

VOL. 3

NO. 21

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: It is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it is more of a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was driving home this morning and I heard the Bobsy Twins responding to a lady who called in to say that I said in the House-or outside the House or somewhere, I do not know how she ever got the idea- that I had said that the Premier was having parties in Confederation Building. Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing. What I was referring to yesterday in the House and outside the House was the victory party they had on Saturday night somewhere here in St. John's. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what kind of an interpretation they put on what I said, but the Bobsy Twins certainly should have known better. I did not make any such statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who? Who?

MR. NEARY: The Bobsy Twins over at VOXM. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order merely to clarify the matter, Mr. Speaker, I did not say, have never said that the Premier was having parties in Confederation Building as was reported. Apparently it was some kind of a convoluted report of something I said on CBC that led to this. But I just want to clear that up because that is not what I said nor did I intend it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition did rise on a point of order and explained

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): exactly why he raised this point of order.

Before we proceed, I understand we have two groups in the gallery from the Labrador Inuit Association Mr. William Anderson and Sharon Edmunds; and from the community of Herring Neck a delegation of Barbara Richmond, Max Holwell, Edward Blandford and Ross Warren. I welcome these people to the galleries today.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I welcome to the gallery as well the President of the LIA, Mr. Anderson, and Miss Edmunds, part of a group which I had the pleasure of meeting with this morning.

And I wish to advise the House that I did meet with the Labrador Inuit Association to discuss the issue of new harvesting plans for the George River

MR. SIMMS: caribou herd. Also in attendance at the meeting were my colleagues, the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie).

Interest was expressed, Mr. Speaker, by the Labrador Inuit Association concerning the sport hunt and the need for close consultation during its development and implementation.

In this regard, I have agreed to an annual meeting with the Labrador Inuit Association to discuss in detail all aspects of the sport hunt pertaining to my department, and I have requested input from the L.I.A. on any issue they wish addressed concerning the hunt. I feel that both parties recognize the economic benefits to be accrued. However, it is essential that the programme is administered in a responsible manner. I feel that the open door policy between government and the Labrador Inuit Association will ensure that this becomes a reality.

As a result of a proposal, Mr. Speaker, presented at our meeting by the Labrador Inuit Association, I am pleased to announce today that my department will permit the L.I.A. to undertake a commercial caribou harvest in Northern Labrador to supply meat to communities who find it difficult in obtaining same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The merits of this programme were addressed in the recent study recommending the sport hunt, and it was evident from the data available that the resource base, contrary to some opinion, is more than adequate to meet the demands of both programmes.

My department will be preparing the necessary regulatory changes to permit this harvest and I am delighted that the L.I.A. will be immediately

MR. SIMMS: developing plans to take advantage of this programme, and make it available to serve the needs of our Labrador people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: This is a major policy change in dealing with the utilization of a renewable resource. However, we are convinced, based on available data, that the programme can be viable and can be sustained for the foreseeable future.

As I have said on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, resource needs for the people of Labrador will be our first priority, and I am sure that all members of this House will agree that this initiative has strengthened this particular position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to the minister's statement in a very favourable manner. The minister has finally seen the light.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: He has seen what the people of Labrador have been advocating for some time.

MR. WARREN: It is good to know that the minister has given the LIA permission to go ahead with a commercial caribou harvest. If the minister would only go back four or five months ago when he brought it in in his Ministerial Statement about the sports hunt, it was without consultation with the people. This again shows, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side may be small in number, but at least we are making the ministers realize that you just cannot run roughshod over the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite pleased that two of the representatives from the LIA are in the gallery and I am sure they are pleased that the minister had the initiative to go ahead with this hunt in a positive manner that will benefit the people of Labrador first.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening in the House, on the Atlantic Salmon Management Plan, I asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) if he would give us a copy of the Telex that he had sent to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane). He did that yesterday evening and we studied his Telex. I want to make one point now quite clear, that we want to make the approach to Ottawa completely nonpartisan - we on this side of the House. But there are certain things in the minister's Telex which I cannot agree with, there are certain things there that I believe are not strong enough and perhaps not pushing enough. For example, the minister, I believe, has agreed with a two week delay in the salmon fishery without compensation for

MR. TULK: the loss of income to fishermen, and that I find somewhat difficult to agree with. But in trying to keep this nonpartisan and in trying to work out a unified position for the House to be presented to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), I want to ask the minister if he will agree to have a unified position to be established by myself and him, in consultation with our own people, our own caucuses, outside the House will he agree that we will sit down and work out a satisfactory approach to Ottawa on behalf of the fishermen of Newfoundland?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Opposition accepted my appeal made yesterday to them during debate that this matter be approached to determine at least once in the history of - indeed not in history, but in the history of my standing in the House as a member, that the Liberal Party can show that it has some influence over party policy in Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, before I go any further I would like to table that Telex. I was asked to table it yesterday, table this Telex sent yesterday morning. And I want to say first of all I do not know why the Opposition still leaves the impression that I am agreeing to anything. I merely said that we would consider a 10 per cent reduction. Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this document, first of all, the Telex went yesterday morning to the minister in Ottawa, and to say at the same time that we never did agree, I never did say that I agreed to a two or three week or any period of curtailment or delay except to say that we would consider a 10 per cent reduction reasonable based on a 50 per cent to 80 per cent reduction in the rest of Atlantic Canada. That is the position we took in the discussions and we take now.

In the meantime, may I inform the hon. gentlemen and the House that this morning we had a lengthy telephone conference hook-up with the minister and his senior officials, Dr. Art May, and his assistant deputy, Mr. Stein, and including my deputy and other officials in the department and we discussed this whole issue. He is now in the process of forwarding detailed information to us with regards to his understanding that only 10 per cent will be the reduction in the number of salmon caught by a three week delay.

We have asked him for the information and a breakdown of regions. We understand, for example, the Southwestern part of the Province, in LaPoile area, that that would be much greater than 10 per cent, it is more like 60 per cent. That is where most of the salmon is caught -

MR. NEARY: I told you that yesterday.

MR. MORGAN: -whereas it averaged out around the



MR. MORGAN: Province to be 40 per cent  
in our estimation, 35 per cent to 40 per cent.

Mr. De Bane said this morning that his biologists and scientists are saying otherwise. So he has agreed to forward all of the data and information, he is now doing it by Telex this afternoon to the officials in my department. And he has agreed further to come to Newfoundland over the weekend for a meeting with me to discuss the whole issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: He will be here this weekend and we have agreed to meet and discuss it, and especially with regards to the content of my Telex sent to him yesterday morning. I am hoping with the combined efforts of all members of the House, the Opposition with us -

MR. MORGAN: I have no objection whatsoever to the Opposition assigning a spokesman to sit down to that meeting on salmon. I have no objection whatsoever, I think it would be worthwhile to have him at that meeting - on that one topic, to discuss the Atlantic salmon policy, and to go over with him his information supplied to us now, and to go over what we feel is going to be more than a 10 per cent reduction in certain areas of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before I introduce the hon. member I would just like to welcome another group to the gallery, a delegation from Botwood, with Mayor Elliott, councillors Langdon, Woodsworth and Thompson. I do welcome them to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, that was going to be my second question to the minister, that if we could work out a unified position of this House to be presented to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), would we indeed also be included in any meetings that were held with the minister? He has answered that and we certainly accept that once we have worked out a unified position. But I would ask the minister further if we could - there are a number of things wrong with it - outside of this House, whether it be today or tomorrow, work out a position that is satisfactory to both sides of this House, if we can do that, can we at least get together to see if we can do that, to work out a unified position that is the consensus of this House? Because there are a couple of things that I want to see changed in the minister's arguments which I think are somewhat weak.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe I will read for the record,

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Telex which clearly outlines what we are saying, the Telex to Mr. De Bane sent yesterday morning: "The announcement made by you over the weekend does not reflect the conversation held between us on the morning of April 5. In essence, the official management plan of your department as announced is much more severe than you had earlier indicated.

"Our discussion of April 5 related to six important issues and you indicated as follows: Number one: Maximum curtailment of two week delay in opening date which would result in approximately 10 per cent reduction in commercial salmon landings. Number two: Part-time fishermen would have their licences cancelled and compensation of \$500 per fisherman would be provided for a 'once only deal'. Number three: Permit transfers of licences between family members. Number four: There would be increased efforts to curtail the Greenland fishery. Number five: There will be increased spendings towards salmon enhancement programmes. And number six: There will be increased efforts to reduce poaching and to improve the habitat.

MR. MORGAN: "The official management policy being carried by the media indicates the opening date will be delayed by three weeks, until June 11, and there is no mention of part-time fishermen having their licences cancelled while the other issues receive minimal coverage. It is my strong belief that this delayed opening date will result in decreased landings by commercial fishermen of approximately 30 per cent to 40 per cent, not the 10 per cent as your announcement indicates. And this will place additional restriction on full-time fishermen without phasing out part-time salmon fishermen and this is simply unacceptable.

"I would strongly urge you to review this matter and to reflect our original discussion.

"I am further available for discussion upon your request."

Now that Telex I think clearly outlines the policy that was to be announced on Friday and was not announced, there were some major changes made to it, major as far as we are concerned. So my suggestion now, Mr. Speaker, is that, based on that Telex, and based on the Telex sent yesterday by the Opposition, that we indeed sit down and come to an understanding as to what we think is a reasonable position taken by the Province as a whole moreso than any party, to the benefit of the fishermen, taking into consideration these issues I pointed out, with the Greenland fishery, about the salmon enhancement programme, and about the poaching and about the curtailment in other provinces. And if we did that, maybe we will be able to persuade Mr. De Bane to change his policy. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, in adding to that, that there has been input from the Fishermen's Union and this Telex from us here and a Telex from the Opposition, and at this time Mr. De Bane is standing firm on the data provided to him from his

MR. MORGAN: biologists and from his scientists, and he is still convinced that this delay in opening of three weeks will still only mean a 10 per cent reduction. Now he is basing his information on his biologists and the scientific information available to him and, as I said earlier, that will be relayed to us to be analyzed, and then we can sit down with him on Sunday, and hopefully, as I say, with the Opposition joining forces with us, and supporting what we are saying on the issues, that we can get the policy changed, at least not to be as severe. We have to agree on conservation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Oh, absolutely!

MR. MORGAN: Anybody today who stands and says, "No, we are opposed to conservation. No, we are opposed to any curtailment at all. No, we are opposed to what he is trying to do, the concept," I think would be totally wrong, irresponsible.

MR. MORGAN:

We have to agree to conservation measures unless we are going to see the salmon fishery in the same state as our herring fishery, and we no longer have a herring fishery around our coastline. So, Mr. Speaker, based on that, I think if we can agree together on a reasonable conservation measure, hopefully we can persuade the federal minister (Mr. De Bane) to agree with us.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all clear up the idea that anybody is joining with anybody to take their plan. But let me say to the minister, too, quite clearly, two things; that we on this side have established our own position; we have it but we are not going to release it to anybody until we have had a chance to meet with the minister, because we think that would not be the way we should negotiate a unified position to take forward to the minister.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. TULK: But let me say to him quite clearly that we on this side recognize - and let not anybody be under any illusion that we do not - that we have to conserve the salmon stocks and that we have to perhaps rebuild them, and let that be quite clear to the federal minister. But the one big thing that concerns us on this side - and hopefully we can get together with the minister outside of the House to straighten this out - is that there is nowhere in the minister's Telex the idea that if you are going to delay the opening of the salmon fishery and the fishermen lose income, that they have to be compensated for it. Now, Sir, that is one of our prime concerns.

MR. NEARY: Right on! .

MR. TULK: I will not get into the rest of them at this point, but I will just ask the minister if, quite simply, we could, perhaps immediately after Question Period or sometime this evening, get together to lay out the groundwork on which we will do the thing that has to be done in approaching the federal minister?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with that; in fact, I welcome that suggestion. This evening, the Estimates Committee on fisheries starts at, I think, 7:30 p.m. My suggestion is that maybe we get together around 7:00 p.m. at the Colonial Building. I have some delegations this afternoon, but if at all possible between now and 6:00 p.m. we get together for some discussion and then the follow-up this evening around 7:00 p.m., before the Estimates Committee, and hopefully get something in a joint way to sit down with Mr. De Bane on Sunday.

