

VOL. 3

NO. 16

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I would like to report briefly on my meeting this morning with the Federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin.

MR. NEARY: I reported that two weeks ago.

MR. BRETT: Our discussions covered virtually every aspect of transportation in the Province with a view to putting in place an understanding regarding the federal government's involvement in the provision of transportation system improvements in Newfoundland and Labrador. We discussed in some detail the implementation of the container plan for the Newfoundland Railway. This initiative was identified in our study of railway operations as being an essential just step to ensuring the long-term viability of the railway.

MR. NEARY: How many did you lay off?

MR. BRETT: In this context, I can welcome the announcement which Mr. Pepin made today regarding the commitment of \$50 million for this purpose.

But, Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity to re-emphasize to the minister that the other elements of our proposal for revitalization need to be addressed as well. And I understand that further discussions in this regard will be held between officials of the parties involved over the next few months.

MR. BRETT: We briefly discussed the railway labour assistance programme which was concluded recently with the railway unions. I understand that a process of detailed discussions with the affected personnel is ongoing, and I would hope that these would result in fair and equitable treatment of those employees who are involved. This is, of course, essentially a matter which must be resolved between the employer and employees.

I discussed at some length with Mr. Pepin the question of federal funding for continuation of the strengthening programme for the Trans-Canada Highway. And in this regard, I pointed out our needs in special circumstances. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pepin was not in a position to confirm what funding would be available within this fiscal year, although the question is still being considered, at least he said it was, within the federal system.

I received an indication from Mr. Pepin that the federal government is prepared to continue in this fiscal year the programme of providing airstrips in communities in Coastal Labrador. Mr. Pepin left me with a draft document dealing with transportation activities in Newfoundland financed by the federal government and he invited our comments on the paper.

It was left with us, Mr. Speaker, you know, we had no time to - we just saw the cover, that is all - so it is impossible for me to comment on it at this time. Of course, my officials and myself, we will examine this document and I will then be bringing it before my colleagues in Cabinet and after its consideration I will make our views known to the federal minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: It was not a very fruitful meeting.

MR. BENNETT: I would like to have had a copy of that so I could of sort of run over it , Mr. Speaker, to make a comment. I hope there is not too much of a confrontation between the minister on our level, the provincial level, and the federal level.

Earlier in the year I was told from a very reliable resource , Mr. Speaker, a representative from Ottawa, that they had to come down here and practically beg this government to submit their plans

MR. T. BENNETT: for the upcoming year for agreements with Ottawa for funding. This funding, or the 'wish list', apparently had not arrived in Ottawa up to the 15th or middle of November. All other provinces, Mr. Speaker, had submitted their 'wish list', as it is now getting to be known, to Ottawa in the middle of July. It looks to me now as though the delay that is being caused, and I can only assume it is being caused by the inaction of the government on our level here, the provincial level, the inaction of this government to submit to Ottawa its programme of spending and the needs of the department. It seems to me the delay being experienced by Ottawa is going to run head on and certainly not run parallel with their budgeting for the year, and undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, will cause adverse effects.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Undoubtedly all members of this House are aware that Newfoundland Hydro is again looking for an 8 per cent increase.

MR. NEARY: What? They only made \$12 million last year.

MR. STIRLING: And with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) not in his seat, in view of the fact that we are now getting first hand from the people in Bellevue the fact that people just cannot exist, they just cannot continue on with these increasing costs in electricity and oil in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy I would ask the Premier, has the Cabinet seen the presentation from Hydro looking for this additional 8 per cent increase?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are aware and have been talking some time with obviously the members of

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro about their proposed application to the Public Utilities Board for a rate increase and therefore have been in touch with them over the last several weeks on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, this 8 per cent increase that they are seeking, as I had indicated, in their statement yesterday, still means that the people of the Province of Newfoundland will have the lowest electrical power rates in Eastern Canada. And we would like to think that that can be maintained over the long term but it is very difficult unless and until we get a better deal on the Upper Churchill and get the Lower Churchill started right away. So the whole question of power rights for this particular year and the application for an increase only highlights and foreshadows the dilemma and problem that this Province faces in the future if, in fact, we

PREMIER PECKFORD: are not able to get Gull Island, which is the preferred sight, or Muskrat Falls going in the short term. If that is not possible and cannot be arranged, then we will see from 1983-84 onwards, major increases to reflect more expensive small hydro projects in the Province, plus more oil generated electricity at Holyrood. So, whilst nobody in this Province is happy with seeing any increases in electrical rates, number one, it should be noted that even with this increase the consumers of electricity in the Province still will be lower than anywhere else and, secondly, it does provide an opportunity to foreshadow the whole idea of electrical power rates and the fact that a province that has all the resources that this Province has must still depend on oil for twenty-five to thirty per cent of its generation.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later in this House the government is going to have to make up its mind whether or not it supports the world price of oil. Maybe the Premier, as a supplementary, can tell me if Canada had followed his recommendation of world prices or near world prices for oil, and since Hydro says that the main concern, the main cause of this eight per cent increase is the cost of oil, if the Premier had his way what would be the cost to the consumer today instead of the eight per cent if he had the world price of oil being used?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier of this Province had his way, Gull Island would be going which would guarantee lower prices and no oil.

March 24, 1981

Tape NO. 586

EL - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the Premier of this Province had his way, we would not be, with the kind of resources and water we have in this Province, having one ounce of oil going towards generating electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Well, why have you not done it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And the onus is on those who -

MR. NEARY:

Why have you not got the Lower Churchill going?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- the onus is on those who have the jurisdiction and the power to ensure that we can begin the Gull Island project so that we can phase out Holyrood and be dependent totally upon a one hundred per cent hydro generated electrical system.

MR. HODDER:

Do it!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It has nothing to do with the price of oil. It has to do with the commitment that we are equal to other Canadians, that is the commitment.

MR. NEARY:

Do not be so foolish. That is a red herring.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is where the Liberal Party and the Leader of the Opposition have got to answer their questions.

MR. NEARY:

A red herring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

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

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, as they know on the other side, they do not have to answer questions and the question they did not answer again with a red herring. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is again misleading this House.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 586

EL - 3

MR. STIRLING:

this House.

The Premier has again misled

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It has been ruled by Your Honour that one is not allowed to insinuate that a person has misled the House. It is contrary to parliamentary practice. I refer Your Honour to both Beauchesne again, page 108 and page 109. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not permitted to make an insinuation that anybody in the House is misleading the House.

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 587

DW - 1

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is, Sir,
that misleading - if you do not use the phrase 'intentionally'
or 'deliberately misleading' that 'misleading' is now parliamentary
and has been parliamentary since - what year?

MR. L. THOMS: 1958.

MR. S. NEARY: 1958, Your Honour, 'misleading' has
been a parliamentary term that has been accepted according to
Beauchesne since 1958. And I am sure my hon. friend has the
reference there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Page 112.

MR. S. NEARY: Page 112, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order,
Beauchesne does point out in two sections, one is on page
108 which says that 'mislead' is unparliamentary, one is on
page 112 which says that since 1958 it has been ruled
parliamentary.

My interpretation of that, in
consultation with other authorities and other jurisdictions,
is that depending on the context in which the words are used it
has been ruled parliamentary on some occasions, other occasions
unparliamentary. I have certainly ruled on occasions in the
past that the term 'mislead' or 'a member is misleading the
House' is unparliamentary. I prefer not to hear it so to
resolve the matter maybe the hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Stirling) could withdraw those remarks and get on with
his question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I used a word that my colleagues assured me was acceptable by Beauchesne and that was why I used the word. I was trying to find the strongest word that I could find -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Again, comments after rulings are not in order either. I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) if he would withdraw and then get on with his question.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word 'mislead'. And I would like to search for another word which expresses in the strongest terms the inconsistency that the Premier is using, Mr. Speaker, when on one hand he looks for world prices and then on the other hand - maybe the Premier would like to attempt, in the same sense, to explain how it is that he just gave the impression that if we had the power from Muskrat Falls or Gull Island that people somehow would be saving money when he knows - and I would ask him to explain that the power from Gull Island and Muskrat, based on their own latest projections, would cause our present rates to double. The landed cost of Muskrat and Gull would not be 8 per cent, it would cost it to double. And it has to do with the impression that the Premier tries to create that something which is five years down the road is affecting something - the state of the mismanagement of this Province. Maybe he could explain that?

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 588

NM - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), was given the liberty of being able to go into almost a speech before he asked his question and then when -

MR. STIRLING:

Now he is criticizing you, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- the Leader of the Opposition got around to asking the question he was asking for an explanation. So I hope I will be allowed some liberty in answering what was a speech and then a question which I was asked to explain.

Now number one -

MR. STIRLING:

You think you can (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Leader of the Opposition think that the Upper Churchill- the Lower Churchill, is a red herring. Let it be recorded that the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in the Lower Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

- the Premier knows very well that he was asked a question about oil and pulled in this red herring of the Upper Churchill and now he is trying to divert attention from the fact that this government not only agrees with Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker, but he is actually -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 588

NM - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

- encouraging world prices.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING:

To the point of order,

the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not

a point of order. It is an interruption of an answer to a question. It is an interruption of the proceeding of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- and it is a transgressing

on the privileges of the members of this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Interruptions in debate are

not allowed. Legitimate points of order are allowed, Mr. Speaker. By any stretch of the imagination that is not a legitimate point of order and the hon. Leader of the Opposition should not attempt to take the House on his back in order to disagree with an answer that he does not - disagree with a truth that he does not like revealed to him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He cannot take the heat.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point

of order, I would rule there is no point of order but perhaps a difference of opinion.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker.

So first of all let it be

recorded that the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to

PREMIER PECKFORD: hydro developments in Labrador.
Number two, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
A point of order.
The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: The Premier has now gone farther, Mr. Speaker. He is imputing motives and he is now attempting to mislead. He is now saying something which he knows is not correct and he is imputing motives to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) which he cannot do.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order,
Your Honour has ruled with respect to the use of the word mislead and I suggest to Your Honour that the context in which the hon. member, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made reference to the word "misleading" was to definitely imply that the hon. the Premier was motivated by stating a falsehood. The word "mislead" was followed with certain qualifications which give this definite connotation and I submit, Mr. Speaker, to you that this has to be withdrawn and it has to be withdrawn immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: First of all that would be a different point of order. We are dealing with a point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and if I heard it correctly it seems to be the same point of order that was raised just a moment before. If that is not the case, then I will certainly reserve my ruling on it and have a look at Hansard.

