one. It is not the sort of statement

MR. ROBERTS: that I would like to make, but it is a correct statement, and I believe in facing reality.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. ROBERTS: We are courting disaster if we ignore reality.

And it is folly almost criminal in nature to ignore this reality.

And when the Minister of Tourism spoke, as I understood him as I heard him to say, that these are only a crackpot minority and we should pay no attention to him. Sir, he has revealed that he has no touch with what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is real, it is urgent, but it is not insurmountable. I believe there are steps which can be taken, which should be taken, to make the people of Labrador aware of what I believe to be the truth, which is that it is in their best interest to be a part of this Province. I think it is incumbent upon the government to take those steps. I think it is incumbent upon the House to advocate them and to debate them in the hope that the government, which have shown a lamentable ignorance of Labrador, a lamentable lack of concern for Labrador, a lamentable lack of awareness of the feelings and opinions of the people of Labrador. And since the government are this way then it is up to us in the House to try to do it.

And that is why this is one of the best private members' motions I have seen put down in my ten or eleven years in this House, Sir. And I have seen many motions, and some of them of great importance.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of specific points that I wish to make. I do not think I have quite used all of my time, I probably have a few minutes left according to the rules. It is now nearly 6:00. Let me just mention one or two because I do not know if I will be in the House next Wednesday or not, I may be in St. Anthony joining in the protest against the Greenpeace and other gentleman from beyond the seas who come to disturb us.



MR. ROBERTS:

But, Mr. Speaker, let me just mention some of them that I think are specific and imminent. I will just very quickly say them because time is about to run out. I think the government have got to make a commitment and they have got to back it up with action, and not just words, to make available to the people of Labrador starting this year public services equal to those available elsewhere in the Province. I think they have got to take some positive steps on the air travel, to end the situation where the people of the Coast and the people of Western Labrador are prisoners, prisoners of geography and prisoners of high costs.

And I think as well, Sir, that it is incumbent upon this government to make it possible for both television networks to be available to all of the people of this Province, including in particular the people of Labrador. And then, Mr. Speaker, as well I think that we should look at constitutional changes within the constitution of this Province. And I have some quite detailed thoughts which I shall put forward either next week, if I am here, or if not we will find another occasion and I shall have the opportunity to put them forward for discussion and examination.

But I think, Sir, the present situation cannot go on. I think it should not go on, and I think it must not go on in the best interest of this Province.

Sir, I move the adjournment of the debate, and I assume we do not even need a further motion because we meet at 3:00 o'clock tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: We met at three o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. HICKMAN: At three o'clock.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is right, I move the adjournment of the debate and then I assume the Speaker will call it 6:00 and we will be back here at 3:00 tomorrow afternoon for another sub-amendment, and on from there on the Throne Speech. I move



Mr. Roberts:

the adjournment, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 o'clock I adjourn the House  
until tomorrow, Thursday, March 10, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 9, 1977

# 101  
Feb 14/77



NOTE TO PRESIDENT OF  
TREASURY BOARD

Reference: Questions from  
Mr. Neary (La Poile)

MAR 9 1977

- (1) Who are the present members of the Public Service Commission?

The present members are:

Mr. Alfred J. Goss, Chairman  
Mr. Jack Burt, Commissioner (Vice-Chairman)  
Mr. Vincent J. Rossiter, Commissioner

- (2) What are their individual salaries?

The present salaries are:

Chairman - \$31,500  
Commissioner (Vice-Chairman) - \$27,566  
Commissioner - \$25,719

- (3) What are the terms of their appointments?

Each Commissioner holds office during good behaviour in line with the Public Service Commission Act of May 1, 1973.

  
V. YOUNG  
Secretary  
Treasury Board

NH/yt

March 2, 1977

# 131  
Monday Feb 21/77

1161 6  
2/21/77

NOTE TO PRESIDENT OF  
TREASURY BOARD

Reference: Inquiry of Mr. Neary (La Poile)  
regarding total amount paid in  
subsidies to Newfoundland  
Transportation Company

The information obtained regarding total amount paid in subsidies to Newfoundland Transportation Company during July, August, and September 1976, reveals:


Subsidy paid: \$11,200 per week for eight (8) weeks

July - \$44,800

August - \$44,800

September - No subsidy paid

No other remunerations or expenses paid.

  
V. YOUNG  
Secretary  
Treasury Board

NCT/yt

February 25, 1977

47. Capt Winsor (Fogo) -- To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

During (a) calendar year 1975 and (b) calendar year 1976 what was the total number of persons employed directly in the service of his Department or indirectly by any Board or Authority which reports to him?

MAR 9 1977

ANSWER

Permanent employees during 1975:

Department	64
Loan Board	19
Advisory Board	<u>2</u>
Total	85

Permanent employees during 1976:

Department	75
Loan Board	19
Advisory Board	<u>4</u>
Total	98



49. Capt Winsor (Fogo) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) The number of fishing vessels leases to fishermen in 1976.
- (2) What areas of the Province have vessels been leased?
- (3) What hire is being charged?
- (4) Who is responsible for maintenance, overall, and keeping the vessels in good condition?

ANSWER

- (1) 1 Direct to Fishermen  
3 to Saltfish Corporation for Fishermen  
Arrangements made for other 4 in 1977 to  
complete program as authorized.
- (2) Portugal Cove  
L'anse au Loup  
Change Islands  
Red Harbour  
Branch  
Fermeuse  
Admiral's Beach  
Port de Grave
- (3) 10% of Appraised Value Annually
- (4) The Lessee

MAR 9 1977