MR. TULK: Okay, no problem.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews).

Last night in Estimates Committee on his department, I asked the minister about the concern that has been expressed about the German Air Force, the Luftwaffe, going into Goose Bay and the effect of low flying on the caribou herds. I would like to ask the minister would his department consider carrying out an environmental assessment on the possible effect of low flying aircraft on the herd? I understand the German Air Force will be increasing their presence in Goose Bay this year and they will be taking in

MR. WARREN: a bigger radius. I would like to ask the minister would his department consider taking upon doing a environmental assessment review on the potential that these low flying aircraft would have on the wildlife in Labrador?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, we discussed this last night in my estimates and my reply was and still is that we have reviewed the proposal put forward to us by National Defence through the West German Air Force and discussed it with all agencies that would be concerned, and particularly the Wildlife Branch of the provincial government, and see no reason to do anything more. We have made some minor changes in the proposed area that the Germans wanted to use. This is satisfactory to the Wildlife people and it is quite satisfactory to us. But seeing the concern of the member, I will certainly review the situation again at this point in time.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in this same respect I would like to ask a new question to the Minister for Forests Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). I presume it is the minister who is responsible. I understand that the Canadian Air Force on behalf of the German Air Force is applying for extra land in Labrador to carry out their low flying activities. I beg to differ if I am asking the question to the wrong minister, but could I ask the minister if he has received any requests from the Canadian Air Force for a permit to extend German activity in Labrador?



MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forests,  
Resources and Lands.

MR.POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware  
of any such application but I certainly will undertake  
on behalf of the member to find out and bring the answer  
back tomorrow.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
direct a question or two towards the Minister of Justice  
(Mr.Ottenheimer). I would like to start out by asking  
the minister what has happened to our once happy Province?  
Mr. Speaker, today in Newfoundland people are almost  
afraid to walk the streets, Service stations and convenience  
stores are being robbed right, left and centre. Armed  
robbery. There are all kinds of crime, Mr. Speaker, You  
can hardly pick up your newspaper or turn on a news  
cast but you hear a report of some violent crime taking  
place in this Province. What is happening, Mr. Speaker?  
Has the minister with his policy spread the Newfoundland  
Constabulary now too thin? They have taken in the  
metropolitan areas around St. John's. Are they spread  
too thin? Are they able to carry our the surveillance that is  
necessary?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the rate of crime has skyrocketed in this Province. Here we were once happy Province, you did not even have to lock your door. Or, Mr. Speaker, is it the direct result of the mismanagement of the economy by the administration there opposite that is causing crime and violence in this Province?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, essentially I think, although there is obviously a specific question there in general terms, there are also two sort of sub-questions, and that is is it the government's policy which has resulted in these crimes, or is the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary encouraging them or being complacent about them or something like that?

Certainly all hon. members regret any violent crime; indeed regret every form of crime but especially violent crime upon or against the person. And also, of course, crimes with respect to property. What is happening in Newfoundland, of course, is evident. Newfoundland follows in terms of behaviour - it is part of North America, it is obviously part of Canada, - as overall North American environment. And in many ways the good things which develop from, if you wish to call it in general, North American culture, I guess, we benefit from. But the unfortunate things, the pejorative things, the negative - that is the right word - the negative aspects of North American culture we inherit as well.

As the hon. member knows, in the words of John Donne, "No man is an island" and that is true of Newfoundland in terms of the influences operative here. Although geographically the Island part of the Province is an island, certainly in terms of influence that is the case. And certainly all hon. members in the government, all hon. members on both sides and the Department of Justice are very concerned when there is

MR. OTTENHEIMER: an increase in crime and when there is violent crime and when there is also crimes of armed robbery, break and entry, that kind of thing. But all one can do is do everything possible, number one, to prevent crime. And that is something which, of course, all of society has a certain role in not only the Department of Justice, but families, educational institutions, the whole social structure obviously has to participate in that because the question of overall values, I think everybody recognizes that. And the police, the two forces in the Province, the RCMP and the RNC to the best of their ability prevent it then to the best of their ability

MR. OTTENHEIMER: detect and arrest and charge people who are guilty of it. But it is unfortunate that indeed as part of North American society we inherit the good things, but we cannot inherit the good, it would appear, without inheriting the negative as well.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know the hon. gentleman there a few moments ago said that somewhere in between I indicated that the Newfoundland Constabulary were encouraging this. Look, I hardly have to reply to it. But I must say that I am flabbergasted at the minister's reply, his reply that Newfoundland is really only catching up now to the rest of North America. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and flabbergasted at that kind of a statement from the minister. I would have expected him to be more aggressive in this matter because people are alarmed at the high rate of violent crimes in this Province. Let me ask the minister what extraordinary measures that he intends to take to try to curb violent crime in this Province?. For instance, Mr. Speaker, the other day we discovered that the Chief of Police has been off sick for some time. Is he now back in his position? Who is in command now, Mr. Speaker? Could the hon. gentleman give us a few details? Is the morale of the Newfoundland Constabulary now as good as it has always been? Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty serious matter. As I said earlier, one time you could leave your door open in Newfoundland, but today you are almost afraid to walk the street after dark, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is reaching in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. SPFAKER (Russell): has made a fairly lengthy preamble to what was recognized as a supplementary question.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, Chief Roche is still on sick leave, Deputy Chief Randell is in charge during that period; that certainly has nothing to do with any crimes which have happened in the interim. I mean, certainly there is no causal connection or circumstantial connection or any kind of connection whatsoever in that area. With respect to the morale

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

of the force, to the best of my knowledge the morale is very high. I attended an induction ceremony, I guess about ten days ago, where thirty-three I believe is the exact number, people were sworn in and the morale of the Constabulary is very good indeed. I certainly did not state that Newfoundland is catching up with the rest of North America, therefore hurrah, hurrah, three cheers, now we are catching up, we have got more crime. What I did state is an obvious fact, not something to be wished, not something to be desired but something to be seen, something which is evident; even if we do not like it we cannot deny it. And that is that Newfoundland, as an integral part of North America society, obviously the factors which are operative in North America, the influences which are operative in the rest of Canada in particular, in North America in general, obviously are operative here. It is not as if we were not part of North America in terms of our values, in terms of what comes in television, in terms of what we read, in terms of what we hear, in terms of attitudes of people, attitudes toward authority; in all of these things obviously we are very much a part of North America and are recipients of the North American influence. And those things which are positive and beneficial are operative in Newfoundland; it is unfortunate that those things which are negative are also operative here.

Certainly the two police forces, the RCMP and the RNC, I have a high level of confidence, as the government does, in both of those forces in their work of provincial policing in Newfoundland and Labrador,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and they are doing everything possible and operating, in my opinion, on a high level of professional competence, doing everything possible with respect to the prevention and detection of crime.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I would just like to take a minute to welcome a delegation from the Kilbride Citizens Committee to the galleries, with Mr. Frank Stanley, Mr. John Weiger, and Mr. Mark Walsh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I agree that the RCMP and the Newfoundland Constabulary are doing their job to the best of their ability with the wherewithal that has been provided by the hon. gentleman. But what I would have expected him to say today is that the minister, as a result of this rash of violent crime in the Province, was going to step up surveillance, step up patrols, that there was going to be something positive done by the minister to try to curb these violent crimes. Now the hon. gentleman mentioned that Deputy Chief Randell was now in charge of the Newfoundland Constabulary. What has happened to Deputy Chief Coady? I thought there was a Deputy Chief. What has happened to the Deputy Chief? Is he on sick leave also?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman also, because we do not have much time left in the Question Period, let me ask the hon. gentleman what about the Police Commission that we have been talking about in this House for several years past?

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not have one.

MR. NEARY: We do not have one, that is the trouble. Will the hon. gentleman now, Mr. Speaker, admit that it was a mistake to delay the implementation of a Police Commission in Newfoundland here in the city of St. John's, that that would be a great help in these trying time, Mr. Speaker? And I ask the hon. gentleman now to express his views on that. Does he now think that it is high time that we had a Police Commission? And would the hon. gentleman tell us what extraordinary measures are going to be taken on behalf of his department to restore Newfoundland to the once happy Province that it was? Or is the hon. gentleman just going lay back and throw up his arms and say, 'There is nothing we can do about it anyway'?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.



MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly the hon. gentleman should be aware that at the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary the structure has always been one Chief of Police, two Deputy Chiefs of Police. That has been there for several years. Chief of Police Roche, two Deputy Chiefs - Deputy Chief Randell and Deputy Chief Coady. Chief of Police Roche is now on sick leave. One of the Deputy Chiefs, Deputy Chief Randell, who is senior in that he has been a member of the force many more years than Deputy Chief Coady, is now in charge. Deputy Chief Coady is still Deputy Chief Coady and nothing has changed there.

With respect to a Police Commission, the fact that we have or we do not have a Police Commission has nothing to do with the rate of crime. If a person is going to sit down and figure out whether he is going to break and enter into the hon. Minister of Public Works' (Mr. Young) home, he is not going to say, 'Now, I wonder if there is a Police Commission?' If there is a Police Commission I will not do it, and if there is a Police Commission I will not do it'.

MR. TULK: He jokes about it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Whether there is a Police Commission or not has nothing to do with the crime rate. As I have explained before, in areas where there is a Police Commission, and I suppose the closest one is the most logical one to look at and that is in Nova Scotia, in Nova Scotia there are approximately thirteen police forces, there is Halifax, there is Dartmouth, there is Antigonish, there is Truro, there is Bridgewater, there are several others, there are New Glasgow, Sidney -

MR. WARREN: That is North and South.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - North and South I am told - so there are about twelve or thirteen police forces all with their own chief and all responsible to a municipality, because law enforcement in Nova Scotia is regarded as a provincial responsibility. So in order to get any semblance of uniformity in terms of training, in terms of professional standards, in any kind of conformity whatsoever, any kind of uniform practise, there has to be a Police Commission which oversees all of these twelve or thirteen forces. Now in Newfoundland we only have two forces doing provincial policing, the RCMP and the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. So the reason that you have the Police Commission, to co-ordinate and to try to give some uniformity to twelve or thirteen or fourteen different organizations all with their own chiefs, does not exist here. There is not need for it. And if we were to have one - we could still have one even if there is not a need - we could say, 'We will have one even though that is unnecessary'. But that is just another level of bureaucracy, another level of expenditure, another level of red tape, which we try to eliminate. There is one thing in all governments - and I suppose ours included - red tape is a nuisance and it is very frustrating for ministers and we all try to cut through it as quickly as we can. But we

MR. OTTENHEIMER: certainly do not want - if there is no need for a Police Commission - we certainly do not want to create one to have another unnecessary level of bureaucracy and expense and red tape.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that we are shocked on this side of the House to see how lightly hon. gentlemen there opposite treat this matter. The hon. the minister does not seem to be concerned at all. They think it is funny. We are asking the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) some very serious questions about the high rate of crime, the way that violent crime has escalated in this Province, and we have the seals and the sheep over there pounding on their desks when the hon. gentleman says something funny. It is not funny, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman should address himself to the fact that people are concerned about this matter.

MR. NEARY:

And the hon. gentleman should tell the House - let me ask the hon. gentleman again, Mr. Speaker - if his department intends to take any extraordinary measures to deal with these matters, to step up patrols, to step up surveillance? Does the RCMP and the Newfoundland Constabulary have sufficient staff, are they following the proper procedures, or are they understaffed? These are the questions the hon. gentleman should address himself to, Mr. Speaker, never mind poking fun, because it is not funny at all. It is a pretty serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. minister have leave to answer the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Social Services' estimates I would like to report that the Committee has passed Head XII, Environment; Head XIII, Education; Head XIV, Social Services; Head XV, Health; Head XVIII, Culture, Recreation and Youth; Head XIX, Justice: all without amendment.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answer to a question posed by the gentleman representing Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), in which he enquires for a list of all reports and studies commissioned by my department since 1980.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Commission Of Offences Against The Laws Of The Province By Young Persons," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 11)

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976," carried. (No. 1)

On motion, Bill No. 1 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3, Concurrence Motion, I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate last night.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are now doing concurrence on a motion moved by the Chairman of the Government Services Committee, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), I think.