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 588

NM - 4

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I now rise -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

- on the point of order, and I

will not bore the House, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. MARSHALL:

is doing I will just take my comments as being presented as read as it were and re-submit them to Your Honour, that the hon. gentleman when he was getting up and using the word 'mislead', and the context in which he used it was implying - not implying but almost directly saying that the hon. Premier was deliberately misleading or being deceitful to the House. And in that context, Mr. Speaker, he has to withdraw them.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to that point of order, I will reserve my ruling on that as well to check Hansard because I am sorry I did not clearly hear what the Leader of the Opposition said.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If I can be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to continue: Not only does it relate now to not wanting hydro developments in Labrador, but the Leader of the Opposition in his preface to his question and as a part of his question talked about that he was opposed to having the price of a barrel of oil go to seventy-five to eighty-five per cent of world price. In other words, by saying that the Leader of the Opposition is not only against hydro developments in Labrador, he is against the development of Hibernia and oil and gas off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, because you cannot develop it without that kind of cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So not only is the Leader of the Opposition against hydro developments in Labrador, he is against offshore oil and gas developments off the East Coast of the Island of Newfoundland. So I do not what the Leader of the Opposition wants to do. Does he want to close down the Province? - no hydro developments, no oil and gas developments. And then thirdly, Mr. Speaker,

PREMIER PECKFORD: I find it absolutely astounding - if not hilarious and amusing if it was coming from somebody else - I found it astounding that the Leader of the Opposition would talk about Gull Island rates being double what they are on the Island. Does not the Leader of the Opposition understand that what we are talking about when we are talking about the development of the Lower Churchill is that by the time the Lower Churchill can be realistically developed there is no alternative generation source as cheap?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I accept from the Premier his last assertion. Let me say so there is no doubt about order, that I entirely agree with him, that I am against, as every Newfoundlander should be against, going to world prices. And that is the inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, and I asked the original question: Now in view of the fact that Hydro says that the only reason that they need this money, this eight per cent - and they may not need it again until 1983 possibly because there may be an election in 1982, but they do not need a change until 1983 - will the government - and they say the main reason they need it is for the financial reputation of Hydro and in view of the fact that the Government of Canada has said that they will support - and this is why we are in favour of the development of either on the Lower Churchill - the Government of Canada will support their credit and it is the only way that the Lower Churchill can be developed is with their credit, will the Premier now exercise some influence and will the government exercise some influence

MR. STIRLING: and require Newfoundland Hydro not to request this 8 per cent increase and to freeze electricity rates until 1983, because they do not need it?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) did not read the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro statement that was issued yesterday. He could not have read it, Mr. Speaker, because that statement indicated that one of the reasons - one of the reasons, not the only reason - one of the reasons for the 8 per cent application to the Public Utilities Board had to do with the escalating cost of oil that would be needed to generate electricity at Holyrood, and that the other reason was also, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING: (inaudible) world prices.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the other reason was to help pay for the capital cost of Hinds Lake, and that is contained in the statement by Newfoundland Hydro in its announcement yesterday, to go before the Public Utilities Board. That is the truth of the matter. It was not just because of oil escalation costs, it was also - whether the Leader of the Opposition likes it or not, you still have to pay for hydro developments even though they are cheaper than the development of a Holyrood four or five station out there, so that there is more than one reason for the application to the Public Utilities Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, besides that, besides trying to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that his question was based on some lack of information, let me go on to indicate to him that this government here is a responsible government and it will try to pay its way, and to ensure that its Crown corporations pay their way so that this Province remains a financially

PREMIER PECKFORD: viable Province, and a financially viable government so that we can continue to borrow money and to build other hydro power projects around the Province to give to Newfoundlanders the cheapest possible electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition. A supplementary.

MR. STIRLING: Does the Premier now confirm then that Hydro, even in advance of going to the Public Utilities Board, has the support of his Cabinet to get this 8 per cent increase?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously, again, the Leader of the Opposition does not understand the process -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no! No, no!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Because it is only after public hearings are held, and interrogation and the closest scrutiny is given to the application by people independent of government, would government decide then as to whether this increase is justified or not. We are not going, Mr. Speaker, to predict whether they should or they should not. That is why we have established an application before the Public Utilities Board, so that an independent quasi -

MR. STIRLING: That is why you (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, can I be heard in silence to respond? - so an independent quasi judicial body can hear the evidence presented by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, to hear the evidence on the other side presented by the Federation of Municipalities, presented by the Consumers Association, presented by other groups. And after that scrutiny and analysis is done, then the Public Utilities Board, in the full light of all the

PREMIER PECKFORD: information from all
quarters, decides on whether the 8 per cent, or 7 per
cent, or 6 per cent, or any increase at all, after that

PREMIER PECKFORD: analysis is done, that scrutiny is done, the Public Utilities Board makes a report to the Cabinet and then at that time the government decides.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I will address my question to the Premier too, it is in keeping with the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro statement. And what I am wondering about, assuming that we accept that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro justified their need for an increase of 8 per cent. I do not understand why Mr. Young would then go on to say that the people of Newfoundland would have to pay \$6.00 a month or accept an 8 per cent increase when last year Newfoundland Light and Power increased their profit by 8 per cent, increased their revenue by 12 per cent. So let me ask the Premier, assuming Newfoundland Hydro does need the 8 per cent and they will charge it to Newfoundland Light, will the government intercede and refuse to allow Newfoundland Light to pass that extra cost on to the consumer in view of the profits they made last year and the increase in profit?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The member for Windsor - Buchans does not understand the process either and somebody has got to get together over there and try to - I wish the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) would get together with some of his colleagues over there and explain the process that is in place.

After the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro goes through the application -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - of the Public Utilities Board, based on what happens there then if they are to pass on any costs to Newfoundland Light, Newfoundland Light then must apply to the Public Utilities Board and be scrutinized. And only after that has been done will there be any determination as to whether Newfoundland Light will make any addition charges

PREMIER PECKFORD: or not. So that therefore we are talking in sort of a void because we have not had the benefit of that scrutiny, of that analysis and of that public hearing, which is obligatory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it must be the President of Hydro who is talking in the void. He said in his statement that increase that Hydro is asking for will cost the Newfoundland consumer 8 per cent. And obviously Newfoundland Light sells to the Newfoundland consumer, so why should he assume that Newfoundland Light will want an increase based on the profits they made last year?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. FLIGHT: I am not asking the question, that is a preamble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker..

I will ask the Premier if this increase is going to apply to the commercial and industrial users in this Province and then specifically will it apply to the electricity that ERCO buys from Hydro under the new contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Incredible, I find this absolutely amazing, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Young, the President and Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland Hydro, issued a statement yesterday. I have read the statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was also on Open Line this morning.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you very much. And he was on Open Line this morning and I do not know where he is this

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 591

SD - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: afternoon, he will be somewhere
else tomorrow and so on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, now
he has indicated a desire and intent

PREMIER PECKFORD: on behalf of that Crown corporation to make application to the Public Utilities Board. And then after the Public Utilities Board has ruled, it will be decided whether it will be 8 per cent. Because Mr. Young says he wants an 8 per cent increase, does not mean that he is going to get an 8 per cent increase. So that therefore everything else is completely hypothetical until that point in time that Public Utilities Board has its hearing, makes its recommendations to Cabinet and then Cabinet makes a decision. That is number one part of the question.

Number two part of the question, surely the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), a learned man in his own right, Mr. Speaker, a man who has been around this House of Assembly for the last several years, understands what we did a little while ago as it relates to the ERCO contract, one of the greatest achievements ever performed by a government in the last ten or fifteen years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Surely he was here in the House that day, Mr. Speaker, when we announced a new power contract with ERCO to up their rates from somewhere around two mils per kilowatt hour to eight, and then escalating each year thereafter until it reaches thirty mils. So obviously, Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor-Buchans did not hear well that day because he would have understood that we have developed and put in place a new power contract with ERCO which saves the Newfoundland taxpayer around \$160 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): A final supplementary, the hon member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we will see how hypothetical the 8 per cent increase is in the next month or two. The people of Newfoundland who pay the bills will see how hypothetical it is. But let me ask the Premier this, since he referred to the new ERCO contract. When he made that statement in the House he also indicated, and he had indicated it prior to talking about ERCO while bringing in the new contract, that the oil industrial users, the paper companies, and those kinds of companies in the Province, who the Newfoundland people are subsidizing to a few million dollars, that his government was looking at increasing the cost of energy to those various companies. Now possibly, Mr. Speaker, if that increase was put in place or had been put in place by now maybe this increase by Hydro could not be necessary. I want to ask the Premier what the status of that negotiation is? Are we any closer to having the industrial users of electricity in this Province brought into line with what it is costing this Province to generate electricity, and when can we expect an announcement on the new contracts?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) properly, what he wants to do is get out of debt with one company and go in with another. In other words, if we have any saving, if we can reduce our \$8 million deficit in one place, if we do not reduce it, if we reduce it by \$2 million, we use that \$2 million, which is still in deficit, to subsidize another part of the economy. So that therefore your deficit is still as great as it always was. That seems to me to be a crazy argument for trying to get on a financially sound basis. That is number one.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number two, we are now, and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) can elaborate on this better than I can, into negotiations with all other industrial customers in the Province to try to see that the cost of power to them is not borne unnecessarily by the Newfoundland taxpayer. And as these various agreements come into being, these new agreements, they will be announced in this hon. House or in an appropriate forum at the time the final agreements have been reached. We are very proud, Mr. Speaker, that in the last twelve months we have been able to renegotiate the ERCO power contract, able to renegotiate long-term concessions with the forest companies. As part of our ongoing policy, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) will be surprised to hear

PREMIER PECKFORD:

over the next few weeks and months of other agreements entered into which protect the Newfoundland taxpayer and do something that has not been done in this Province for decades and decades.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for La-Poile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. On March the 19th, I asked the minister about the cost and the information in connection with the low-bed and the other work that he has done by Highways equipment. He did not know the cost on March the 19th even though he had written a cheque, so he told the House yesterday, on March the 17th. And the documents that were tabled, Mr. Speaker, I suspect are fake documents, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh! Shame!

MR. NEARY:

They are fake documents, Mr. Speaker, they are fake.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman, you know, made a statement that-I do not know if the hon. gentleman wishes to consider the import of it-but the statement is to the effect that documents presented to this House were faked. And this obviously, Mr. Speaker, is a matter that completely offends the order and the privileges of this House. I would refer to page 114 of Beauchesne, Statements By Members, "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary

MR. MARSHALL: temperately to criticize these statements."

Now, it is alright for the hon. gentleman to criticize in his statement but I suggest that it is completely unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, for him to insinuate that the hon. gentleman has presented a statement in this House which is a fake statement, which is incorrect and which is deceitful or dishonest, which is in effect what the hon. gentleman is saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my learned friend from S t. John's East (W. Marshall) has once again demonstrated the old saying that little learning is a very dangerous thing. He read part of the citation from Beauchesne, and he did what he has often done before I fear, he left out the relevant part. The sentence in its completeness, Mr. Speaker, reads Section 322 which is found on page 114: "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself, it does not refer to documents, 'respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible."

And I would suggest to Your Honour that that is exactly the portion of this ruling which applies to this. My friend from LaPoile (S. Neary) was being temperate. He said quite clearly that in his view, in his belief these documents were fake. I may say there are numbers of

March 24, 1981

Tape NO. 593

EL - 3

MR. ROBERTS: others of us in the House, Sir, who have our own doubts as to the authenticity of this document, a so-called bill, for example. But whether we have our doubts or not, we are allowed to express them, in my view because, Sir, it is not contrary to the rules. He did not say that the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) has intentionally, what is it - no imputation of intentional falsehood. We just said that in our opinion these

MR. E. ROBERTS: documents are not true, they are fake. And I would suggest, Sir, that is parliamentary and my friend ought to be allowed to ask his question and see if we get an answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: By what contortion of logic one can come to the conclusion the hon. member comes to. The fact of the matter is as you go on as he has read, but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what possibly could be the import of the words of the hon. member when he says that the hon. member presented documents before this House which were faked. They were documents, Mr. Speaker, that he presented himself, personally. To say that he presented fake documents is to say that he has deceived this House, is to say that he is dishonest. And, Mr. Speaker, despite the unfortunate observations made by the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), I know that he would not wish to impute this. The word of any member of this hon. House is to be taken, and the day we get to the stage where words of the hon. members of this House are not to be taken, particularly with respect to statements made before the House such as the hon. member has made without contrary proof is a sad day indeed. And it is very much contrary to the rules of this House and it is going to leave the door open, Mr. Speaker, to the type of accusation which is going to lead to the grossest kind and to the basest kind of disorder in this House and, in essence, will result in the House not being able to function effectively as a parliamentary body as it should.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It is against, Mr. Speaker, I submit on this particular authority that I have quoted and on parliamentary practices, contrary to all rules of order and all rules of privileges of hon. members and of this House itself.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A further comment to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A further comment to the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Your Honour, given the tradition of going back and forth I would like to respond briefly to that. First of all, I do not need to give the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) any lessons in contorted logic, he evidences these daily. But I want to say that I do agree with him on the seriousness of this point because the House would become unmanageable and thus totally ineffective, ineffectual if we were to get to the point where we would not accept each other's word. Your Honour has ruled that the word 'mislead' is unparliamentary and I understand that to be in the sense of 'intentionally misled'. And that is another example of the principle we are talking about.