MR. NEARY:

We are discussing the estimates of the Department of Public Works, Transportation, Finance, Labour and Manpower and Municipal Affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions involving some of these departments that I would like to put to hon. gentlemen.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), Mr. Speaker, what he thinks of the recommendation from the Employers' Labour Council on the two-tier minimum wage. Now, we put the question to the minister in Committee but we did not get a very good answer from the hon. gentleman. I believe he should tell the House now whether the government has just disregarded the recommendation made by the Employers' Labour Council. Has it been just tossed into the garbage bin where it should go, Mr. Speaker? Because, as hon. members know, we have done away with the two-tier minimum wage system in this Province, and I do not think we should go back to it. I think it would be a very retrogressive step indeed. I would like to hear what the minister has to say about that.

I would like to direct a question also, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in connection with the Bell Island ferry service. Now, hon. members are aware that there are severe protests from the people of Bell Island because, in the next five years, rates across the Tickle will double and, Mr. Speaker, that will be devastating for the people who have to commute back and forth to work.

MR. TULK: The same way with Fogo Island.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and Fogo Island the same way. But Bell Island is getting the highest increase in

MR. NEARY: the whole Province.

MR. TULK: Why is that?

MR. NEARY: Why, I do not know.

MR. TULK: Because they had the lowest increase in something else?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, let me state a policy. Let me state a concept, a policy that I think should be adopted by this House, and that is that where you have islands and communities that are -

MR. TULK: Sit down and listen to this now.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should stay, he might learn something. I happen to think that the Bell Island ferry service and the Fogo Island ferry service should be an extension of the highway system.

MR. TULK: Right on, Sir!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there should be no charge.

MR. TULK: Right on!

MR. MORGAN: Where have you been the last twenty years.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: Where have you been when Otto Lang and all your colleagues in Ottawa were setting up the user-pay concept?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware, or in case early senility has set in and the hon. gentleman is losing his memory and he does not remember, Mr. Frank Moores, when he was campaigning in the provincial election in 1975, went to Bell Island and at St. Pat's Theatre, where he had a political rally, he told the people of Bell Island that if his administration

MR. NEARY: were elected -

MR. DINN: Was that not after you headed for LaPoile?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DINN: Is that the time you put your running shoes on and headed for LaPoile?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was a minister. The hon. gentleman was in that administration when Mr. Moores told the people of Bell Island that if his administration were re-elected that they would make the ferry service a continuation, an extension of the highway system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) supported that administration. And here we are nine years later and are they going to keep that promise? No. What they are going to do in a cruel and callous way, without going to the Public Utilities Board for approval, for a hearing, is they make a decision on the eighth floor down in the Cabinet Room to increase the rates.

MR. ANDREWS: Not a bad place to make a decision, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: No, the Public Utilities Board always made these decisions and now that right



MR. NEARY: has been taken over by the Cabinet. The people of Bell Island never had an opportunity to have any input to go and raise any objection or complaint. They had applications before which always had to be made to the Public Utilities Board. This is the first time in our entire history, I suppose, that an arbitrary decision has been made. And the people of Bell Island have no recourse, or Fogo Island have no recourse except now they are holding meetings of protest and demonstration. But the fact of the matter is that the rates will increase on the Bell Island Tickle for commuters and trucks, it will double in the next five years. That means, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to discourage people from getting jobs on the Mainland, commuting back and forth to work. It is going to increase the cost of living on Bell Island. And the minister did not even have the courtesy to go to Bell Island when he was invited to attend a meeting -

MR. DAWE: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: - with the committee.

MR. DAWE: I was not invited.

MR. NEARY: The minister was invited.

MR. DAWE: I was?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg your pardon he was invited. As a matter of fact, a brief was presented to the minister, and the minister told the Commuters' Committee and the Concerned Citizens' Group that they would be given the answers. Every point in their brief, they were told by the minister, would be answered. And they do not have the answers yet. And the minister has refused to meet with them and to give them the answers that they want.

MR. DAWE: I met with them several times.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so there is the difference in philosophy and ideology. We on this side of the House feel that all ferries should be an extension of the highway system.

MR. TULK: We have our policies on paper.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. TULK: We put our policies on paper.

MR. NEARY: We have our policy on paper.

Let me see it, No , you go ahead and read it.

Mr. Speaker, not only the intra-provincial ferries but we think the interprovincial ferry service should be a continuation of the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: Now hon. gentlemen can sneer and laugh at that now all they want, but that is the difference in Liberalism and Toryism. We think that is a great reform that should be introduced in this Province. And instead of increasing rates -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - if we are going to be equal, and we hear the Premier day in and day out talking about equality, you know, if Bell Islanders are ever going to be equal to the rest of Newfoundland, or Fogo Islanders or St. Brendan's or Gaultois or any of these places where you have a ferry service, if they are going to be equal to the rest of Newfoundland , not alone Canada, if they are going to be equal with the rest of Newfoundland and enjoy the same privileges as the rest of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, then these ferries have to become an extension of the highway system , Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: They have the same rights to travel, have they not?

MR. NEARY: They like to travel, the same right to go shopping, to go to school, to go to university, go to work, go to hospital to visit sick people. Sick people have a right to travel just the same as anybody has the right to travel over a highway.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is as plain as the nose on your face, but what does the administration there opposite do?

MR. TULK: Nothing. They up the rates.

MR. NEARY: They up the rates. I managed to keep the lid on when I was there. That is one thing I did. We did not have an increase in ferry rates on Bell Island, I would say, for fifteen years because I always advocated they should be abolished, wiped out.

MR. TULK: If the minister had given us any indications of what was going to happen there we would have kept the lid on again.

MR. NEARY: Yes, if they had not done it down on the eight floor of Confederation Building in the privacy of the Cabinet Room, if they had allowed a hearing at the Public Utilities Board, then hon. gentlemen would have gotten the message, Mr. Speaker, of how violent people are towards these increases in the ferry rates. It is a backward step. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) know that.

MR. TULK: We would have rescued him the same as we are going to rescue the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on the salmon question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have rescued a number of ministers over there now; the minister on the caribou herd, the Minister of Fisheries. We throw out policy suggestions, recommendations, ideas, we put them on the table of this House -

MR. TULK: The Marystown shipyard.

MR. NEARY: The Marystown shipyard, building ferries, that was our suggestion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Yes, it certainly was our suggestion. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should remember when I went on a Province-wide broadcast and telecast, the hon. member should remember one of the things I suggested in my Province-wide broadcast, in a rebuttal to the Premier, was that we should start building ferries at Marystown. And incidentally, while we are talking about building ferries, the John Guy, operating on the tickle, Mr. Speaker, is twenty-five years old and needs to be replaced.

MR. DAWE: Says who?

MR. NEARY: Says everybody except the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman. The CSI, the inspectors, everybody says it. They had to put a new engine in her last year. The ship should be replaced. The John Guy is twenty-five years old and should be replaced, Mr. Speaker. So they should get a ferry built for the Bell Island-Portugal Cove service. They should get a ferry built with icebreaking capability in the Marystown Shipyard. They will scoff at it.

MR. TULK: Yes, but they will probably use the idea next year.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has treated the people at Bell Island with utter contempt in this matter. He sneered at the people on Bell Island, the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Unless he can fly over, if it is a fine day he can go over in a helicopter or charter a plane, Mr. Speaker, he will not go over.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I will have another go at it shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this go because, although it has nothing to do with fisheries, it is dealing with the estimates in a number of other departments, but I just cannot let this go without rebuttal. Because the hon. gentleman stands in his place today and talks about transportation and the problems we are having in transportation on some of the ferry services, he has the gall to stand and say that the Liberal policy is that these ferry services like Foggo Island and Change Islands and Greenspond and Gaultois and other places around the Province should be part of the Trans-Canada Highway network. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was in the same

MR. MORGAN: Liberal Party when his colleague in Ottawa, a very arrogant man by the name of Otto Lang, was Minister of Transport for Canada. The people dealt with him in not the last general election but the one before that, they voted him out of office because of his arrogance. I was then the Minister of Transportation here in this Province and for four years I dealt with Otto Lang. Mr. Lang, on behalf of the Government of Canada, on behalf of the colleagues of those today in the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, forced to take over the ferry services in this Province. It was not a discussion, it was not a dialogue, it was not consultation, it was a matter of coercion by the federal government coming in and saying you must take over those ferry services. Where? The one to Bell Island, Fogo Island, Change Islands, Greenspond, Gaultois, Ramea. I think that is all of them. And, Mr. Speaker, on top of that, the gentleman says that any ferry services should be part of the Trans-Canada Highway. Well, where was he when Premier Moores and this minister here-at the time in Transportation - was

MR. MORGAN:

fighting day in and day out for four years to try to get his colleagues then in Ottawa to understand not to increase the ferry rates across the Gulf of St. Lawrence? What is the difference between Fogo Island and the Island of Newfoundland? We are indeed linked to a Trans-Canada Highway system across the country of Canada, why should we be penalized because we happen to be an Island? Why should we be penalized? We kept asking over and over and over the last number of years. Did we have support then, Mr. Speaker, from the same hon. gentleman who now sat down? Mr. Speaker, we had no support. We had absolutely no support from the then Liberal Party, the same gentlemen in the same party. Who was leader then? There has been so many in the Liberal Party over the years! Let me think back.

MR. HODDER:

He got money for it.

MR. MORGAN:

Who was leader, I wonder? Was

it Mr. Rowe? No.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Was it Mr. Roberts? Maybe. Was

it Mr. Stirling? No, it was not, he came later.

Mr. Jamieson? No. Mr. Roberts, I guess. There was so many leader over the last four or five years it is a job to keep track of them all over there. But, anyway, that same hon. gentleman was then in the House as a Liberal, as he is now, and the federal Liberal government said, 'We are going to increase the fares across the Gulf, we are going to downgrade your services,' because the CN Marine has been downgrading the service across the Gulf for the last number of years. We have a second-class service to the mainland and we are being penalized as Newfoundlanders. Now after all of these years they can stand in the House and suddenly say, 'We believe that all ferry services should be part of the Trans-Canada Highway system and the road network in the Province.' Well, if

MR. MORGAN: the same is going to apply to the Bell Island service and the other intraprovincial services, why is it they cannot push their policy and have it apply to the Gulf ferry services, where tourists today are deterred from coming here because of the high rates, because of the poor service and the level of service, because of the poor vessel maintenance and vessel arrangements and accommodations, etc., if we are going to have a constant policy? You see, Mr. Speaker, what I am pointing out is this, that the Opposition and the Liberal Party in this Province has had no influence, no influence whatsoever with their own colleagues in Ottawa. They have absolutely no influence, They do not listen to them like they listen to the sheep. My appropriate song, 'Voices in the Wind' is so appropriate to them. I recorded it twenty years ago but it is still appropriate today to the Liberal Opposition, 'Voices in the Wind' because the people in Ottawa keep saying that is all they are, the Newfoundland Liberal Party, 'Voices in the Wind', we do not listen to them. Who are the Liberal Party? Why should we listen to these people down in Newfoundland? They have absolutely no influence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Today, for example, what is it costing for the Bell Island ferry service? It is costing today the taxpayers of our country \$2 million on an annual basis, \$2 million to keep a ferry service back and forth to Bell Island, \$2 million on an annual basis. Each and every year it is costing \$2 million. Now what are we getting from Ottawa towards the subsidies of all the ferries in the Province? What are we getting? Are we getting \$15 million, \$16 million, \$20 million, \$30 million? No, Mr. Speaker. It is going to cost to operate Bell Island alone \$2 million. And what are we getting from Ottawa in total to help all the ferries around the Province? We are getting a total of \$2



MR. MORGAN: million towards all the ferry services - Fogo Island and Change Island and Greenspond and St. Brendan's and Ramea and Gaultois and all of these places. We are only getting \$2 million from Ottawa to help all the ferry services and it is costing \$2 million to operate the Bell Island ferry service alone.

MR. MORGAN: It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the party that has been opposite to us in stripe - and otherwise in Ottawa over the years - it is too bad that they did not listen to reason, did not listen to our policies, did not listen to our proposals put forward in 1975, in 1976, again in 1978, a detailed transportation position put forward on these ferry services fully pointing out that the people on these little island communities, including Bell Island, because of the unemployment in these areas, because of no industrialized base, because they have not got any major source to get revenue from in their economy, they are unable to afford to pay high rates and high fares. We kept saying to them, 'Why should you remove these ferry services? You have taken away the CN coastal boat services, well, do not take away the other service we have, the ferry services. Why are you forcing these ferry services on us?' So, at the time, I recall, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why - I do not know if the word 'hypocrisy' is parliamentary or not - but it is hypocrisy, it is total hypocrisy on the part of the Opposition today, The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I think may be looking for a seat this time on Bell Island, there is a new seat coming up, and he knows about the boundary changes. He is not going to be re-elected in LaPoile again, we know that and the hon. gentleman is aware of that, so maybe he will have a Come Home Year, he will come back to Bell Island, which he ran away from a few years ago because he could not get re-elected. Now he is going to stand up with this new policy position on ferry services, which is absolutely ridiculous, a position brand-new now because it is politically wise to do so. That is the whole issue. It is politically wise now to say that they believe, because the ferry services are part of the Newfoundland Government and we have to maintain the service to Bell Island, now they are saying to us, 'Now, Mr. Minister of Transportation

MR. MORGAN: (Mr. Dawe)' - my colleague, they are saying now - 'you must provide a policy which makes that ferry link to Bell Island and Fogo and these places part of the provincial highway network.' Well, why is it they take that position today and they took the very opposite position when the Trans-Canada Highway, the link between the Mainland and here, could not be linked as part of the Trans-Canada Highway network across our country? Which Premier Moores has been saying, Premier Peckford has been saying, 'It should be today. We should not have to pay any extra fees for crossing a Trans-Canada Highway network to go to Alberta or Ontario or Quebec or somewhere else in the great Canada we have.' And we are. We are forced to pay a rate for crossing the Gulf because we happen to be an island. Why should we be penalized because we happen to live on an island as part of the great Confederation we have? Why should we? So when we fought that policy and put forward that position, we had no support from the Opposition because there colleagues in Ottawa would not listen to them and they did not have the courage of their convictions to stand up and say to Ottawa, 'You are wrong in your policy position.' So they could not stand up and fight their own colleagues, stand on the courage of their own convictions. Now the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stands up and says, 'The Newfoundland Government has now got to pay for all costs, do not increase the fares, do not have any user-pay system, pay for it all out of your own money.' And all we are getting from Ottawa is a total of \$3 million. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the ferry services throughout the Island -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. MORGAN: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Does the hon. the minister  
have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: You will get another ten minutes  
afterwards. You will get your chance.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, this is not the end  
of the debate. The minister can stay and get back in for another  
ten minutes, if he wants to make some sense, if he wants.  
to say something that is sensible in this House. But what he  
has just put through

MR. TULK: his mouth is nothing. He used the word, and I let him use it because I want to use it back at him, the word "hypocrisy". What he has just said is the worst political guffaw that ever you heard in your life.

MR. NEARY: And it is not true.

MR. TULK: And it is not true. It is absolutely not true. What happened to the ferry services in this Province? How come they are not being run by the federal government today? The minister knows exactly why they are not being run.

MR. HODDER: He made a financial deal.

MR. TULK: Because he, when he was Minister of Transportation - I remember it quite well although I was not in this House, but I remember it quite well - he asked the federal minister to take over the ferry service in Newfoundland for a certain price.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order. Now, first of all, hon. gentlemen in this House are referred to by the district they represent, not by he or you or that, or something else, number one. Number two, I want to correct the hon. gentleman that I did not, and it is well known in this Province, that I was the minister who refused to sign this ferry service agreement with Ottawa. I refused to sign a sixty/forty deal on the Trans-Canada Highway, and moved from Transportation to a different portfolio in the Moores' Government. I refused to sign these agreements. They were wrong, they were forced on us, they were bad deals and I would not sign them, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order,  
the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I submit to Your Honour that  
that is not a point of order. What the hon. gentleman  
is doing is saying that the present Minister of Transportation  
(Mr. Dawe) is not as good as he was -

MR. MORGAN: No, he did not sign it either,

MR. TULK: Well, how come we got it?

MR. NEARY: - that the present Minister of  
Transportation did things that the hon. gentleman would not  
do on behalf of the administration. So, Mr. Speaker, I  
know the hon. gentleman is hurting, because when I get up  
I have a few things to say in rebuttal to what the hon.  
gentleman said. I would submit that instead of getting into  
this debate that he knows nothing about, the hon. gentleman  
should go out and try to straighten out the salmon fishery.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I in no way cast  
any reflections on my colleague. He is doing an excellent  
job. Is our colleague, the Minister of Transportation,  
doing an excellent job -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - an excellent job in his port  
folio? But the fact is back in 1977, 1977 was the year  
that the federal government forced on the administration  
in this Province, on the people of this Province, forced on  
us responsibility for all the ferry services. And at that

MR. MORGAN: time this minister refused to sign the bad deal put forward by Ottawa and we had no support from the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order, I rule that there is no point of order, merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister can stand and deny and try to weasle out. He has now put his foot into it again by saying that there was a bad deal. And he did go and ask to have the provincial ferry services transferred to the Province, that is on the record, but he is now standing and saying it was a bad deal. They are only getting \$3 million for it or something, for the deal. It is a bad deal. He refused to sign it. Well, who signed it?

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight!  
We are getting \$2 million.

MR. TULK: \$2 million? Well, it is a worse deal.

MR. NEARY: You were a member of the administration that adopted it.

MR. TULK: It is a worse deal. Who signed it? Who signed it over there? If it is a bad deal, who signed it? If it is a bad deal will the minister tell us who signed it?

MR. DINN: Silence in the Opposition!

MR. TULK: You will get your ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Well, tell us who signed it. Was it somebody on this side signed that agreement or was it that minister or that minister?

MR. TULK: The truth is that the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) today, who was then the provincial Minister of Transportation, has done as he has done so often, to make himself look good, to make himself look like he is grabbing something for Newfoundland or getting something for Newfoundland, put his foot into a place where he really did not have the ability to handle it; the same thing as he did yesterday with that salmon management plan. So he sold out the provincial ferry service -

MR. HODDER: For dollars.

MR. TULK: - for dollars, for dollars that really could not do the job. The present Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) knows the dollars were not there to do the job, and it cost this Province a considerable amount.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he comes to the point that the ferry services in this Province is a philosophy of that government over there, that it should be part of the Trans-Canada Highway, that it should be free, it should be the same as normal.

MR. MORGAN: User-pay policy, the Liberal Party policy.

MR. HODDER: I know it is user-pay up in Labrador, I am sure! One of the most highly subsidized runs in the world.

MR. NEARY: Your user-pay policy is to charter an airplane for the Minister of Transportation.

MR. TULK: He has just said that he believes that it is a policy of his government that ferry services should be free in this Province. He believes that. That is what he just said. It is a policy of the government, a policy of the Premier.



MR. HODDER: He does not know what he is talking about, what he is involved in.

MR. TULK: Well, you are the government. We are not the government. It is our policy, it has been for years, that you should not have to pay on a ferry to cross from Fogo Island, to cross from St. Brendan's, to cross from Long Island.

MR. MORGAN: How about across the Gulf?

MR. TULK: Not at all, I agree totally. It should be part -

MR. MORGAN: Why did you not agree with us four years ago, six years ago?

MR. HODDER: We did.

MR. TULK: I understand that my colleagues did. I was not here at the time, but I understand that they did.

MR. MORGAN: No, you did not.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, we did.

MR. TULK: Let us bring him back to his jurisdiction. The ferry services are your responsibility under your Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and I am thankful, as well, that that minister is not the same minister as before. But it is your responsibility, so if it is your policy, why do you not implement the policy? Why do you not next week - instead of charging the people of Fogo Island in five years double for truckage, double for getting a truck across to Fogo Island, in spite of the fact that you have a shorter run - why do you not now make it a measure that you will push, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will push, along with the Minister of Transportation and Cabinet that all ferry services in this Province will be free, if it is your policy? He said it was his policy, so why not push it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Minister of Fisheries, who was the Minister of

MR. TULK: Transportation, should stay out of Transportation. Because I presently have - I do not know whether I have it here or not, but I can get it for the minister and certainly can table it in this House - I have a telegram in my possession from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) which states quite clearly that before the Bonavista North Loop Road was paved, he was going to pave a branch road to Ladle Cove and Aspen Cove. I have that telegram. Well, I still have to drive over that unpaved road

MR. TULK:

so the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would be very wise to leave the Ministry of Transportation to the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe). He would be very wise to do that, because when he stands in this House and talks about promises made and promises kept, then he should realize that, being the type of minister he has been, that he is threading on very thin ice indeed. Now he is gone.

The Fogo Island ferry rates that are presently coming into effect, it will cost in five years - and the minister will not deny this - it will cost them in five years double the amount to take a truck, to take goods and services back and forth across that run than it is costing now. I think it goes from something like \$20 to \$40 for a truck. Now what does that mean for the people of Fogo Island? They are paying , as the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) would know, the highest rate for food, for clothing that you will find anywhere in this Province with the exception of Labrador, Labrador is the highest, Fogo Island is probably the second highest , The cost of living is higher on Fogo Island than it is anywhere else in Newfoundland with the exception of Labrador, absolutely! And it is because of their transportation system primarily, because you have to store goods and so on , And here we have a government and the Minister of Fisheries says - he announces policy on behalf of the government the time - he says it is their policy that they will free up the ferry services in Newfoundland and make them free to people. And yet out of the other side of their mouth, and you are talking out of both sides of your mouth, out of the other side of their mouth they are doubling the ferry rates again. Mr. Speaker, as usual this government says one thing and does another.

MR. TULK: Now I would like for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to reply because I would certainly put a great deal more credence in what he says about the policy of the government with regards to ferry services than I do the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has elapsed.  
The hon. Minister for Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, just a few words to reply and perhaps put this whole thing as it relates to the Province's acceptance or agreement.

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

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

MR. WARREN: A quorum call. Forty-four members and not enough to listen to him.

MR. DAWE: They are all inside listening to me.

MR. WARREN: No one wants to listen to you, boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I checked back through most of the records when I took over this particular portfolio. There were a number of questions outstanding. Perhaps the largest one, and the one with the largest policy implications as well as financial implications, was that addressing the intraprovincial ferry system in the Province. And we had a study done, as members on both sides of the House are aware.

MR. DAWE: But I want to go back to the comments made by my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the comments made by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) as it relates to what exactly happened with regard to the responsibility for the provision of that service transferring from the federal government to the provincial government.