What we have said here is not that the hon. gentleman misled the House, Sir. We have not given anything as to what he knows or does not know.

MR. L. THOMS: Even though he may have.

MR. E. ROBERTS: What we have said is that we think the documents - and I would simply say two things; first of all, my hon. friend has made no attack against the minister and the member for Trinity North district (Mr. Brett).

AN HON. MEMBER: No ?

MR. E. ROBERTS: No! But I would say that I for one would like nothing better than to have the hon. gentleman for Trinity North under oath, under cross-examination on these documents. There are some questions that should be answered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: But having said that, Sir, I think that the remarks made by my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) were in order. He has every right to cast doubt on the authenticity of documents presented in the House. He is not questioning the word or the honour of the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett). It may well be - in fact these documents, the one that concerns us was not sent by the minister, it was sent to him. And I will tell you now, in my opinion, it has as much validity as a statement of account, Mr. Speaker, as if I were to sit down today and do one. And what led us to this is the conclusion that \$1,800, which is a large amount of money, particularly for an individual to draw a check, the minister drew a check on day one for that amount of money and on day three he did not remember it. That is what led us to this and that is why the question, Sir, which I suggest is in order.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): One further submission, the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is a great deal to be added. I think the argument so far has, in fact, centred around paragraph 322 in Beauchesne and if I could just read the last sentence or so there, it says, 'it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident!'

The distinction I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that for hon. members to criticize the documents or the information in

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

the documents tabled by the hon. gentleman, to say the information is inaccurate, is not a proper addition arithmetically, is not written up in a proper or a logical manner, is not authentic, is not any number of things, comes within the purview of a strong difference of opinion with respect to alleged facts, and that is obviously permissible.

But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the word 'fake' itself, and this is a question of what a dictionary says as well as what our common understanding of what the word is - I do not know what a dictionary says; I presume it would be quite close to what our common understanding of the word 'fake' is - and when we say that somebody has faked something, then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He did not say that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- or that - okay -

that a document is faked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A fake document.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Okay, a fake document.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A fake document. Now,

saying that a document is faked, or a faked document is a fairly - but, anyway, a document is faked. To fake means to deceive or to attempt to deceive. And I am sure if Your Honour looks in a dictionary, whatever the definition is, it will be something very close to deceive or to attempt to deceive. So it is this connotation of 'fake' which I think is at the heart of the matter, not that hon. members disagree totally with the documents or their accuracy, whether it is -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - mathematical or anything else, but the conception of a document being faked because 'fake' means, or it must mean, 'to deceive or attempt to deceive', and it is the connotation of deception - what one cannot say directly cannot be implied as well - so it is the connotation of deception, Mr. Speaker, implied in the word 'fake'.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Well, I thank hon. members for their submissions to the point of order. It is a rather important point of order and in view of the fact there is no urgency now to proceed with the question, I think what I would like to do is reserve on it and to do a little more research. Perhaps there are some precedents that maybe I should be aware of. I will give a ruling tomorrow, prior to the Question Period.

The time for Oral Questions, therefore, has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Financial Administration Act, I wish to table a report on the guaranteed loan paid since the sitting of the House last.

MR. SPEAKER: Answers to questions for which notice has been given.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have been putting questions on the Order Paper now since the House opened and so far I do not have any answers to my written questions. Could I ask the Premier to find out

MR. NEARY: from the ministers -

MR. ROBERTS: We do not have any
true answers.

MR. NEARY: - when we are going to
get answers to questions?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I have heard enough.

I have ruled on that point of order a multitude of times
and the ruling is the same now -

MR. NEARY: You are going to
(inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: We have many precedents.
The ruling is the same now, it is not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Since this is a day for
points of order, I rise on another point or order. From
time to time the hon. gentleman has gotten up and asked
a question along the lines of this one. Answers to questions
for which notice has been given has been announced. I
suggest to Your Honour that the mode and operation of this
Assembly is in accordance with the rule of Beauchesne and
British Parliamentary practice, and not in accordance with
the rules of one 'Mr. Neary' - or the hon. the member for
LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

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

MR. ROBERTS: - if I may reply to that,
I would simply say the hon. gentleman from St. John's East
(Mr. Marshall) has once again failed to marshall either his

MR. ROBERTS: facts or his argument,
Sir.

MR. NEARY: How childish can you get?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to
the point of order -

MR. STIRLING: What is to (inaudible).
There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me think just for a
moment. First of all, the Chair cannot anticipate what a
member is going to say when he rises on a point of order
and, therefore, the Chair is obligated to hear the point of
order. However, when the Chair hears enough of a point of
order that is repeatedly made, then he will intervene and
call a member to order.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of
the Opposition has a petition?

MR. STIRLING: I have a petition, Mr.
Speaker.

I beg leave to present a
petition on behalf of the people of Gambo South: "We the
undersigned residents of Gambo South are presently unable
to understand why it is that persons wishing to build a
house are not allowed to do so in this area. At this
moment there are eight residents who have purchased land.
They have spent money excavating and preparing in other ways
to build. One person has a home partially built. All have
been stopped from further building. This is as a result
of orders from the town council. The reason given by
council is that there is no water and sewer facilities in
the area. Does this not indicate that the fault does not
lie with

MR. STIRLING:

the persons wishing to build but with the town council and/or the government. It does not seem reasonable that progress must stop and that a native Newfoundlander cannot build a home in his own area just because those in authority have fallen behind in their job. We therefore suggest that someone in authority please use this authority to straighten out this mess and allow us to go ahead and make a home for ourselves as Newfoundlanders have been doing for several hundred years!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the commitments made by the PC government under its former Premier was to the people of Gambo in writing that they would finish the water and sewer services. I ask the Premier of the present administration, a member of that Cabinet, a minister of Municipal Affairs, I believe, at the time that the Premier made the commitment, whether or not he would continue with that commitment? But last year funds were cut off in the middle of the water and sewer project, right in the middle of the project and the present government led by the present Premier has not lived up to the commitment of the former Premier. The reason that these people find themselves in this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that they really have no control over this situation. It was an ongoing, phased-in series of installations but for some reason, for some unknown reason in the middle of their commitments last year this government just cancelled the water and sewer commitments, cancelled the requests for water and sewer services. And at this point the council has requested a meeting with the Premier and the Premier has refused to meet with them. So that is why that they have taken up a petition to try to get the attention of this House focused on the fact that these people

MR. STIRLING: had a written commitment from the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, I support this and I ask that these petitions be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support that position so ably presented by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and relating, of course, to the rights and privileges of people from my home town. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem and certainly it goes against the government's own acknowledged goal and priorities, Mr. Speaker, in terms of developing rural Newfoundland and the maintenance and continuance of the culture of rural Newfoundland, when we prevent people of building in the areas, in their home town in which they want to build. Now, Mr. Speaker, granted that this is a municipality, but I personally run into the kinds of problems in unincorporated areas of this Province. Mr. Speaker, the situation is in my own district. In several communities regulations like this have stopped the further growth and development of these communities. I can name Cannings Cove, Bloomfield, Musgravetown where people, unless they build on a piece of land that can be given to them by their parents, when it comes to moving into another area, an extension of the community, they cannot do it. The reasons given, of course, is that this is promoting or encouraging ribbon development and in the event that they are going to put water and sewer there it is going to be too costly to the government. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of regulation that stopped the growth and expansion of rural Newfoundland. As I said before,

MR. LUSH: in my own district there are several communities that I can name that building is not permitted there any more. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a terrible regulation, it is an insidious regulation and one that is preventing the people of Newfoundland from building their homes in the community in which they grew up and where they want to live.

Mr. Speaker, it is a serious matter and I am not sure that the government is aware of the seriousness of this kind of a problem as articulated by the Leader of the Opposition and as expressed in this petition by the people of Gambo South, a concern, Mr. Speaker, that has certainly been on the minds or will be on the minds of a lot of people in rural Newfoundland. And I would certainly urge the Premier, and certainly the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs Newhook), to look into these kinds of regulations that are affecting the people of this Province and certainly preventing them from building up in the places of rural Newfoundland where they want to live. Because they want to be a part of rural Newfoundland, because they want to be a part of the culture,

MR. LUSH: because they want to live in those rural areas and enjoy the kind of life that only rural Newfoundland can give them. Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of regulation that is preventing this kind of thing from happening, preventing the development and growth of Newfoundland and certainly should be looked into immediately. And whatever the rules and regulations are they should be immediately rescinded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Before I recognize another hon. member, I may be a little bit too late, but hon. members would want to join me in welcoming to the galleries, if some of them are still there, a delegation from the Twillingate-New World Island Development Association, led by its President, Mr. Albert Canning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a further petition?

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which I take great pride in presenting. It is a petition signed by 1,971 of my constituents and these are men and women who live in the communities from Cook's Harbour around to Goose Cove -or I should say precisely from Wild Bight and Boat Harbour, which are next cheek by jowls to Cook's Harbour, right around to the community of Goose Cove, excepting the community of St. Anthony. And I would say the fact that there are only two signatures on this from St. Anthony means nothing more or less than that the people who have taken up this petition have not sought support in St. Anthony because they would have had the unanimous support of the people of St. Anthony, but they have taken it to the communities

MR. ROBERTS:

directly involved.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is succinctly stated. Let me add, there are letters of support here from the Town Council of St. Anthony and from the St. Anthony Chamber of Commerce. But the prayer of the petition is succinctly stated. It refers to the gravel roads in the area between Cook's Harbour and Goose Cove, and it says, "Whereas gravel roads in the area are not up to a standard acceptable to the residents of communities within the boundaries served by the White Bay North Development Association"-who sponsored this petition-"and whereas these roads have not been properly maintained and upgraded; and whereas upgrading and paving of these roads is necessary to enable residents of the area served to gain proper access to schools, medical facilities and places of employment; the following people support the White Bay North Development Association in its efforts to have the roads upgraded and paved and call upon the necessary departments of government to give a commitment that this matter will receive priority during 1981."

As I say, Sir, it is signed by a little under 2,000 men and women and that is close enough, Sir, to every adult, every elector in the communities, the two, four, six, eight, ten, twelve, fourteen, sixteen, eighteen communities in that area.

The petition, Sir, is accompanied by a brief prepared by the White Bay North Development Association and the brief is a study of gravel roads in the area, the area from which this petition comes, And I would commend it. I am sorry the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) has left the House, I am sure only temporarily, and I regret as well the Premier has left the House, So there is nobody of any substance left to speak on the other side. And I regret that because this is a matter on which we do seek some comment and hopefully some commitment.

MR. ROBERTS: The brief I would commend,
Sir, because it outlines in graphic detail -

MR. DOYLE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: If my friend from Harbour Main-
Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) would keep it down to a dull roar: I can
yell at least as loudly as he can, Sir, but I have no desire
to.

As I was saying, this brief
outlines both graphically and in detail the reasons why these
people believe their roads should be upgraded and should be
paved and I say without any hesitation, and quite succinctly,
that I support them categorically, completely and without any
reservation.

Last year, Mr. Speaker,
according to the Public Accounts, the government spent on
improvement and reconstruction and on new construction a
little over \$26 million in this Province. And that does not
count DREE, that does not count any money spent on DREE. I
will wager, Sir, that not \$50,000 of that money was spent on
the 100 miles of road involved, and that fact, which is a
fact, Sir, and is unchallenged and unchallengable, is the
most telling evidence of the merit of this petition. There
are 100 miles of road, Sir, and there

MR. E. ROBERTS: has been insufficient maintenance done on it, to put it mildly. The men and machines in the area do what can be done but the minister has not made available the money.

The national park is served by these roads at L'Anse-au-Meadow, the national historic site, the government paid no heed to that at all apparently. Hundreds of men and women go back and forth each day over these roads to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: - as I was saying before I was interrupted, hundreds of people go back and forth each day over these roads, back and forth to work. Men, women and children go back and forth to hospital, children go back and forth to school, so these roads are part of the fabric, the very fabric of life in these communities. Now we hear a great deal from the Premier about equitable treatment, and I say now quite simply to the Premier and his colleagues, if there is any equity in them, if there is any equity at all in the government of this Province, if there is any desire to try to do what is right - I know their means are limited - but if there is any desire at all we will see it reflected in work being done on these roads this year. They are the worse gravel roads in the Province, barring none, and that includes even the roads in St. Mary's-The Capes and the roads in Labrador South. They are no worse than that -

MR. HANCOCK: No, no!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I disagree with that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: - but they are just as bad, Sir. And I would say to my friend from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) I have been over the roads in his district many times since he has been last over the roads in mine, and I know whereof I speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: And I would say, Mr. Speaker, if there is any equity at all in this group of men and women who

MR. ROBERTS: are presently the government of the Province, they will make available this year the funds that are needed. I do not want to hear them say it is federal; these are not federal roads, they are not a federal responsibility, these are entirely a provincial responsibility. And I would simply say, Sir, that these people in this part of this district deserve better than they have got from this government. And we will see the roads that are being paved elsewhere in this Province, we will see whether justice and equity are principles to which the hon. the Premier and his colleagues subscribe in fact or simply in words. This will tell, Sir.

I support this petition and do so wholeheartedly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that petition not only because of the validity of that petition itself and the 1,900 names but because, Mr. Speaker, what we are now seeing is that the moment of truth is arriving. And that is we have heard all the rhetoric, we have heard minister after minister tell the federal government to get out of their area of jurisdiction under the Constitution. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is clearly in the jurisdiction of the provincial government, there are no excuses that can be made. The government has gotten it full measure under equalization grants, it has the same budget that any other province had based on its own resources. There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker. This is not part of the Trans-Canada Highway. And it is crying out all over this Province, Mr. Speaker, that people demand at least basic, decent facilities.

And, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the people on the other side to start getting interested and involved in what is really happening in this Province and get off the constitutional foolishness and the anti-Ottawa foolishness and to get onto doing something definite and

MR. STIRLING: make some commitments to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And this is very important and this is the kind of petition that this government is going to receive from all over the Province. Their patience was worn out; they have listened to all the rhetoric and all the promises and all the inconsistencies, and now they would like to see some action, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: Not a word from anybody on the government side, let it be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.
MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to

present a petition on behalf of 275 residents of the communities of Mainland and Three Rock Cove.

The petition reads: "We, the residents of Mainland and Three Rock Cove, request that our road be upgraded this coming season and we would ask the government to carefully consider our brief".

Now, Mr. Speaker, the brief which is referred to in the petition is one which I passed around earlier today to all the Cabinet and also gave copies to the press. This brief was compiled and written on behalf of the Three Rock Cove - Mainland Committee, and they are not a wealthy committee by any stretch of the imagination but they are a very hard working one. They have asked me as their representative to make sure that this brief came to the attention of all ministers. Now I note, Mr. Speaker, with some chagrin that there are about six ministers now and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why it is that ministers cannot stay in their seats long enough, because these petitions come from the people and this petition that I am presenting today comes from the people of Three Rock Cove and Mainland to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), to the Premier and to the Cabinet. Now they are asking for consideration and I would say this,

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, that this particular brief, there was an awful lot of effort, work, time and money went into the preparation of this brief. But yet for some reason or other, ministers cannot stay in the House of Assembly because these petitions go to ministers from people in this Province who have legitimate desires and legitimate concerns, and this is one particular petition, Mr. Speaker, and brief which I personally commend the people and the committee of the area because they have been working in the most positive way possible during the past year to try and get decent roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to talk about the brief for a few minutes. The brief tells a little about the history of both communities, but it shows that these particular communities are trying to help themselves. They are trying to help their children, they are trying to help themselves from the depressed economic state in which they find themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the communities of Mainland and Three Rock Cove are productive fishing areas, as the brief explains. They have a labour force which are either in the fishery or work outside of their community. All of their children are bused over the road. The people have time and time again - I suppose, Mr. Speaker, this must have been about the tenth petition I have presented in four years to this hon. House on behalf of the people of this area.

MR. NEARY:

It is just as well to leave them home.

MR. HODDER:

They had at one point, Mr. Speaker, they had a peaceful demonstration in the area which made the National News. Last year out of pure frustration they

MR. HODDER: blocked the road. But what happened, Mr. Speaker? The police marched on them. But yet in this area, with the same type of concern when the students in St. John's on the Prince Philip Parkway, and in Corner Brook when out, the police protected them. They also asked that question in their brief, Mr. Speaker. They realized that the students had a legitimate concern, and they have a legitimate concern too, one that nobody sees, that nobody from this government ever gets out to look at, that I doubt, Mr. Speaker, anybody in this government cares much about.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a well put together brief. I would commend ministers on the other side - I am sorry the Premier is not here that he had to rush off, I am sorry the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) could not stay here. He is one minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: They are at a meeting.

MR. HODDER: There is one minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a wrap up of their meeting.

MR. HODDER: Oh, I see, Mr. Speaker, they are meeting. Yes, they probably are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: But there is one minister, Mr. Speaker, who should never leave his chair because there are a number of petitions, there are two petitions today that were presented in this hon. House on behalf of roads in this Province, and the minister cannot find the time to sit there, nor can other ministers who might be receiving briefs.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this petition be tabled, that the government take it and read it, that they answer this brief. And I would ask,

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of these two communities when the budget comes down - they are not asking for paving, Mr. Speaker, they are asking for money to upgrade their road to paving standards - I would ask when the budget comes down on their behalf that their road be included for upgrading and maintenance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I was here reading the petition from the people from Three Rock Cove and the other couple of petitions that were presented here today. And I find it rather ironic that three members on the Opposition side got up and criticized the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) for not being in his seat when he is inside meeting with a delegation from Morton's Harbour from the hon. member for Twillingate's (Mr. Stirling) district and with the member present.

MR. WINDSOR: At the member's request.

MR. DINN: At the member's request.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: So I do not know you can criticize him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: That is disgraceful!
Disgraceful!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I cannot say I am pleased to rise to support that petition because there should not be any need for anyone to rise in this House to support that petition because it has been presented so many times before.

March 24, 1981

Tape 599

PK - 4

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, I visited the people in that area. I sat down and talked to the women whose children were involved in that protest,

MR. STIRLING: women with tears in their eyes because they now have a criminal record. They were picked up by the police and taken to jail, an experience that was a horrible experience for them. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was done out of desperation because of a government that just does not care, a government that essentially represents urban Newfoundland and sits in its smugness and attacks Ottawa, does not try to get something for the people who really deserve it -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, The hon. Leader of the Opposition is engaging in debate on the petition, quite obviously engaging in the debate. He should confine himself to the remarks of the petition.

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

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

MR. HODDER: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether the Leader of the Opposition was getting into debate would be to know the facts of the situation. And what the Leader of the Opposition was saying, Mr. Speaker, was indeed the facts of the situation which are referred to in the brief which was mentioned as well in the petition. The brief was mentioned in the petition, and the brief itself mentions this particular instance on which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was given straight facts.

MR. HANCOCK: They do not care what goes on.

MR. SPEAKER: The rules are quite clear, I think, for all hon. members with respect to the debate and discussion on petitions. Standing orders 90 to 97 clearly outline, in part at least, that a member speaking to a petition must speak

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): in support of a petition, contain his comments to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the petition, and the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains but there shall be no debate on a petition. And at the point when the hon. the President of the Council (W. Marshall) was rising on a point of order, the Chair was about to rise himself and ask the hon. leader to contain his remarks to the statements in the petition and the number of signatures attached.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would expect we are going to have many more points of order, Mr. Speaker, because I am sick and tired of the kind of arrogance on that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:. Order, please!

That has nothing to do with the petition either.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, please, to the petition before the House.

MR. STIRLING: I am referring to the petition, Mr. Speaker. The same kinds of relevancy I am using as was used by the Minister of Labour (J. Dinn) a minute ago when he got up and explained the absence of the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett). Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) cannot change the facts of the petition. Now what are the facts, Mr. Speaker? What are the facts? The facts are that these people want the road changed into a road from various craters that are there now that they have to get over. There is nothing to grade, so, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the facts as they point out. The facts of the matter is that these people did get to such a point that they

MR. STIRLING: did protest, they did get arrested. Children were taken by the RCMP, that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing with the facts of the petition, not entering into the debate, because, Mr. Speaker, we cannot at this particular time get them to debate the situation as it applies, so we can only deal with the facts. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) would have many occasions to be on his feet because we are not going to allow the government to get away with this kind of arrogance and the kind of use of the rules of the House so that they will not allow us to deal with the issues because they will not bring them before this House. Well, we will do it, Mr. Speaker. We will do it in petitions, we will do it in questions, and we will do it in every other way. And, Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for it. It is time that this government did something about these petitions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order one, Address in Reply.
Yesterday debate on the amendment
was adjourned by the hon. the member for St. Barbe (T. Bennett).
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I hope we all have a copy so that we can refer to page one, and the very first line after His Honour - he says 'over the last year and a half my government embarked' and then we go way down to the five lines up from that, which says 'my government has addressed each of these over the past two years'. Now, I am wondering who is getting their signals mixed, Which is right? Now, that is number one on that page. We go down the line - we go down the pages there are five lines and we see 'managing all our resources'.

MR. BENNETT: And this is what has been put before the House of Assembly, 'Managing all our Resources'. All our resources: That is a story in itself. This may suggest that this government is managing all our resources, but I think, Mr. Speaker, many of our people, our young people especially who are unemployed and the main resource of the Province, are not being managed very, very well at all.

We go further down the line to 'Four components emerge, therefore, as the basis on which government policy must be pursued in order to achieve such a society and they are', Mr. Speaker, number one, 'An honest and efficient political system'.