Mr. Speaker, in this search that I did I found out very clearly, and it was very obvious in the correspondence and in conversation I had with people in the federal administration subsequently and with people in our own Transportation Department, that a decision was made about five years earlier that would have been in about 1972-73, five years before the Province took over the system that in fact the federal government were going to get out of providing an intraprovincial ferry system to the islands around this Province. They said, no question about it, in conversations at officials' level, in conversation at the political level, 'We are getting out of it. Now, Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, if the people on the islands are going to receive acceptable service, then you are going to have to provide it because we are getting out.' And subsequent Ministers of Transportation in this government thought that during the process of fighting that concept from the federal government, which was going to abdicate its responsibility as it relates to providing a coastal service specifically to the islands where there are communities still functioning—unlike what would have been the case, I suppose, if their provincial colleagues had been allowed to continue on and there would not have been anyone on the islands so we would not have had this problem; but we do have that problem, we do have

MR.DAWE: people still living in places around this Province where they wish to live, and some of those people live on islands - so we argued with that position, argued violently with that position of the federal government, that they were getting out of providing that intraprovincial ferry system. The argument got down, Mr. Speaker, and the dialogue got down to the fact that this Province was given an ultimatum as it relates to the provision of an intraprovincial ferry system. 'You either take our deal' which was to contribute to the subsidy for the provision of service to selected islands - 'you either agree to that for a five year period or there will be no service provided.' Mr. Speaker, this Province found itself in a position, because of the people on the islands, because a recognition that the people on the islands deserved a transportation link, the Province was forced into agreeing with the federal government to take over the intraprovincial ferry system. It had no choice. The people being served would not have had a service, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government, if the Department of Transport had gotten their way.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.DAWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we not only took over the existing intraprovincial ferry system with the operations that were in place, but we also increased that operation. We have increased the frequency of trips to islands where there was an existing operation and we have added new operations to that service. Now, Mr. Speaker, does the federal government contribute to the subsidies, to the new

MR. DAWE: operations, to the operation in Gaultois, to the expanded operation to Ramea, to the expanded operation on Bell Island, to the expanded and increased frequency on Fogo Island? Does it contribute to any of the massive expansions that this government has made to the intraprovincial ferry system? None, Mr. Speaker, none. It contributes on a formula that was based on the existing operations back in 1978. So we have added numerous service increases, new service and service increases to the intraprovincial ferry system without an added assistance in that subsidy from the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked at a number of improvements and a number of inequities in the ferry system. We have addressed them all. The standarization of a fare increase in some cases but a decrease in others, but a

MR. DAWE:

standardization of the fares charged on intraprovincial ferries in this Province took about a year and a half to two years to formulate, because we took into consideration all the needs and aspirations of the people on the islands. We have established, Mr. Speaker, administratively as it relates to the ferry systems a Director of Ferry Operations, a marine mechanical engineer who takes care of the refitting and various mechanical requirements of the ferries in our system. We have hired people; in the case of Fogo Island we have an individual who is responsible for the ferry operations. He is responsible for the day-to-day scheduling and the day-to-day operations of that service, a much improved communication network, a very much improved frequency of service in that particular area, and the change in the fares in no way reflect a user-pay concept. It in no way reflects that the people serviced by these ferries are in some way paying an exorbitant fee for deciding in their own minds that they wish to live on an island. We, Mr. Speaker, as a government, as a department are providing an excellent service and it will improve over time. In order to be fair, we phased in what is a fair fare increase. We have phased that in over a five year period. We have indicated to the people serviced by these vessels that we will be doing that over a five year period. There have been so many meetings on Bell Island between me as minister, the member representing the area, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle), officials from my department in dealing with the Commuters' Committee, in conversation with the town council, in conversation with various other interest groups, with individuals who have come to my office, with me visiting the Island, and, Mr. Speaker, I have some paternal connections with Bell Island, so I have a personal interest in seeing that the residents of Bell



MR. DAWE: Island have their needs satisfied historically, so, Mr. Speaker, we have done everything in our power. What kind of fare increases are we talking about? What kind of exorbitant increases are we talking about? Mr. Speaker, the St. Brendan's-Burnside ferry service, in the constituency of our newest member in the House of Assembly, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), well, the present adult fare one way is \$3.00, or it was prior to April 1. Mr. Speaker, what will that increase to? What exorbitant increase has the Province imposed as of April 1 on the people of St. Brendan's as it relates to their ferry service? Well, Mr. Speaker, they will go up from \$3.00 to \$3.10.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. DAWE: Ten cents, One tenth of a dollar, Ten cents.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DAWE: Oh, it is a shame, Mr. Speaker, but I will get back to it again.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me pick up on something that the hon. gentleman said. Just to show you how weak this administration are, the hon. gentleman is arguing that the federal government threatened to get out of the intraprovincial ferry service in this Province. The previous minister said that he resisted it and he told them to go jump in the lake. Now, Mr. Speaker, obviously the present minister caved in and allowed himself to be bluffed and bullied by the federal government by being told that they would withdraw these ferries if the hon. gentleman did not agree to let Ottawa buy its way out of the intraprovincial ferry service. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman surely does not expect us to buy that argument. Mr. Speaker, back in the

April 10, 1984

Tape No. 852

SD - 3

MR. NEARY: '50s, just to show you the  
difference in Liberal policy, Liberal philosophy and the  
present Tory philosophy, or

MR. NEARY: the philosophy of the Tory Party of this Province, back in the 1950s, when the hon. Mr. Pickersgill was Minister of Transport, the Liberal Administration in this Province not only got the federal government to take over the intra-provincial ferry service, but got the federal government to subsidize the ferry services in this Province, the one to Bell Island, the one to Fogo Island and various other ferry services, got -

MR. PATTERSON: That was Mr. Deifenbaker.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it was Mr. Pickersgill in the Government of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that all we managed to get Ottawa to do? No, Mr. Speaker, we got Ottawa to build a ferry for Bell Island in 1957.

MR. CARTER: This is not relevant.

MR. TOBIN: Where did he build them?

MR. NEARY: They built her, Mr. Speaker, in Canada. Marystown was not even there then.

MR. TOBIN: That was before Diefenbaker's time.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it was before Mr. Diefenbaker's time.

MR. TOBIN: Diefenbaker built the shipyard.

MR. NEARY: Built what shipyard?

MR. TOBIN: In Marystown.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman on a bad trip today or something?

MR. TOBIN: It is true.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal administration of the day got the federal government to build The John Guy, and turn it over to the Province for \$1. That is the difference in the Liberal approach and the Tory approach.

MR. NEARY: but the minister caved in, allowed himself to be stamped into accepting a deal that he now apologizes for. He said, "We had no choice, there would have been no ferry service." That is not true.

Mr. Speaker, how often did the Government of Canada threaten the Liberal administration? How often did they try to buy their way out of the ferry service in this Province? We would not allow them to do it. We stood firm. We had the courage to stand up to them, and we told them to go take a jump. And we would not allow them to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now that the Province has taken over the ferry service, they have bought out or are in the process of buying out the present operators in this Province. They have made a deal with the Newfoundland Transportation Company, without calling public tenders, contrary to the Public Tendering Act, and have extended their contract for five years without calling public tenders. They have increased the rates to the people of Bell Island that will double over a five year period without going to the Public Utilities Board to hold hearings and to allow the people to protest these increases. Mr. Speaker.

So that is what we are seeing now, Mr. Speaker, as far as Bell Island is concerned. And that administration used to be so critical! I remember they used to get up and harrangue and harass the previous Liberal administration about what are you going to do for Bell Island? They have been over there fourteen years and the only thing they have done for Bell Island is to increase

MR. NEARY: the ferry rates.

MR. CARTER: What happened to the contract that was on Smallwood's desk?

MR. NEARY: I remember once when I was running on Bell Island, Mr. Speaker - I won three elections after that, in case the hon. gentleman is interested - but I remember once I was running against a Tory over there who had run a sweepstake, and the sweepstake was supposed to be a motor car, the prize was a motor car, and the sweep was never drawn.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Did he have a lottery licence?

MR. NEARY: No, it was before the lottery licence. But the ticket was never drawn and that particular gentleman later ran for the Tory Party against me twice on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I remember he put a sign up in his window, 'Where is the contract?' And I went and produced the contract and I put it up in my headquarters window, and all the documentation in connection with it. Then I put a little sign underneath it, 'Now where is the prize, where is the car?' And he took the sign down the next day, Mr. Speaker. I could say the same thing to the hon. gentleman if he wants to get into that kind of a mug's game.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Bell Island are now going to have to suffer because of an arbitrary decision made on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, the commuters are going to have to pay double, five years from now they will be paying double what they are paying now, the cost of living will go up on Bell Island, and they are being completely ignored by the minister. The minister has refused to deal in good faith with the people of Bell Island. And we saw what happened the other day when the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) tried to defend and justify the actions of his colleagues. What did the people of Bell Island say to the member? They told the member that he was letting them down, that he should be fighting for them instead of agreeing with the minister, that he did not know what he was talking about, that he was a weakling, that he had jelly knees, that he would not stand up for their rights. Now they are over there, Mr. Speaker, night and day they are calling me and they are calling the Opposition to try to get some help to fight against the increase in the rates and to try to get the minister to deal with them. The minister has refused to deal with them in good faith.

MR. TOBIN: How come you are not still representing them?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know that rudeness cannot be tolerated in this House, especially if you are not

MR. NEARY: in your own seat. I would ask the protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this policy is going to be devastating to the people who live in communities that are serviced by ferries. Again I have to come back to what I said in my earlier remarks and it is this, that I believe the first mention in Newfoundland and Labrador that ferry services should be an extension of our highway system and the Gulf ferry should be an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway, the first mention of it was made by Liberals in this Province. I think I was the first one to mention it and it is a great reform that, please God one of these days, we will have the privilege and honour of implementing. Ferry services, Mr. Speaker, should not be a privilege but a right for people who live on these islands and in these remote communities.

Where were you when all those people got turned off Long Island in Placentia Bay and Merasheen and all of those?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where I was. I was in the same place the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was when he moved the whole population off an island in Newfoundland and sent the bill in to the Newfoundland Government. He bought a truck and a bulldozer and a couple of other pieces of equipment and moved the whole population

MR. NEARY:

without permission, without taking a vote, without anything else, move them off the island and sent the bill in to Mr. Smallwood. Now that is where I was.

MR. DAWE: Did you pay it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, unfortunately we paid it.  
We paid it.

MR. DAWE: Of course you paid it.  
It was part of your policy and you had to pay it.

MR. NEARY: How could you turn down the parish priest, Mr. Speaker? How could you turn him down? He had the powers of persuasion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let the parish pay it.

MR. NEARY: He had such a power over the politicians, who could you refuse him, how could you turn him down, Mr. Speaker? We helped the hon. gentleman in more ways than that too. Every election the hon. gentleman was helped considerably in one form or another. But we do not hold that against the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to divulge any Cabinet secrets. We used to sit around the table and say, 'Look, I want to read this letter, Just listen to this, This poor old parish priest-destitute.' And we would always come up with a few dollars.

MR. PATTERSON: Do not go too far now, he is not here to defend himself.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. He is not here to defend himself.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, in case the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) wants the answer, that is where I was I was in the same place as his colleague, now the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.  
The hon. Minister of Transportation.



MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to go over a couple of points that perhaps need clarification. The Minister of Communication, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), there are members on this side of the House and MHAs who have argued and effectively argued very well for their constituency, but I do not know of any other member who has been more successful or who has argued better in this particular case as it relates to the provision of an adequate ferry system for the people of Bell Island than the member representing that particular constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

And, Mr. Speaker, just to get it on record, perhaps it would be interesting to identify some of the improvements that have been made in that particular service since the member now representing the area was first elected.

In 1978-1979, and perhaps we should go back further than that, back in the early 1970s, mid-1970s, a boat was provided, The Katherine as a standby vessel in case anything happened to the vessel that was operating on the service, The John Guy. It was a standby vessel. It was paid for through an arrangement, a contractual arrangement between the federal government and the company operating the service. It was subsidized. It was paid for. The principal, the interest, the insurance, the caretaker aspects of it were all paid for through taxpayers dollars, but this vessel was stationed, I believe, at one of the docks in St. John's and it was used when The John Guy went on refit, it was used in case The John Guy had mechanical difficulties and the boat had to be used. She was a standby and that was it.

The Province in 1974, the Province, Mr. Speaker, not the federal government, but the Province worked

MR. DAWE: out an arrangement with the company that operated that particular vessel and the service to Bell Island to provide a second boat service, I think, that was somewhat in the neighbourhood of about \$80,000 back in 1974, and it continued to do so until 1978-1979, that amount for the second vessel, for The Katherine, the Province paid for completely with some \$91,000.

When my colleague, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle) was elected for that particular district, in 1978-1979 alone, that subsidy, not the increase in the number of trips of that vessel, the subsidy itself increased to \$160,000. Any increase in fare, Mr. Speaker? Not one.

MR. DAWE: In 1980 - 1981, that subsidy increased to \$239,000 with increased frequency. Was there any increase in fares, Mr. Speaker? None. In 1981 - 1982 it went up to \$372,000 subsidy for that second vessel. Again, no increase. In 1982 - 1983, \$333,000; in 1983 - 1984, \$353,000. Up to that point in time, Mr. Speaker, up to March 31, 1984, the subsidy increased from 1978 - 1979, from \$91,000 to \$353,000 without a fare increase. But that was not the really important thing. The really important thing was that the frequency, the use of a second vessel on that service, increased from some five weeks back in 1978 - 1979 to five months - five months, an extra four months, less a week - of increased service.

When I was talking to the people of Bell Island, talking to their member, talking to the delegations, the individuals, number one on their list was the increase, a two boat service, from what it was operating at to hopefully a twelve-month two boat service. That was the prime objective of commuter committees, of councils representing the area, of individuals in the area, the frequency of a two boat service for as long in the year as could be provided. They realized in conversation that there would have to be adjustments. I mean, people are not so naive as to think that there would not have to be adjustments somewhere down the road, some fare increases that would have to try to account for it.

So now, Mr. Speaker, that increased from not only five weeks, but as of April 1 a two boat system will be in place for some nine months of the year, an additional subsidy on a second vessel of some \$559,000. Mr. Speaker, \$559,000 will be the

MR. DAWE: subsidy for a second vessel; increase that vessel from that five month period last season to nine months this year. And, Mr. Speaker, what will be the generated revenue, the revenue that will come in from the increase in the fares? Will it be \$559,000 to take care of the extra subsidy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DAWE: Will it take care of the \$2 million overall subsidy that is paid for the use of that vessel? No, Mr. Speaker. It will amount to somewhere in the vicinity of \$80,000, Mr. Speaker, compared to the extra \$559,000 that it will cost to provide that two boat service for five months.

Mr. Speaker, the fare increases or the fare structure was designed to equalize the fares in all the systems in the Province and it has done just that and will do that over the five-year period. Some will go down, others have gone up, most of them very, very little.

But what is important, Mr. Speaker, in this debate, I think, is the fact that the Minister of Communications, the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), somehow it has been suggested by members of the Opposition that he has not been voicing the concerns of the residents, and I think the facts speak just the opposite of that. He has been one of the more successful MHAs in representing the wishes of his constituents and seeing that action has been taken on some of their concerns. And this is an example, a prime example, of what a good MHA can do when he puts his mind to it,

MR. DAWE: when he puts his mind to it, when he brings forward the arguments of his constituents and puts them into government policy. And this has been a prime example of that being done. Mr. Speaker, I think the kind of contribution and the kind of awareness that this government has made, through representation from that particular individual, is proof that we are concerned about the life style and the quality of the social needs of the people on Bell Island, the people on St. Brendan's and the people on Fogo Island and other islands serviced by our intraprovincial ferry system. And I am very proud of what has been accomplished, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the people on the islands, by and large - there is always a dissenting voice, no one likes to see an increase in taxes, no one likes to see an increase in park fees, in licence fees, in any other kind of fees that are charged from time to time, but they are a fact of life they are a reality that we have to face. What we are doing here, Mr. Speaker, is stabilizing the fares throughout the system, we are certainly not putting an undue burden on the people of Bell Island or anywhere else in this system. We have recognized the commuter aspect, the people get 50 per cent of the rate; we have recognized some concerns of the people on fixed income, like senior citizens, and senior citizens are getting 50 per cent of the regular charged rate. We are doing all of these things, Mr. Speaker, because this government has a sensitivity to the needs and the aspirations of people in all parts of Newfoundland, the islands not withstanding.

The suggestion

the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who was then Minister of Transportation, would not sign a particular agreement but that I subsequently did, just to set the record straight, I was not in the portfolio when the agreement was finally ratified. But I do

MR. DAWE: know that it would not have made any difference at the time who was in the portfolio because, Mr. Speaker, I have to say again, and all the information that we have available to us so indicates, that this Province had no choice. The people on the islands would have had no service had not the government agreed to go along with the blackmail tactics that were imposed by the federal government at the time.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has expired.  
The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words. First of all I want to note that I am wearing my flower today.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Flower power!

MR. CALLAN: On Friday past all ladies and gentlemen opposite wore theirs.

MR. STEWART: You are behind the times.

MR. CALLAN: Actually, this one that I have I got it from somebody on the other side, who it was I am not sure, I think it was the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who gave me this one. But anyway on Friday past, of course, it was the second anniversary of the '82 election results, April 6. Today is April 10 and it is the third anniversary of the wonderful victory that we - and I say we - shared in the district of Bellevue in the Bellevue by-election of April 10, 1981. I am very proud today, Mr. Speaker, to be wearing my flower power, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) refers to it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALLAN: - and as they did, of course, on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of topics came up here this afternoon and I wanted to have a few words on them. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has left his seat, but I am sure he is not so far away he cannot hear

MR. CALLAN: what I am saying. I would like to talk about the calcium chloride, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE: I hear you.

MR. CALLAN: He heard me. It came up at the estimates and the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) mentioned, or asked at the Estimates Committee, was it not possible to apply this calcium chloride. I think all hon. members know what it is, especially if you have a district, of course, where there are dirt roads. You know that calcium chloride is laid during the Summer months to keep down the dust, dust control used by the Department of Transportation during the Summer months. And the member for Twillingate wondered and asked the minister at the Estimates Committee whether or not it was possible to get calcium chloride spread in between communities. And the minister came back and said, 'No, the stuff is costly and all we can afford to do is through the settlements, where there are people, of course, who hang clothes on the line and who have their windows opened during the Summer and that sort of thing. So the idea was to keep the dust down in the communities. But

MR. CALLAN: the minister knows, I think, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows as well as I do that there are some areas which are exceptions for whatever reason. Now the minister, as I know, is listening, I just got off the phone not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, talking to a gentleman who travels the stretch of road between the town of Chance Cove in my district and the Bellevue Beach Park intersection. That area is unpaved. There is another way to get from Chance Cove to the Trans-Canada. There is another route. You can go the Gull Pond route which takes you to the Trans-Canada, but of course it takes you down the Trans-Canada, and it was paved for the benefit of people who lived in Chance Cove and who were working at the Come By Chance refinery. That is why that was paved and, of course, the other stretch was left unpaved.

Mr. Speaker, in a letter that I wrote recently to one of the minister's officials, I said, "I am prompted to write at this time regarding the calcium chloride that is used to treat dirt roads around the Province each Summer." And I referred to that section of dirt road, and I said, "Although the road leading from Chance Cove to the TCH at Gull Pond is paved, all travellers use the shorter route to Bellevue," and, of course, to the Fair Haven Road intersection. They use the shorter route when travelling for example to Whitbourne to go to the pharmacist or whatever, to the bank, or if they are on their way to St. John's, or any point East they use the shorter route.

I did not mention it in my letter, Mr. Speaker, but in addition to all of these travellers, there are millions of pounds of fish trucked over



MR. CALLAN: that stretch of road during the Summer from the fish plant, Smith's Seafoods in Chance Cove, and of course there are millions of pounds of fish trucked over that stretch of road.

Well, the answer came back from the minister's official, and the minister's official says, acknowledging my letter and so on, "This section of road from Bellevue Beach Park to the Town of Chance Cove is not a built up area, that is, an area where permanent residents live and of course is not eligible for the dust control programme." So says the minister's official.

Mr. Speaker, what I am asking now, I am asking the minister, Would the minister take a second look at this himself? Because I know and he knows that there are sections of dirt road, not only in Bellevue by elsewhere, where there are cabins, for example, not permanent residents but cabin owners, who have their sections of road done with calcium chloride. So I ask the minister to take a second look at that. I was going to write the minister a letter but now that the minister is within hearing distance I want him to take another look at that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to ask the minister a couple of questions regarding that section of road between Gander and Glenwood. In a recent newspaper article we were told that apparently \$1 million worth of pavement was laid last year, last Fall, and it is all gone to wack, or awry or whatever, and the minister tells us that it is going to have to be redone. And the minister accepts responsibility, by the way. He says in the newspaper article, or I assume that is what he is saying, that it is the department's fault. What happened out there is a fair question, Mr. Speaker. What happened?

MR. CALLAN: Did not the Department of Transportation have qualified inspectors there who were qualified to test the mixture of asphalt that was being laid there, to make sure that it had the proper ingredients so that it would not break up within a four or five month period? Now that is another question that I would like for the minister to address, Mr. Speaker, when he comes back into the Legislature.

But, Mr. Speaker, we also heard of resettlement. It was mentioned once or twice here this afternoon and, of course, who put

MR. CALLAN: and , of course, who put the people off the islands and so on. I do not know if hon. members have read today's Evening Telegram yet but there is a lovely letter to the Editor on page 6 and it is titled, 'A claim for foolish money.' And this man, who gives his address as Swift Current, of course is not from Swift Current at all. I mention the letter, Mr. Speaker, because he says in his letter, he is talking about the welfare programme, 'A claim for foolish money,' and he calls the Premier everything in the world. But anyway he says in paragraph 4, 'I hear that Wilson Callan, MHA, came out from wherever he was hiding these last few years or so to demand that the provincial government prevent the scrapping of the Come By Chance refinery by taking it over.' And, of course, he says, 'stupid that I am,' and he uses that phrase about a dozen times throughout, 'stupid that I am,' I cannot understand this and so on. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is not from Swift Current, even though that is where he picks up his mail. The man's name is Randy Lieb, and he lives out on Woody Island, the only inhabitant of Woody Island that was resettled many years ago, and the only man who wants to be on Woody Island, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Is he a Newfoundlander?

MR. CALLAN: Where is this gentleman from? This gentleman is from Germany and he is from Woody Island. He picks up his mail at Swift Current. But anybody in St. John's or anywhere else reading this article, of course, would think that here is a man who lives in Swift Current year-round and, you know, has good arguments and so on. But he has no

MR. CALLAN: good arguments against me, Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee you that, because all the gentleman has to do when he comes off Woody Island is ask anybody in Swift Current where I have been hiding for the last two years - or in Garden Cove or any of the area. I visited Woody Island once or twice, not to see this gentleman but to go out and spend the night in a cabin with a former resident of Woody Island who now lives very happily and contentedly in Swift Current. And, of course, there are hundreds of others who live in Arnold's Cove, and they are living just as happily and peacefully as my friends are from Swift Current, who did not move off the island because they were forced to but moved off the island - Goodbye Santa!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: -but moved off the island because they wanted to move.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the arguments that are used by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in his estimates and so on about the ferries and the high cost. What would the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) if he were in the Cabinet today, what would he be saying about providing public services to people on Merasheen and all of the other islands, Isle of Valen, Woody Island, Sound Island, and all of the other islands in Green Bay and, of course, in Bonavista Bay.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has elapsed. Does he have leave to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is granted.

MR. CALLAN:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Does the hon. member have

leave to continue?

MR. PATTERSON:

Just a couple of minutes,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A couple of minutes, by

leave.

MR. CALLAN:

I thank the hon. gentleman and lady opposite, Mr. Speaker. But I am wondering, as I was about to say, what would this government, which cannot afford to do a lot of things, this is the hue and cry that we get, we cannot afford to be doing these things, we cannot afford to pave this stretch of road, how would this government provide services to these islands, you know, especially under this present situation - what do we call it? depression or recession or whatever it is that we are suppose to be experiencing? And this gentleman from Woody Island, Randy Lieb, who is from Germany originally, is more to be pitied than blamed. And as I said, if he wants to write an article and use my name in it, then, of course, I say to him, and I say to anybody, that I have not been hiding these last two years or so. Anybody who lives in Swift Current or lives anywhere besides out in the wilderness all alone in a stone house, anybody who has access to schools and churches

MR. CALLAN: knows that I am visible in my visits to the schools in Swift Current and to the churches and the celebrations and all of the other things that I am called on to participate in as the member for the district of Bellevue. I think the members opposite for granting me those extra couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, nobody on the other side wants to speak this evening?

MR. NEARY: The life is gone out of them. We have got the wind knocked out of them.

MR. WARREN: And here we are trying to find out some reasons why the government are spending much money and why they are showing so much lack of concern! In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am shocked beyond belief that the hon. new member from Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), with one forty-fifth of the budget, has not gotten up and said anything yet. You know, we are anxiously waiting for the member to make his first speech. We are waiting for him to make his first speech. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) has not spoken yet. Why does he not speak and protect the government that he is a part of?

AN HON. MEMBER: How low can you get?

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker, not how low can you get. I am surprised that the hon. the member from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has not gotten up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREENING: Actions speak louder than words.