Mr. Speaker, is the government of the day finally admitting that in the past they have been totally dishonest? Are they finally suggesting that from here on they are going to be honest? If we look on page 29 of the Auditor General's Report, Tourism, Recreation and Culture, and if we read the issue there, which goes something like this, Mr. Speaker: Commenting in his 1974 and 1975 report to the House of Assembly, the Auditor General reported upon a number of weaknesses in the system of internal control for the issuing of licences. In these reports he expressed a concern that certain reconciliations were not prepared. And as we go down a little further: 'The audit for the year ended March 31, 1980, disclosed that the department did reconcile some of its accounts. Of the total revenue \$812,360,00, proceeds of \$522,271.00, realized from the sale of big game licences were not reconciled'. They were not reconciled. Now to me, Mr. Speaker, that does not indicate honesty in the first instance. Five years to reconcile more than a half million dollars of the taxpayers' money into this House of Assembly, into the Treasury of this government!

MR. BENNETT: Number two: 'A stimulating and enlightened cultural policy'. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if this indeed means that outsiders are not allowed to come inside this Province? To me it is exactly what it is suggesting.

Number three: 'A progressive and compassionate social policy within a healthy and safe environment'. A progressive and compassionate social policy within a healthy and safe environment. The healthy part; I am wondering if that is why we are using matacil, within a healthy and safe environment? A compassionate social policy, Mr. Speaker: Anytime and every time that any funding comes down from Ottawa to assist people on assistance that this government is responsible to and for - anytime this government is responsible to welfare recipients or other people who depend on this government's assistance, anytime that any assistance comes down from Ottawa to help these people, they automatically get deductions from their cheques in lieu of federal help.

Number four: 'A resource development policy that involves wise management of our renewable and non-renewable resource'. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must suggest renewable and non-renewable resources, yes, but I think the greatest resource is our people and they have to ship out. The greatest resource of this Province, Mr. Speaker, is the people of the Province and if they want to get employment they have to ship out. It was only this morning that I checked for a constituent of mine who was in here looking for employment to see what opportunity or what possible chance a constituent of mine would have in getting a job offshore. And I was told there are 8,000 applicants at this time with the Department of Labour and Manpower, 8,000.

March 24, 1981, Tape 601, Page 3 -- apb

MR. BENNETT:

Now, Mr. Speaker,

that is an incredible number of people unemployed and I would suggest that most of them are from this general area, because people up in the Northern part of the Province, and on the West coast too, I

MR. BENNETT:

suspect, are reluctant to even be bothered registering with the Manpower Labour for employment because they know their chances are practically nil. If they could come up and rap on the door every other day at the Department of Manpower and Labour they might stand a chance of getting a job. But they have to register here in order to qualify. They cannot go through any other channel other than this government's Manpower and Labour.

We can find an awful lot of discrepancies in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and as we go along - paragraph 5, section (d), the Workers' Compensation of fishermen; that was introduced, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, eight years ago and it has just come into being now apparently. It is a long time to have a bill passed in this House of Assembly, eight years. "It was for this reason that my government has steadfastly held that our fishery, our hydro power, and our offshore resources be developed in line with provincial priorities." In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, provincial priorities are to make sure that our people leave the Province, send them out to Ottawa, send them out to Alberta, send them out to British Columbia, send them - just send them any place to look for employment and create very little in the Province to attract them.

If on page 3 we go down several paces we come to the word "boast", and it is being used in this context; 'This assertion becomes most meaningful when one considers that this Province boasts of the highest taxes, the highest unemployment rate, the lowest standard of living in Canada, and this after more than thirty years in Confederation.' Now in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is not very much to boast about.

MR. BENNETT: I think we should change that wording most certainly.

'My government is deeply concerned for existing tax revenues. We are the highest taxed Province. We have quadrupled our Provincial debt and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the taxes we are collecting from our people are barely able to keep pace with the interest on the money that this government has borrowed in its ten years in office.

Mr. Speaker, we can look back over the years and start at 1950. 1949-50 we came into Confederation and for the twenty years after that there was indeed a great deal of progress made.

If we look at the years from 1970 to 1981, the present day, I wonder myself, and I am sure the rest of the people in this Province must wonder, this was displayed yesterday by a colleague of mine in the House of Assembly -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal Bible.

MR. MARSHALL: The Liberal Bible.

MR. NEARY: And we are proud of it.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I challenge this government to put out a brochure of this -

MR. BARRY: You are expecting to get three seats in the next election?

MR. BENNETT: I expect to get enough to form a government. If your government would put out a similar brochure and display what you have accomplished for this Province -

MR. BARRY: They will have three.

MR. BENNETT: - then I doubt very much if you would get three. Because it looks to me, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Offshore, codfish and constitution.

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 602

NM - 3

MR. BENNETT:

- like all you have accomplished since you have been government of this Province, is a fantastic provincial debt that you cannot bear up under and we are going to have to have a change of government, a change of administration or you are going to have to change your policy of operating, of running the country, or this Province is going to go deeper and deeper and deeper into debt.

MR. T. BENNETT: You do not have to turn many of these pages before you can come up with an awful lot of the accomplishments for the period, the twenty year period. Now mind you, this government of today has been in power for ten years, and that is half of the period of time that these accomplishments, the 6,000 miles of highways -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nine years.

MR. S. NEARY: Going on ten, You are going into your tenth year.

MR. T. BENNETT: You are in your tenth year and you had, Mr. Speaker, this government had a foundation from which to start. This government had a foundation from which to start. This government had a good foundation from which to start. They had a network of high roads, they had the university, they had the -

MR. S. NEARY: College of Fisheries.

MR. T. BENNETT: - College of Fisheries, they had high schools, they had trades schools. They had so many things, Mr. Speaker, and it is displayed in this brochure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: If I could have the tolerance of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: Number six on this 333 if you would like to hear some of these accomplishments, number six is the increase of employment in fish plants from 1,500 to 10,000 persons. You can open this to any place and put this government, the existing government, you can put it to shame with one little brochure put out describing the accomplishments of a government that ruled this Province from 1950 to 1970.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, number forty on page four - if you would like to have copies of this I can get them for you - but, Mr. Speaker, number forty says the government financed the establishment and/or the enlargement and/or improvement of sixty-three fish processing plants in fifty-eight settlements in that short period of time. How many fish plants has this government established or seen established in the Province?

As we go along, seventy-nine-you just pick them at random - number seventy-nine, 'Recovered to the Crown 650 square miles of timberland in Newfoundland, and 4,100 square miles in Labrador', that is number seventy-nine. Number 169 of the 333 accomplishments 'Created a system of foster homes' - now listen to this one, Mr. Speaker - 'created a system of foster homes for neglected and other children whose parents were unable to look after them properly.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen would like to listen to what I have to say, I would be glad to have their tolerance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: And if they would not like to hear what I have to say, perhaps they would like to go outside for the benefit of those who would like to hear what I have to say.

So I repeat, number 169 of the 333 accomplishments of the Liberal Government, 'Created a system of foster homes for neglected and other children whose parents were unable to look after them properly'. Now a few days ago I asked the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) if he is, indeed, going to let a home in Corner Brook close, an Inter-Faith home in Corner Brook close

MR. T. BENNETT: that is taking care of four such children who cannot be cared for in their own homes, and that is the only one we have on the West Coast. It seems to me that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is going to let that house close.

Number 170, 'Substituted cash payments for relief orders for public welfare' instead of sending them down to a retail store.

Now this one here, Mr. Speaker, under 'Agriculture', number 137, 'Established community pastures of 15,000 acres'. Now how many acres has this government established? I know that they have closed up a few pastures that were created by this original government, this Liberal Government, because there is one which is just as well for it to be closed in my district and there is no way that we can get money out of this government to support it.

Mr. Speaker, number 148 - now the hon. gentlemen are laughing but I suspect they are not very anxious to hear the facts, and these are facts - number 148, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government 'Established Canada's greatest system of Provincial public parks and camp sites; opened forty-five new parks, 2,155 camp sites, 1,511 picnic sites which 30,000 persons had visited up to 1979. And before this there was no such thing in this Province as camp sites and public picnic sites! Now this government is trying to unload all these picnic sites and provincial parks. They are trying to dump them back on private enterprise because they do not have the wherewithal or the interest

MR. T. BENNETT: to establish a tourist business that needs this type of thing in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, number 150, the Liberal government of that day financed senior citizens residential institutions in St. John's, Grand Falls, Gander, Corner Brook, Brookfield, Clarke's Beach et cetera and financed dozens and dozens of privately owned and privately operated homes.

Mr. Speaker, 151, Liberal government instituted a system of financing to the owners of private homes, especially in outports-which this government seems to have no time for, outport life - in which elderly citizens could be accommodated. This was instituted rather than adding to the number and size of the larger institutions. Such private homes has now over 4,000 citizens in them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder this government continually flogs and hates Joey Smallwood and the old Liberal government as much as they do. It is no wonder, when the accomplishments, that they are not willing to recognize, because if only the people in this Province realized, read this and compared it with the accomplishments of this government they would demand an election. And I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if indeed they would get three seats in the House of Assembly.

Now that is only a very small portion of what this could reveal, and I hope other hon. gentlemen from both sides of this House will have the courage to display to the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, some more of the accomplishments of the Liberal government when it was in power.

I will set this one aside for a little while, Mr. Speaker, and make a few comments on a few other things that could relate or are relevant to the Thorne Speech. I do not see very much in there that is going to take care of the needy of the Province, Mr. Speaker. I am very anxious, I am most anxious to hear the Budget when it is

MR. BENNETT: brought down in a few days time. Now we can bring in a Budget to the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, but without reaching out to that Treasury up above, our budget in Newfoundland will have very little significance and very little impact on the economy of this Province and on the welfare of the people in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that is painfully unemployed. I would say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that there is 60 per cent unemployed people in my district, 60 per cent easy.

AN HON. MEMBER: I have 85 per cent in mine.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I am suggesting 60 and I might very well have 85 per cent in my district. But for the Canada Works programmes, Mr. Speaker, and a few federal programmes that come into this Province during the Winter, this would be a very dark day in outport Newfoundland, a very dark day indeed.

I would like to read an excerpt from this paragraph: "Action", now this is going to set some people thinking, "Action by John Crosbie, as the Minister of Finance, Sinclair Stevens, then the Treasury Board President that brought projects to a halt in Newfoundland and Labrador and the distinction must be made that it was not review or delay but a complete freeze, which meant that if a contract had not been awarded and work begun it was not about to go ahead". What this meant was that projects such as Wabush Airport, where a number of contracts remained to be awarded to complete the \$11 million job, were halted and held up for a year.

MR. BENNETT: The Small Crafts Harbour projects, Mr. Speaker, has got a great bearing on my district because the district is made up of thirty-two tiny communities and they all have small harbours. 'The Small Crafts Harbour projects, wharves and breakwaters in many parts of the Province, so important to the fishermen, were held up because the freeze instituted by John Crosbie, Newfoundlander who became Finance Minister of Canada, 'Our own Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: -when he got the opportunity to freeze Canada's federal spending in Newfoundland, he brought down that freeze on his people, the people who sent him up to Ottawa. 'Funds for roads to industrial parks at Stephenville and Corner Brook were similarly frozen.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Foolishness!

MR. BENNETT: I do not think that is foolishness, Mr. Speaker, it is just the truth and sometimes the truth hurts. 'It was also the Tory administration that announced calculation of Canada Works programmes preventing millions of dollars from being spent in rural Newfoundland and Labrador.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: Now I do not know what the people in my district would do if we had no Canada Works programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why our unemployment rate dropped to twelve per cent last month.