MR. WARREN: I agree with the hon. member that actions do speak louder than words, and I am sure that when he does speak in the House he will have quite a bit to say and

MR. WARREN: hopefully he will get one forty-fifth of the provincial budget for his district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some time ago in this hon. House I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), seeing we were discussing Finance, I asked the Minister of Finance if he would consider placing labels on rum, beer, whiskey, on the containers that contain alcoholic beverages, would he consider that? Now let us face it. On a cigarette package, the Department of National Health and Welfare has a label stating that cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health. It does not say it is hazardous, it may be hazardous. So I am requesting that the Minister of Finance will look at the same thing. Now even if the Minister of Finance said, 'Well, we will look into the matter. We will look and see if it is possible.' But the minister had the gall to say it would be a conflict of interest. I got a letter - it is too bad I do not have the letter in front of me now - I got a letter from a chap in Corner Brook who had written the minister about five times in the past two or three years, and who had written to his own member and still he cannot get past first base with the Minister of Finance and the reason why he cannot get past first base is the Minister of Finance is saying it is conflict of interest. Because if we put labels on liquor bottles and people pick up their bottle and the first thing they see, 'Drinking may be hazardous to your health', or, 'Do not have any more than seven shots of this, it may kill you', or something like that, maybe we will lose taxes. Now which is the greater, to lose taxes or to lose lives? Because one of the most serious problems

MR. WARREN:

in Newfoundland and Labrador today is the consumption of alcohol.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. YOUNG: Not true.

MR. WARREN: That is one of the most serious problems. I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works says it is not true, because if the Minister of Public Works would read some of the mail that goes across his desk, especially from the Chairman of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission -

MR. PATTERSON: He sees some of the victims across his table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: He sees them across his slab.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. the member for Placentia just said, the hon. the Minister of Public Works is more interested in what goes across his table than what goes in and out of the liquor store. Mr. Speaker, I think it is enough to be concerned about and if the minister would read the latest report from Ann Bell, who was appointed by this Province to chair the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, that he would see the statistics that are there and know that government has to do something.

I went into one of the liquor outlets a few days ago and I was surprised to find that beside the cash register and the young lady serving there, there is a little slot with some propaganda about offshore oil.



MR. WARREN: I do not know how much this is costing this government. In fact, maybe it could be good literature that is going out to the people, You know, fine and dandy! But if they could put out this propoganda saying that we own the offshore oil, surely there could also be some literature there telling the people that alcohol may be dangerous to your health.

MR. NEARY: Was Brian's picture up there too?

MR. WARREN: No, his picture was not there this time but the document was done in blue and white.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district which has, like many other districts throughout the Province, an alcohol problem. There is an alcohol problem, Mr. Speaker, in my district; there is a problem with alcohol in many other districts in the Province. And I believe that this government is obligated -

MR. NEARY: Right on, Sir!

MR. WARREN: - this government should be committed and this government must take the bull by the horns and try to do something, whether it has to be an educational process, or whether it is bringing back prohibition. Maybe in many of the communities in this Province the answer would be prohibition, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that if this government just sits back and does nothing, then we are going to see in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador the lives of more and more people being destroyed, their health being destroyed by the curse of alcohol.

Now, I would not mind, Mr. Speaker, if we had to go back to the old days when you had to bring your little book into the liquor store and get stamped and come back again next month for another bottle. If we got back to those days, it might be the answer.

MR. WARREN: It may be the answer. It may affect some of my colleagues, or some other of my many, many friends who have establishments throughout this Province, who may not be able to generate the revenue that they usually bring in. But I am sure that their establishments may be turned into other centres, such as detoxification centres of something like this. I am sure there is always going to be room for a person to go into another field of livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time has pretty well elapsed, but again I would beg this government on behalf of thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who need help, and there is only one way that they can get help is if this government would consider the serious affect that alcohol is having on the lives of individuals and families, the distress and the concern, Mr. Speaker, that it spreads throughout this Province. And I believe that the minister definitely should come in and say, 'Let us start at the beginning. If Canada Health and Welfare can put a label on the cigarette packages, let us make it mandatory that a similar label will be placed on liquor bottles and beer cans.' Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

The goat spoke.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

MR. NEARY:

The Mobile goat.

The goat spoke.

MR. TOBIN:

After listening to the hon. gentleman who just spoke here, I am sure that he spoke in a very sincere fashion as it relates to the problems that are associated with alcohol in this Province and I am sure within the world. However, I must say to the hon. member that

MR. TOBIN: this administration and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) have gone a long way in trying to resolve that situation. I would say this administration just a very few short months ago put in place the Drug and Alcohol Foundation, which has a very wide broad mandate of responsibilities, and they are doing a terrific job and they are to be commended for it. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that surely demonstrates the concerns that this government has to the problems which the hon. gentleman just spoke to.

Mr. Speaker, earlier on today there was a great deal of debate on the Department of Transportation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) referred to the present Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) as being some sort of a weakling, of a man who sold out. Well, I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the present Minister of Transportation is one of the best that this Province has ever known.

MR. STAGG: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, all I have to do is look at my district, I can look at my district since I became involved with the hon. minister, and I can tell you that the minister nor myself have anything to be ashamed of in terms of provincial dollars being spent in the district of Burin-Placentia West. The minister has always been available to travel to my district, as he has to all other districts in this Province, and to lend total support to councils, to concerned groups. It was just last Summer myself and the minister, Mr. Speaker, spent days on end travelling in Placentia Bay. Why were we in Placentia Bay last Summer, if he wants to talk about ferry systems? Why did we spend days down in Placentia Bay last year dealing with ferry systems? We spent time down there, Mr. Speaker, because of the contempt and the arrogance that the

MR. TOBIN: federal government displayed towards the people of Burin-Placentia West.

And, Mr. Speaker, do you know something else? That that action by the federal government to downgrade the ferry service, to give the people of Placentia Bay no adequate service, not the type of service they were used to, that type of display by the federal government was supported by the Liberal Party in this Province. I remember trying to present a petition in this House on behalf of these people and we were rudely interrupted on several occasions by the members opposite. And I can say, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud to have an association with the minister as I am sure all of my colleagues are. And I hope that he has a long stay in Transportation because places such as my district are beginning to get a chance to prosper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can look at the various departments that comes under the heading of Government Services and I can say Municipal Affairs is another example where water and sewer, Mr. Speaker, in my district, in the last two years since I had some input into the dollars that were allocated; that the

MR. TOBIN: district of Burin - Placentia West has recieved hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for water and sewer improvements. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can look at the district of Burin - Placentia West, which has been neglected for so long by the people who represented it not caring one little bit about the people of that area, and I can say, as I have said in this House the other day, that I look forward with a great deal of enthusiasm to within four years, Mr. Speaker, having spent more money in the district of Burin - Placentia West than was spent in the last ten years by all three former members. Why is that going to happen? That is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, because of people such as the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), such as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and others who care about rural Newfoundland. And all it means, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the ability to work with these people to get the opportunity to put our case to these people and the end result is that work has been done in our district.

Since I became elected, Mr. Speaker, we have put water systems in Lewin's Cove. In Burin, Mr. Speaker, we have spent in excess of \$250,000 last year, The year before that, I say there was well in excess of \$500,000 spent there. Marystown, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we are well over \$1 million in water and sewer service. Rushoon, Mr. Speaker, we were there and upgraded the water system. We have had several meetings in Rushoon and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, on Friday coming the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will be in Rushoon for meetings along with my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) where we will be addressing the needs of the people. We will be travelling, Mr. Speaker, extensively in the district of Burin - Placentia West as well as the district of Fortune - Hermitage to speak with the people and to address the needs and hopefully get some response.

MR. TOBIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, this year there was money again put into Red Harbour to upgrade their system. If you look at the Department of Municipal Affairs, their municipal roads programme, Mr. Speaker, again hundreds of thousands of dollars has been pumped into the district of Burin - Placentia West. We can look at all the services. If you look at fire trucks, I believe last year, Mr. Speaker, we had two fire trucks in the district-and then the hon. gentleman afterwards would say that this government is not committed to rural Newfoundland. This government, Mr. Speaker, this administration has such a commitment to rural Newfoundland that the hon. gentlemen opposite should hang their heads in shame because they have never done anything for their districts. Where was the first hospital opened, Mr. Speaker? is that not a reflection on the commitment that this government has to rural Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: What a member.

MR. TOBIN: 'What a member!' Yes, Mr. Speaker, he ought to say, 'What a member', when he stood in this House and voted against the dollars that were being spent in Port aux Basques to create a new hospital. Yes, what a member he is, Mr. Speaker. He voted against the dollars to be spent for the construction of a hospital in his own district. He did the same thing in my district last year when the hospital was to start in Burin - Placentia West. Then, when I told the people, when I made it public in the district that the Liberal Party voted against the dollars for the new hospital, the hon. member took to the airwaves and referred to the member of Burin - Placentia West as some fellow who did not know what he was doing in the House of Assembly. Well, I can tell the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that I respect my record and the dollars that have been spent in my district since I was elected with the dollars that he has been able to spend in his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TOBIN: And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we can look at transportation.

MR. CALLAN: Do you know you are condoning pork barrelling and that is political favoritism?

MR. TOBIN: Yes, condoning pork barrelling when you opened the new hospital in Port aux Basques in the district of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), who voted against the dollars. That is pork barrelling, yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed it is.

We refer to transportation again, Mr. Speaker. The Little Bay Road in Marytown, which has been promised for years- it was not fit to drive over, and everyone who was elected was going to do something about it - but,

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, we did something last year, we spent in excess of \$1 million on it. And I am closely watching the budget this year to see what is going to be allocated.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, to the road between Brookside and Boat Harbour that needed to be upgraded, and, again, for years that was promised? What happened to that, Mr. Speaker? Action was taken, Mr. Speaker, and the residents there are indeed very pleased with our commitment to the district and to rural Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I will get back to that later.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, and this should be a matter of record, but, of course anything that is said after, I suppose, five o'clock in the day is not reported anyway so we may as well pack her in and all go home at five o'clock. The cameras are gone.

MR. SIMMS: No, I just did an interview upstairs.

MR. NEARY: You just did an interview now. Well, you know, if you do not get in on the Question Period that is it. I mean, the game is over. Hon. gentlemen should realize that. The rest of the House does not matter. The great debates that take place in this House and the points that are raised are completely irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, to what goes on in this House. But it is interesting to note that it is not the Premier or the ministers who defend the



MR. NEARY: administration, it is the Yahoos, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: That word that the hon. member has been using for a period of time, that was ruled out of order in 1974.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not.

MR. STAGG: Indeed it was. It was ruled out of order in 1974.

MR. NEARY: How about 1968?

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, it is an extremely denigrating word. I suppose the hon. member does not even know what the word means, but it is extremely uncomplimentary to say the least, and it is unparliamentary and the hon. member should have to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman puts himself in the middle of the debate by getting up and saying that a ruling was made in 1974. How about 1968 or 1965? Why not one of these years, why 1974?

MR. STAGG: I know because I made it.

MR. NEARY: You made it. Yes. Because you made it it makes it right. The hon. gentleman made so many mistakes he got turfed out of the Chair as Deputy Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour is aware of that. And the hon. gentleman should also know that if he wants to raise a point

MR. NEARY: of order he should quote from the Standing Rules or from Beauchesne. He will get his opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker.

But the hon. clone from  
Stephenville -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. what?

MR. NEARY: Clone. - should just restrain himself, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order. The hon. member is correct that depending on the context that a word is used the Speaker has the option of ruling pretty well any words unparliamentary. But in this case I do not rule that particular word unparliamentary although I do not say that it does anything to add to the debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, but what I started to say is it is interesting to note that it is not the Premier. The Premier, I see, is allowed up for an hour today, Mr. Speaker. He comes in the House for Question Period, dashes off, then comes back for three or four minutes, in the afternoon for a few minutes just to see what is going on.

MR. DAWE: You do that every day.

MR. NEARY: He does it every day.

MR. DAWE: No, you do I said. It is only when you are yammering you come into the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I never, never, ever leave the ninth floor when the House is sitting. I do not recall when I have ever gone down to my office when the House was sitting.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot afford to leave because somebody else would have your seat in no time.

MR. NEARY: As the Premier tells us so often, your first duty is to the House. But it is nice to see that he is allowed up for a few minutes today. But it is interesting to note that it is not the Premier who defends the administration, or articulates policy on behalf of the administration, or not the ministers, Mr. Speaker, they usually pick the most rude. You have certain classifications of members there opposite. You have the silent and the mute, Mr.