MR. BENNETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line here in my notes, I would like to touch on what the Department of Social Services apparently wants to be doing to take people off the welfare rolls so that they can collect unemployment insurance. Now to carry on with

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 605

AH-2

MR. BENNETT: this here a little bit further.
'The record of the Liberal government - the Liberal federal government over these past years as it relates to Newfoundland and Labrador speaks for itself.' Now to skip over, not bore you with too much of the reading here, 'It is interesting therefore to note the following list of federal expenditures estimated by a federal department, for the year 1980-1981.' If you would bear with me for a minute I will read you some of these expenditures, some of the federal expenditures estimated by federal departments for the year 1980-1981. Now it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this government hates Ottawa as much as they do because they hate Joe Smallwood for what he did for the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: And they hate Ottawa for what it is doing for the Province.

MR. NEARY: They hate the Liberals, period.

MR. BENNETT: It is a Liberal government in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and this Tory government hates Liberalism, it hates Ottawa, it hates progress in Newfoundland in case Ottawa get credit. Now here is some of the spending. 'It is interesting therefore to note the following list of federal expenditures estimated by federal departments over the year 1980-1981. Public Works \$43 million!

AN HON. MEMBER: What! A Liberal government spent that much in Newfoundland?

MR. BENNETT: Now here is a small portion of DREE. \$59 million, Mr. Speaker. National Defence, \$34 million. Listen to this one, Mr. Mines and Energy - My time is not up already is it?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Five minutes.

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 605

AH-3

MR. BENNETT:
\$39,447,000.

Energy Mines and Resources,

MR. MOORES:

Repeat that. Repeat that.

MR. BENNETT:
\$39,447,000.

Energy Mines and Resources

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

It is no wonder the minister

hates Ottawa. I do not know why they hate Ottawa.

MR. BENNETT: I just cannot for the life of me figure their way of thinking. Employment - listen to this one, Mr. Speaker, Employment and Immigration \$350,677,000 National Health and Welfare, Mr. Minister of Health (W. House), \$380 million from Ottawa. Fisheries and Oceans, Mr. Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), \$55,500,000. Secretary of State, \$50 million. Supply and Services, \$22,251,000. Department of Veterans Affairs, \$24,210,000. Transport Canada, more than \$100 million. Listen to this Mr. Speaker, \$265,000,000 on top of that, \$265,000,000 after this was spent on - spent by the Federal Government in salaries and administering these projects in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. It is no wonder they hate Ottawa, because if we could only have a Liberal Government back in this Province you would never see a Tory Government for another fifty years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that adds up to, I think, something like nearly a billion and a half dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe I mentioned once before in the ten years that this government has had the reins of power they have quadrupled the provincial debt. Now, Mr. Speaker, this one and a half billion from Ottawa is only this past year. Mr. Speaker, that is not ten years of spending -

MR. NEARY: That was \$47 million today for the railway.

MR. BENNETT: \$47 million today for the railway. \$47 million for forestry, None of that is in here. Look, this government, they are continually flogging Ottawa and giving them - giving Ottawa no credit. Every time a programme comes out on Ottawa like Retrofit, the various ministers for these departments expect to get the credit,

MR. BENNETT: they want to give Ottawa no credit, and the only way that they can ever stay in power themselves is if they can be financed by Ottawa, have the cash flow come down from Ottawa.

The hon. gentleman from the Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow) has stepped outside but, Mr. Speaker, some of the money is being spent in his district and in my district. I represent St. Barbe and the Federal riding in the Gros Morne Park is \$14 million this year being spent on a roads programme by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Northern Peninsula roads, \$60 million is being spent on upgrading and paving on the Northern Peninsula. A subsidiary agreement passed by the Liberals for \$28 million for West Newfoundland in the Corner Brook, Stephenville area, there was \$28 million passed by the Liberals - just listen, Mr. Speaker - passed by the Liberal Government. They went out of power and that was frozen by the Tories, not going to be spent. The Tories were kicked out of office in Ottawa, the Liberals were put back in and the \$28 million was again reinstated for West Newfoundland, which is Corner Brook and Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: So we are going to have the \$28 million spent by Ottawa in West Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker. \$15 million to the Stephenville Linerboard Mill, tax write offs, \$1.7 million to the Stephenville airport and \$1.2 million to the Deer Lake airport, \$2 million to the Deer Lake Post Office, \$2.7 million Harbour dredging in Stephenville. \$3 million Canada - in my district, in the area, the federal riding on the West coast, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BENNETT: \$33 million for modernizing the two paper mills in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: You do not have it yet.

MR. NEARY: Yes you have. The agreement is signed.

MR. BENNETT: Most of what I am speaking of here was spent in my district, in the federal riding, the district, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) said he had no communication with the federal member for that district. Well, Mr. Speaker, with all that kind of money being spent in the district I do not think the member for the Bay of Islands needs to be in communication with his federal member.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): The hon. member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like before I start my little talk in the Address in Reply, to relate to an experience I had outside of this House concerning myself, and unfortunately the gentleman is not in his seat, the hon. Leader of the Opposition - it was very embarrassing really - while visiting one of the local hospitals I was mistaken for the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no.

MR. WALSH: And the thing is, the serious part about it, Mr. Speaker, was that the person concerned was a resident of the hon. gentleman's district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: You were paid a compliment.

MR. WALSH: My, my, my, maybe he should (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WALSH: I am not that foolish.

MR. STAGG: He is going to change his driver's licence.

MR. WALSH: I fully intend to do that.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador have shown their support for our Premier's stand on the constitutional issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard any comment in my district, especially, to oppose this government's stand on any of the problems we have with the federal government. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I have only heard praise for the Premier's hard insistence on our rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I will speak briefly on some of the issues dealt with in the Throne Speech.

Hydro development transmission; We have in Labrador one of the largest potential hydro developments in the Western World, and once more, Mr. Speaker, we are being stifled by the federal government in their attitude -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, may I have the protection of the Chair, please?

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

The hon. member requests to be heard in silence.

MR. WALSH: - in that the federal government, Mr. Speaker, refuses to exercise its authority through the National Energy Board, to allow transmission of our hydro through the Province of Quebec. Equal rights, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALSH: It seems that if one looks at history and at the present, Newfoundlanders are doomed and destined to go on forever as the underdogs of this great nation,

MR. WALSH: - if Pierre Elliott Trudeau has his way, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WALSH: It seems that the resources of other parts of Canada as they become known or developed, are given to the provinces and controlled by the people, why not in Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, the great potential in the other part of our Province, Labrador, is one perfect example of the ignorance of the federal government, where this Province has and still continue at this moment trying to convince the Mongolian hordes of Ottawa of the great potential in Labrador by requesting DREE funding to develop roads, and in particular a Trans-Labrador Highway, in order that the people of the area can become and be treated as normal Canadians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: - and that we may get on with the necessary development of the vast resources. But, Mr. Speaker to no avail, they will not even sit down and discuss our proposals.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that?

MR. WALSH: The National Government.

Mr. Speaker, the National Government in Ottawa have been downgrading the people of this Province ever since it became a part of the Canadian nation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) full of bull.

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

MR. WALSH: Using the Newfoundland Railway is a perfect example, Mr. Speaker. And, of course, we know that the PC Party was not in power in this Province at the time, neither was the PC Party in Ottawa. We all know who - the so-called great Liberal Party.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. WALSH: Just a drop in the bucket, crumbs from the table

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 608

EL-1

MR. WALSH:

To keep us alive.

Mr. Speaker, the good people of Newfoundland and Labrador have finally realized, God bless them, that the Liberal Party in this Province was not and never will be their friend.

MR. STEWART:

Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH:

I have another turn tomorrow, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Feds in Ottawa, with the backing of their buddy Liberal friends here in Newfoundland and Labrador, are still treating the great people of this Province as - not as second-class citizens, Mr. Speaker, no, more like fourth-class citizens, and they have always done that.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) Province.

MR. WALSH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada are starting to wake up also. They are starting to realize that the Liberal Prime Minister, while the economy of this great nation is going down the tube, is on an ego trip. Yes, Mr. Speaker, on an ego trip. He has threatened the good people of this great nation that he will patriate the constitution at any cost, Mr. Speaker, for one reason only, Mr. Speaker, one reason, that it can be written down in the history books that he was the great Liberal Prime Minister who was successful in bringing the BNA Act home to Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH:

That is the only reason, Mr. Speaker. Egotistical reasons, that is all. He has no concern for the people of this nation, none.

Mr. Speaker, the treatment towards the Canadian people is insanity at its highest and they, the Canadian people, Mr. Speaker -

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 608

SD - 2

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) Labrador City.
MR. WALSH: I most certainly did already.
MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) Speech in Labrador City.
MR. WALSH: I already did, sent it to Aurora
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.
MR. WALSH: The reward; The people of Canada will reward the great Liberal Party in the next election - they will wipe them completely out of office.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.
MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.
MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I did anticipate getting a chance to read the paper while the hon. member was speaking but I did not even get a chance to finish the article on the clash between the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and my friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

Mr. Speaker, you know, in the three or four or five minutes that I heard -

MR. HANCOCK: The real clash is going to come tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: - this government, this administration -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. flat-bed is on the table tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: - has spent a lot of time since they were first elected back in 1972 criticizing Ottawa, criticizing the Right Hon. Mr. Trudeau.

AN HON. MEMBER: So he has guts enough after fifteen years, to bring home the Constitution.

MR. THOMS: I think this is the first time since 1972 that anybody has gotten up in the House and asked protection of Your Honour's Chair in order to criticize Mr. Trudeau. That is what I heard this afternoon. Simply what he

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 608

SD - 3

MR. THOMS: wanted, he wanted five minutes
silence so that he could attack Ottawa. How many times do
we, as an Opposition, have to tell the people of Newfoundland
exactly what is going on, exactly

MR. THOMS: who is damaging this Province, who is costing this Province an awful lot because of the - it is an attitude, Mr. Speaker, that I fail to understand. This year from Ottawa, coming into this Province, \$1.3 billion. Now, nowhere out of all the castigating of Ottawa that I have heard in this House, not once, has the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) advised the people of this Province, or this House, that they were returning any of that money. Now, I understand, through their stupidity there is money available in Ottawa that we have not taken advantage of. I understand that has happened on occasion, there is money there and we have not gone after it. Mr. Speaker, that is stupidity.

I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether to use the word 'stupid' or 'stupidity' is unparliamentary or not.

MR. NEARY: No, boy.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not easy to make a speech in this House of Assembly, it is extremely difficult. For example, Mr. Speaker, as much as I would like to, but it would be unparliamentary for me to do it, I cannot call the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) a bag of wind, that is unparliamentary. I cannot do it. Mr. Speaker, I cannot call him a sewer pipe -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker, at all.

MR. THOMS: - that is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is cute. That was cute, was it not?

MR. THOMS: It is unparliamentary. I cannot call the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) an ass, Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary. I

MR. THOMS: cannot do it.

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

MR. BUTT: A point of order. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: The hon. member is here about a year now and I figured that he would have by this time -

MR. THOMS: Almost two years. Almost two years now, do not mislead this House.

MR. BARRY: - have understood the rules of the House. Obviously he has not. The hon. member cannot do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly and I ask that he withdraw these spurious libels that he has thrown across the House at both myself and the Minister of Fisheries, and that he be severely chastised.

MR. SPEAKER: Nobody speaking to the point of order?

MR. BARRY: No, they obviously -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order -

MR. BARRETT: There is no excuse for bad manners.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order I would rule there is a legitimate point of order. The hon. member cannot say indirectly what he would not directly and therefore I would ask him to withdraw those remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am only too happy to comply with Your Honour's request to withdraw these remarks. I guess I will just have to go on thinking them.

However, Mr. Speaker, it has been ruled unparliamentary since 1958, with one

March 24, 1981, Tape 609, Page 3 -- apb

MR. THOMS: exception now, we have
a new precedent set on that matter, it has been ruled
parliamentary,

MR. L. THOMS:

of course, to call the other side 'black sheep'. I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether 'trained seal' is parliamentary or unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: Yes it is, it is parliamentary.

MR. THOMS: That may be parliamentary. But we are seeing a lot of 'trained seals', if it is parliamentary. If it is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw it.

MR. THOMS: - if it is unparliamentary I withdraw it. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe it certainly is in order to call them 'mouthpieces', 'phonies'. It is certainly in order, Mr. Speaker, check Beauchesne, you will see that 'phony' is an acceptable parliamentary word.

MR. BARRY Is this furthering the business of the House and of the Province?

MR. HANCOCK: That is certainly what the government is doing and what they are.

MR. THOMS: It is also, Mr. Speaker, very parliamentary and very apt and very proper and very right, under the conditions that we have in this Province today, to call members on the opposite side separatist -

MR. BARRY: I was wondering when he was going to take the high road.

MR. THOMS: - because I believe that they are showing it. I believe when the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) got on his feet, I think it came through loud and clear. Anyone who would come into this House, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, had the audacity to sit there and say, 'What has this got to do with anything?', after his own member, the member for Menihek, got up and asked for the protection of the Chair so the hon. member could lambaste and criticize and scurrilously attack the

MR. L. THOMS: Prime Minister of this country.

MR. NEARY: A distinguished Canadian.

MR. THOMS: A distinguished Canadian, undoubtedly,
and probably the most distinguished Canadian -

MR. HANCOCK: Of all the Prime Ministers that we
have had in Canada.

MR. THOMS: - in the whole history of this
great nation of ours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely
no hesitation, none whatsoever in stating in this House of
Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that I agree wholeheartedly, 100 per
cent, with what the Prime Minister of Canada is doing vis-a-vis
the Constitution. I agree 100 per cent with what he is doing
and I am prepared to go before the electorate of the district
of Grand Bank tomorrow and say so and fight an election on that
issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not resign?

MR. THOMS: I will resign if the Minister of
Mines and Energy can find the courage to come back to the
Burin Peninsula after being kicked out. Come on back, I will
resign, you have my word for it. If you want to run against
me in the district of Grand Bank, let the Premier of this
Province give me the guarantee that the hon. minister will
come down to Grand Bank and run against me. I will resign
tomorrow and I would love every minute of it. The hon. member
has already shown that he is only acceptable to the hard-core
Tory voters of this Province. And do not tell me, Mr. Speaker,
about the minister's district.

MR. NEARY: You are talking about my member,
by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about my member. I did not vote for him and I hope my wife never admits that she voted for him either.

MR. HANCOCK: Your wife was one of the calls that I made and she did not even know who her member was. Your wife was one of them.

MR. FLIGHT: Placentia said what they wanted to say regarding that member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, we have seen, I guess, particularly since this session of the House started, a certain decadence in politics on

MR. THOMS:

the government side of the House. There is something, Mr. Speaker, rotten in the state of the Liberal government and the Liberal party of this Province. We saw the first example of it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: - we saw the first example -

MR. NEARY: The Tory government you mean.

MR. THOMS: I think all hon. members know that I am talking about the Tory party even though there may have been a lapsus lingual and I mentioned one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: I will have to find out tonight what a slip of the tongue, Madame Minister, is in French. Instead of using Latin I can use the French.

But there is something rotten in the Tory party of this Province. There is something rotten in the Tory administration of this Province, apart from the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Okay? What did we see in the last session? We saw the Public Accounts Committee bring in a unanimous recommendation, a unanimous opinion that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had publicly and knowingly contravened the Public Tendering Act. And what did we see? We saw this brave, young Trojan hero of ours, 'Little Alfie', stand up in this House and justify it, justify it, try to justify it, and weaselled down in his seat again. We saw the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), both of them going off half stupidly, half-wittedly, half-cockedly, half everything else, signing petitions, signing petitions. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine being Premier of this Province, being the head of a Cabinet and having one of your ministers sign a

MR. THOMS: petition criticizing your administration and then coming into this House and standing up and admitting that he had not read it. He admitted that he had not read it. He just signed it. So we have two cases there. Now, at least the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) showed a little more sense in signing the petition when he crossed out the reference to the insult to the administration. I would suggest that the people of Newfoundland would not have cut out the reference to the insult, but at least the Minister of Transportation did it. Then, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? What do we find? Very shortly thereafter - Mr. Speaker, we will wait for the ruling to find out whether or not you can call these fake documents that were tabled in this House by the Minister of Transportation, but I am telling you it would appear to me - and I am not making any reference to the minister - but it would appear to me that these documents are as phony as a three-dollar bill. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many here have read Ian Fleming or seen any of the James Bond movies, but you will remember that the big cheese, the head man, the head man in the James Bond movies is a Mr. M., a Mr. M. What do we get here? A memo to Barry - I assume now this is not the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), I am making that assumption - I do not know who this Mr. Barry is - to Barry - I do not know who Barry is. I do not know if it is a first name. I do not know if it is a surname. It is just to Barry. I do not know if it is Malcolm Barry or whether it is Barry Malcolm, okay? This is a memorandum to Barry from - guess who? - M., M.

AN HON. MEMBER: Madam.

MR. THOMS: It should read to 007 from M., Mr. Speaker. It would make about as much sense. Now, there is an indication,

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there is a rumor to the effect that this Barry, this either Barry Jones or Jones Barry, is an executive assistant to the Minister of Transportation or some gopher within the department.

MR. NEARY: A political -

MR. THOMS: A political appointment within the Department.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. THOMS: So who prepares the intradepartmental memorandum? Again we see it is from Barry this time to minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has got to be somewhere a legitimate invoice or a bill for the services rendered by the Department of Transportation. And, Mr. Speaker, you know, do not blame me for being upset when something like this happens. I had the occasion a very short time ago when I was trying to get a low-bed to move a home from within the community of Point May in my district. Aylward's low-bed was broken down. They were waiting for the parts to come to get it fixed. I called companies in Clarendville and in St. John's and, you know, the expense, the cost of getting one to go from St. John's down to Point May and back again portal-to-portal was just too expensive. So I tried the Department of Highways and it did not take the Department of Highways long to tell me what the policy was. It did not take them long to tell me what the policy was.

Now, Mr. Speaker, should the minister have any more privileges with the Department of Highways, or the minister of any department, than any ordinary average citizen in this Province? My constituent was turned down flatly. There was no question about policy. I could not write a memo from minister to DM or DN on December 16, 1980 asking him to move the house across the road for any cost.

But as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, we have here an intradepartmental memorandum from a political

MR. THOMS: appointment within the Department of Transportation outlining the cost. Now it is dated February 11, 1981. Certainly you can date a memorandum at any time you want to. You can backdate it, postdate it, antidate it, any date you want to put on it you can put on it.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing goes for a cheque. When you write out a cheque you can put practically any date. You may have problems if you antidate it for more than six months because the bank just might consider that it is staledated. But you can put any date on a cheque. However, Mr. Speaker, the minister said in this House yesterday or on the nineteenth-when we asked him about a receipt, he talked about getting a cancelled cheque. I am not interested in seeing the cancelled cheque except from curiosity, that is all. What I want to see, Mr. Speaker, is this: Every time that I come into the Registry of Deeds down on the ground floor of this building they take my cheque, they go to Central Cashier, which has sort of a little branch down in the Registry of Deeds,

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 613

RA - 1

MR. L. THOMS: and they get a receipt, That is done immediately.

MR. NEARY: That is mandatory, that is the law.

MR. L. THOMS: That is done immediately .

MR. NEARY: That is the law.

MR. L. THOMS: That is the way it is done, The Minister of Finance verify this.

MR. NEARY: That is the law.

MR. L. THOMS: This is the way it is done. You go down now Mr. Speaker, and ask for a birth certificate -

MR. NEARY: Pay your money to the Newfoundland government.

MR. L. THOMS: - you have to go up on the main floor of this building, go in, pay your \$5.00 and get a receipt from Central Cashier.

MR. NEARY: Right away.

MR. L. THOMS: That is the way it is done.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, somewhere this cheque for \$1887.66 had to go through Central Cashier.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. L. THOMS: I would like to see the minister- and if the minister does not do it then you can rest assured that we will be on to the Minister of Finance -

MR. NEARY: And Justice.

MR. L. THOMS: - and Justice and Mines and Energy, and Fisheries and Municipal Affairs, wherever we have to to get it. So, it is no good for them

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 613

RA - 2

MR. L. THOMS: to try to push it off because there has got to be a receipt, there has got to be a receipt.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. L. THOMS: And when these cheques come in, I would sav in the majority of cases, they are receipted the same day.

MR. NEARY: That is right, they have to.

MR. L. THOMS: And in a small number of cases -

MR. NEARY: According to law they have to.

MR. L. THOMS: - in a small number of cases the receipt would be done the next day.

MR. NEARY: Because it was late coming in.

MR. L. THOMS: That is the one we want, that is what we want to see, when it was paid.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. L. THOMS: Because, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the minister was forced into paying this by the questioning in this House. You know, it puzzles me, and it must puzzle the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), that in the House on March 19th the minister said 'I do not know the exact cost now, Mr. Speaker, but I can certainly get it'. Now, he wrote out a cheque for \$1887.66 forty-eight hours before he was asked about it, and he could not remember how much it cost. Now, I ask hon. members of this House on both sides, how many of you, how many times has my wealthy friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird), how many times might my hon. friend from Humber West have written out a cheque for \$1800-almost \$1900. Twelve dollars and some-odd cents short of \$1900-how many times has he written out a cheque for that amount of money and forgotten the amount in forty-eight hours?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: Now, I imagine there are lots of times he would write out a cheque for \$1900 and would like to forget about it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. THOMS: - and would like to forget about it, but I doubt -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) forgot about it too.

MR. L. THOMS: - but I doubt if he has ever written out a cheque for \$1900, and in forty-eight hours forgotten that he did it and how much it was. I would like to hear, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the minister's explanation for his amnesia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, it is all part - you know, the rot is set in.

MR. NEARY: The dry rot.

MR. L. THOMS: The rot is set in.

MR. HANCOCK: The Minister of Fisheries started it.

MR. L. THOMS: There is a chink in the armour of this person, there is a chink in the armour of this person who was held up to be the greatest saint to any politics. The only honest man, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: So he says.

MR. THOMS: -the only honest man in politics - a big headline, and a big story, not even the Minister of Mines and Energy was excluded.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: You are not an honest politician, according to the Premier of this Province.

MR. BARRY: Earplugs!

MR. L. THOMS: You are not. You should have heard yourself yesterday when my friend from Buchans (Mr. Flight) got on to you, you should have heard your

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 613

RA - 4

MR. L. THOMS:

ownself.

MR. BARRY:

I had nothing to say.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not what the papers said.

MR. L. THOMS:

- in view of the wishes of my friend, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and the fact that I have not said all I want to say, and I have not

MR. THOMS: made all of the criticisms I want to make of a rotten administration. -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. THOMS: -I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, a sub-amendment to the Address in Reply and this is:-

AN HON. MEMBER: Hey, who are you (inaudible)?

MR. THOMS: - That this government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Order!

MR. THOMS: - left undone the things it ought to have done, and that they have done the things they should have left undone, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Can I have the amendment please?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is in order. That is in order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Could you read out the sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker?

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

Yes, I will read out the sub-amendment. It comes from the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) to move the following sub-amendment: And that this government left undone the things they ought to have done, and done the things that they should have left undone.

Now, I will certainly have to take just a very brief recess to check to see if this sub-amendment is in order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do have a point of order, you know, I do not advocate (Inaudible).

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

MR. HANCOCK: You are up three or four times a day anyway.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman you know, -

MR. HANCOCK: You are getting a bit childish.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I note that that sub-amendment does not state words to the effect that words after such and such be deleted and the following be added. So I just point that out to Your Honour. Also the fact of the matter is that it is being presented to the House and it has not been seconded. But then again, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I just bring up these points because it is rather important that the technical points of parliamentary practice be observed in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I tell you that the government is not all that big on it, Mr. Speaker, because if the hon. gentleman is not content with the non-confidence motion proposed by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), it just shows another division in their ranks, and if they want to exhibit that they can go ahead and do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): To the point of order, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out and make it very clear that the sub-amendment has been seconded by my friend for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): Further to the point of order?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: To the point of order, yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. MARSHALL: Excuse me. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has already spoken in the debate so he cannot.

MR. HISCOCK: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. THOMS: No, he has not.

MR. MARSHALL: He has so.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has not.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, that is a question of fact which the Chair no doubt will ascertain.

Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the point of order. Your Honour will see in looking under Beauchesne that a sub-amendment, or indeed an amendment, because a sub-amendment is an amendment to an amendment - the section is the section on amendments, which is page 150 to 155, all of that jurisprudence there. Your Honour will see that there are three possibilities of amendments. Whether they are amendments or sub-amendments is immaterial here, because a sub-amendment is an amendment to an amendment. All right? They are done in three ways, and three ways only. Number one, by adding on words to the original motion. The original motion here is the amendment,

MR. OTENHEIMER: the sub-amendment is added on. Three ways; one, by adding on words; two, by deleting the words and substituting all new ones; or three, by deleting some words and substituting others. So it will either have to add on or be a substitution. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this sub-amendment does not add on or substitute, it is just floating in the air.

Now, I would draw Your Honour's specific attention to Beauchesne, Section 438, Subsection (2) on page 155, "A sub-amendment must attempt to explain the substance of the amendment and may not substitute an entirely new proposal." It is very clear and to the point. "A sub-amendment must attempt to explain the substance of the amendment and may not substitute an entirely new proposal." I suggest, Your Honour, that the sub-amendment does not in any way explain the substance of

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the amendment but is, in fact, an entirely new proposal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And then when Your Honour continues and turns to page 156 he will see subsection (2), "A sub-amendment must be relevant to the amendment it purports to amend". And then it says, "and not to the main motion". Here "not to the main motion" is somewhat redundant, but the first part, "A sub-amendment must be relevant to the amendment it purports to amend". And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this sub-amendment is in no way relevant to the amendment it purports to amend.

MR. MARSHALL: Section 36. Standing Order 36.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We also have Standing Order 36 which my hon. and learned colleague, the President of the Council, Government House Leader, member for St. John's East and honoured and respected member of Planning and Priorities Committee and numerous other organizations (Mr. Marshall) has also given specific reference, the general point I made at first. I will point out, Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 36 which says, "A motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; or (c) by inserting or adding other words."

Now, when you add that to the relevancy provisions from Beauchesne I think that, Mr. Speaker, you may come to the conclusion that the sub-amendment is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final submission to the point of order from the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Let me point out -

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 615

IB-2

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: We had two from the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two.

MR. NEARY: Let me point out to Your Honour that the gentleman who just spoke on the point of order, a former Speaker of this House, on two previous occasions ruled exactly the same sub-amendment in order, exactly the same sub-amendment. That the government left undone the things that they should have done and done the things that they should have left undone is precisely, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - precisely the same wording used in two previous amendments and sub-amendments and approved and condoned and upheld by the gentleman who just spoke, when he was Speaker of this House. So I just throw that out as food for thought for Your Honour and to say that we have ample precedent, Mr. Speaker, for that sub-amendment. It is in order and all they are trying to do is to interfere with my friend here continuing for another hour to make his few points on the rot that has set in in this government.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not think he has got the extra time, you know.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, he has got the extra time, oh yes. Your Honour will find that out when Your Honour - maybe we may as well adjourn the House for the day and come back tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

I thank all hon. members for their contributions that they have made to this. I would like to take about a two minute recess and then I will be able to rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

With respect to the sub-amendment from the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), I would like to point out that sub-amendments should be moved in a proper and formal manner, as outlined in Standing Orders 32 and 36, in that it should be presented by saying, "I move -", seconded by the hon. member for whatever district he represents, and that certain words be added or taken out, etc., in the case. And in this particular case I would have to rule the sub-amendment out of order on a technicality.

The hon. member for Grand Bank has about two minutes, I think.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of minutes unless I can get leave to complete my few remarks that I wanted to make.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Maybe the - Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - there were a number of things that I would like to have gotten into, not the least of which is the role of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission and the fact that last year the Newfoundland Liquor Commission made a net profit of something like \$42 million. I have scoured the annual report for 1980, Mr. Speaker, and nowhere in it can I find an expenditure related to education, which I have spoken on in this House before. I have asked questions on it in this House before, why the Premier of this Province, why the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of this Province, does not require the Newfoundland Liquor Commission to budget a substantial sum of money out of the \$42 million to educate not only the adults of the problems of alcohol, and the teenagers. The statistics, Mr. Speaker, in this particular area, they are frightening. I was

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 616

GS - 2

MR. THOMS: watching television - it was
either a program or an advertisement from the States - just
a couple of days ago, which shows that 70 per cent of those who
drive in

MR. THOMS:

the United States drink, that there are more people who die on the highway through alcohol related accidents than are killed by guns in the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, we have a real problem all over and I find it unforgivable that a Crown corporation, under the responsibility of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of this Province, should make a profit of \$42 million and not one cent of it goes back into education. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is anybody in this House who would not but agree that a portion of that money, and I do not mean \$500 or \$5,000 or a few brochures, anything of that nature, but a substantial amount of this profit, net profit of \$42 million, be taken and used for educational purposes.

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your time is up.

MR. THOMS:

I am not going to get, by leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. THOMS:

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I thought if I would be nice for a minute or two, and less critical for a minute or two, I would get a little bit of leave but I guess not.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

If the hon. member will allow me I will check with the Table. Has the hon. member's time expired? The hon. member's time has expired. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Sorry, leave has not been granted.

The hon. member for Humber West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. BAIRD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If my voice sounds a little harsh today it is because I attended three hockey games over the weekend wherein Corner Brook defeated the team from St. John's.

MR. BAIRD: so I was very happy to lose my voice
the weekend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
comment on some of the points in the gracious Throne Speech
also, some needs of the district of Humber West which I have
the honour of representing.

This administration, under the
capable leadership of Premier Brian Peckford, has to fight
for things we knew we owned thirty-two years ago. I wonder
how many of our Newfoundlanders who are now deceased would
have voted for Confederation had they known that Trudeau's
new Constitution would reduce us to a municipality rather
than a full partner in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BAIRD: I am not saying we have not
derived many benefits from joining Confederation, I repeat,
joining, as I understand it was by mutual consent. As the
saying goes, 'Much has been done, however, much more remains
to be done'. It is ironic that our Province, with its
natural resources,

MR. BAIRD: power, etc. should have the highest cost of living in Canada. This government had the foresight and honour of bringing in a five year programme for all to see. A new power agreement with ERCO was negotiated, resulting in the saving of approximately \$140 million to our taxpayers; new legislation to gain greater benefits from the Upper Churchill.

This administration has been criticized for standing up for our fishing industry, our rights to hydro transmission, our offshore resources, coupled with our rights and guarantees as negotiated in 1949. If I am to be criticized for supporting this stand, then criticized I will be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go away. Go away.

MR. BAIRD: Now getting back to my district of Humber West, which comprises approximately 45 per cent of Corner Brook. Ten years ago the population of Corner Brook City was 30,000. Today we are down to 23,000. We have the highest taxes in the nation due, in part, to our topography and also our declining population. To maintain our existing services we must have new industry. To have new industry we must have new infrastructure. To have new infrastructure we must have DREE or, more importantly and firstly, what I would like to see, management and ownership of our own resources whereby we would not need DREE.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: Mr. Speaker, phase one of our industrial park DREE agreement was signed by Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Peckford in 1979, with an agreement in principle for phase two subject to environmental studies. This study is now complete and the people of Corner Brook are anxiously awaiting for a DREE agreement to be signed.

I am advised there are ten projects now before DREE and have been for some time, and

MR. BAIRD: the Province has its funding in place for any and all agreements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: We now have a seventy-five acre industrial park in progress. However, we need assistance from Ottawa to complete the project and have a road link to the waterfront for this site. Mr. Speaker, the main road known as Quarry Hill, is as dangerous and narrow now as it was back in 1949, and this is unacceptable in today's society. Phase two of the agreement would eliminate this hazard and at the same time provide access for an industrial park to the waterfront. Country Road, one of our main streets, with a heavy volume of traffic has no sidewalks, curb or gutter but open ditches. Mr. Speaker, if you could see our school children climbing up over snowbanks trying to dodge traffic in an area where people are paying as high a taxes as we are, it is no wonder we all wonder what became of our just society as promised by Mr. Trudeau on many occasions.

Corner Brook needs new industry. Mr. Speaker, the recent close out of Wometco resulting in the lost of eight jobs, the lay-off of eight firemen in January - and I was advised today that Terra Nova Tel were closing out their business office in Corner Brook and moving to St. John's with a loss of two more jobs. And, I understand, another position by

March 24, 1981

Tape No. 619

GS - 1

MR. BAIRD: I understand another position by Terra Nova Tel could be finished up next month.

I would like to advise the member for St. Barbe South (Mr. Bennett) while I am on my feet - he has been wondering about the group home in Corner Brook this past ten days. I am sure the hon. member for St. Barbe South has a lot of problems in his own area that he does not seem to tend to as ably as he should. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) did make public on the open airwaves two weeks ago and to the Committee, there were no worries about the group home in Corner Brook being opened. They are aware of it. I visited the group home over the weekend and on many other occasions, and I have no worries about the group home staying open.

I would like to thank Ottawa for their so-called many handouts, and if Ottawa would give us the tools, or let us use our own tools, we would get on with the job. We would not need this so-called confrontation and our members opposite, I think, probably would be looking in a little different direction, that any money, so-called, coming from Ottawa - we are part of the taxpayers of the whole of Canada, so some of our money comes back to us and justly so.

It being close to six o'clock,

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. BAIRD: I have thirty minutes - if it is in order I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The motion to adjourn is in order. It is not debatable. If the House wishes to - the motion to adjourn is in order but not debatable.

MR. FLIGHT: The member has finished his speech, Mr. Speaker. The member has finished his speech, he cannot adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member has moved a motion of adjournment, as I understand it, which is in order.

The motion is that this House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour, aye; contrary, nay.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the member was finished his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour, aye; contrary, nay. I declare the motion carried.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is adjourned.

MR. MARSHALL: That is the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that motion has already been made and passed and carried.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) take place.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.