MR. NEARY:

Speaker, and you have those who can be provoked occasionally to get up to have a few words. And then you have the prematurely senile, and you have the sleepy and the dopey, and you have the nasty, but today they are putting up the rude. The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is still smarting under the reputation that he has gained in his district as being probably the most rude member ever to speak in this House, and that is not a reputation to be proud of, Mr. Speaker.

Now let us get back to the matter under discussion. I think we have exhausted the Bell Island ferry service, but I want to say this to the hon. the minister: That if he thinks for one minute that the people of Bell Island are going to quit and give up, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. gentleman is going to be sadly mistaken. My fellow Bell Islanders, Mr. Speaker, will fight the hon. gentleman and the administration to the bitter end. It is going to be a long, hot Summer for the hon. gentleman, and he can continue to ignore the people, treat them with contempt, sneer and jeer at them, Mr. Speaker, but it will do no good. The problem is not going to go away. One thing I will say about my fellow Bell Islanders, they are persistent, they will not give up and they will fight these rate increases because they know, Mr. Speaker, that the rate increases are a matter of life and death for the people of Bell Island, and they know they are being discriminated against, that the heaviest increases apply to the Bell Island ferry service, the heaviest increases of all, the biggest increases and they are not going to tolerate it and they not going to put up with it and they are not going to let the minister and the administration or the member get away with it. They are going to fight. They

MR. NEARY: have started to fight and I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, if I know my fellow Bell Islanders, they are not going to let the minister get away with it that easy. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman got up and crowed and boasted about the two ferries. We had two ferries while the hon. gentleman was still in knee pants, Mr. Speaker. If I had not fought with Ottawa and gotten \$1 million subsidy for the Bell Island ferry service, the hon. gentleman would have nothing to work with. I managed to gouge and bully and pry well over \$1 million in subsidies for the Bell Island ferry service.

MR. SIMMS: You certainly gouged.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly did get it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can run away, shirk his responsibility, and the member can go in hiding all he wants, but I guarantee you the people of Bell Island are not going to give up the battle to roll back these increases and to make the ferry services in this Province an extension of the highway system. That is the difference between Liberalism and Toryism. That is our concept that will be a reform, please God, that we will have an opportunity to introduce one of these days in this Province.

Anyway that is enough said about that. I want to come back now, Mr. Speaker, to the transportation depot that the hon. gentleman is talking about building in Deer Lake. I want to find out if it is underway? Has it been started? He told us \$500,000 is to be expended this year. Have public tenders been called? When will public tenders be called, Mr. Speaker? I would like to get some answers regarding that project from the hon. gentleman.

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), who keeps interrupting, by the way, should go out and try to struggle and wrestle with that problem

MR. NEARY: of a \$10 million deficit this year at the Workers' Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, in 1981 the Workers' Compensation Board had a surplus of \$4 million, in 1982 they had a deficit of \$9 million, and in 1983-84, at the end of the fiscal year, it is forecast there is going to be a deficit of approximately \$10 million. Mr. Speaker, the reserves cannot stand that. The hon. gentleman they put in charge of finance

MR. NEARY: the other day is not going to resolve the problem. I can guarantee you. So instead of interrupting the debate in the House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CALLAN: What category would you put the hon. gentleman in?

MR. NEARY: What category would I put the hon. gentleman in? I would have to put him in the category of rudeness, docile and rude. That is the category the hon. gentleman would have to be put in. Because when they cannot get anybody else, Mr. Speaker, to defend the administration, Frank Moores used to always tell me jokingly out behind the curtain, he could always depend on the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). 'When I cannot get anybody else, when I cannot get the heavies, when I cannot get the big guns up to defend the record of my administration or my policies,' he said, 'I can always depend on the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). 'He volunteers in caucus,' so he told me, 'He says, 'I will get up, I will tell them, Do not worry, I will tell them, Leave it to me, boy, I will tell them.' Mr. Speaker, he should tell us what he is going to do about that deficit in the Workers' Compensation Board.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: So soon.

MR. DINN: The hon. member has elapsed.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: Go ahead.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Pleasantville for yielding. He was under attack, albeit not a very spirited attack and not a very effective

MR. STAGG: attack, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to address a few remarks initially about how the Leader of the Opposition introduced himself to the debate or interjected himself to the debate with his last interjection. He used the word, 'Yahoo,' spelled Y-a-h-o-o, and I would just like to tell the House what that word means because not everyone knows what the word is. It is a member of a race of brutes in Swift's Gulliver's Travels who have the form and all the vices of man, an uncouth or rowdy person. That is the definition of Yahoo, Mr. Speaker. That was ruled out of order in 1974 by myself when I was in the Chair at the time, Mr. Speaker. It added nothing to the debate at that time and it adds nothing to the debate now, but is part of the vernacular of the hon. member. To some extent the fact is that all of us have become somewhat immune to that type of thing. I guess it is, in a perverse sort of way, a tribute to the hon. member who has gradually whittled away the decorum of the House to bring it down to his own level. But occasionally, Mr. Speaker, we must attempt to bring it back to a reasonable level of debate. Swift, when he used that phrase in his writings was being allegorical, and it certainly was not a word that he would have considered to be parliamentary. It was used to be highly descriptive and to be a word that expressed contempt for other individuals. And that is the kind of word that the hon. member wishes to bring into the debate. So I just say that as a aside and I do not raise it as a



MR. STAGG: point of order, but more as some information for the House and as a further indication of the kind of debate that the hon. member likes to involve himself in and has persisted in for too many years. And we can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that he does attempt to slink back to Bell Island after his nine year hiatus, where they will give him his just deserts.

MR. CARTER: The McCarthy approach.

MR. STAGG: 'The McCarthy approach', the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said. But my real reason for getting involved in the debate today, Mr. Speaker, is to speak about transportation

MR. STAGG: generally in the Province, but specifically transportation as it relates to the regional air carrier and, more specifically, how it relates to the service of Eastern Provincial Airways to the Stephenville area, the Bay St. George area and, to some extent, to the West Coast in general.

We have in Stephenville one of the best airports in the world. It did not arrive there accidentally, it was put there after a great deal of scientific research by the American Air Force, the military in the Second World War. It first came there in 1941. It has been built into one of the great airports of the world and for many years it served the West Coast. Subsequently, there came to be another airport at Deer Lake and that has served the Northern part of Western Newfoundland quite adequately.

For years, Trans-Canada Airlines served Stephenville very well. They served with the North Star, the DC7, I think it is; they later served with the Viscount and the Vanguard and subsequently with the DC9, which is presently in operation, and occasionally in summertime with the Boeing 727. For years, we looked forward to getting Eastern Provincial Airways service into Stephenville, and in 1974 or thereabout, we did get it on a partial basis and they have been there ever since.

MR. CALLAN: Did you get that from Barry Stagg?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member might do well to listen to what I have to say as it pertains to the economy of a particular area of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: This speech that I am making is of vital concern to me and certainly to at least one of

MR. STAGG: his colleagues. If the hon. member wants to debase it by his own spurious and typical comments, led by his erstwhile leader, well, then, I suppose I cannot do much about it. But I would like to have silence on this, Mr. Speaker. Because, if I wanted to get up and make a political speech and discuss the hon. member's political family tree or whatever, I am quite capable of doing that too and to have at all the hon. members opposite. But this is a matter of particular concern and I want to get on the record what I think of Eastern Provincial Airways as it relates to the Stephenville area. Let me say that I am not very pleased at what is happening.

We were told last week that Mr. Steele, in his wisdom, is now going to put Boeing 748 service into Stephenville. Now, this is an area that for years has had the best aircraft that Canada had to offer serving the travelling public in that particular area, and now we are reverting to the DeHavilland 748 on an irregular basis and it is exceedingly difficult for us to accept. As a matter of fact, we do not accept it.

The Stephenville Transportation Commission, a group of individuals in our town who are most knowledgeable about transportation matters and are quite concerned about them - one of whom, by the way, is Barry Stagg, whom the hon. member mentioned, who recently made an intervention before the Canadian Transport Commission, who were holding hearings on deregulation, quite a learned intervention, I may say - they boycotted the meeting with Eastern Provincial Airways. Now, I was here in the House of Assembly. If I had been there, I may or may not have boycotted it. But it is certainly the type of public relations gesture that does very little for that airline to come into a town that has had the

MR. STAGG: best air service that could possibly be offered, the Boeing 737 and the DC9 and the DC8 which comes in and carries cargo, and the Boeing 727 in the Summertime, and to tell them that they are going to get Boeing 748 service for part of the week, not full seven-day service, and at inopportune times of the day. If a person from the Stephenville area wants to visit St. John's to do one day's work, it will take him three days to do it. It is exceedingly distressing, and this is where I come to my main point, Mr. Speaker.

MR, STAGG: The thing that I am quite concerned about is that it is quite obvious that Eastern Provincial Airways is being operated with one eye on the airline and the other eye on the stock market. All you hear Mr. Steele talk about is how much money Newfoundland Capital Corporation made in its various adventures - adventures, not ventures, but adventures-throughout the year, and he prides himself in that regard. And one of the main things he has done, of course, is this year to pull his entire operation out of Newfoundland, out of Gander and to bring it over to Halifax because of his duty to his shareholders.

Well, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it is possible in this country, Canada, for the private sector to be involved exclusively in the transportation business; that is to say, is it possible, is it advisable for a private sector airline, like Eastern Provincial Airways, operated exclusively for its shareholders, and, it would appear, at the whim of its president and owner who makes the decisions? It would seem to me that you have to be a good friend of Harry Steele in order to get good service, and, if you dare speak out about the lack of service or whatever, you stand a good chance of the great man coming down very hard on you. This is the type of individual that we have and it is the buccaneer approach to industry and business. It makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker. Well my position is clear, I do not know whether I will ever be able to put it into effect or not, but I believe that any airline that serves the public should have written into its mandate once it gets its licence, that that airline only deals with

MR. STAGG: transportation and it is not an arm of some other activity of that particular company, it is only involved in the transportation business, so that it does not exist at the whim of the owner or at the vagaries of the stock market. And that is what I am concerned about.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

MR. HODDER: One minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has leave.

MR. NEARY: Just finish your sentence, that is all.

The time is up, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman had a chance to finish his sentence and he did not do it. He just stood there dumbfounded, gazing off into space, Mr. Speaker. Could I be allowed to carry on, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I understood there was leave for me to conclude my remarks. The House Leader, as I recall, on the other side, indicated it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair did understand that the hon. member was given leave.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) stood up, but he did not say he was standing on a point of order or what he was standing on.

MR. CARTER: That is right.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
in some respects to support what the member for Stephenville  
(Mr. Stagg) has had to say.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's  
North on a point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, surely we should  
have it clarified for the record in this House that if leave  
is given it cannot then be capriciously withdrawn. It is either  
given or it is not given. And if it is given, it is given for  
a reasonable period of time. I heard with my own ears, and I  
am sure Your Honour did too, that leave had been given for  
sixty seconds. Now it does not seem like very much, but certainly  
it was withdrawn in far less time than that.

MR. BARRY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio  
to that point of order.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I just came out of  
a Committee of the House, which the hon. member chaired, where  
he had his members from the government side give leave and then  
withdraw leave and he recognized that once the withdrawal was  
done that was it.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, if leave is not granted -

MR. WARREN: Go right ahead.

MR. STAGG: - I will live to speak again. I  
am interested in hearing what the member for Port au Port  
(Mr. Hodder) has to say.

MR. BARRY: Finish your sentence.

MR. STAGG: The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry)  
has not been here today, but he wants to get on

MR. STAGG: the record. He is trying to create as much confusion as he possibly can so he might get an interview. That is all it is, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

There was some confusion as to whether or not leave was granted to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I understand the hon. member for Stephenville wishes to hear the hon. member for Port au Port.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this will be one of the rare times in the House of Assembly that the member for Stephenville wanted to hear the member for Port au Port. I think it was, Mr. Speaker, because I said in some respects I supported what the hon. member for Stephenville has had to say.

Mr. Speaker, with the Stephenville Airport, the catchword, I suppose, or the word that is usually used is a catchment area of the Southwest Coast / Burgeo, part of Corner Brook and basically the St. George's area. There is a large population of people who use that airport and use it regularly. This year's schedule that Eastern Provincial Airways have given to the town of Stephenville is nothing less than ridiculous. The type of aircraft, perhaps in the future, Mr. Speaker, we may have to have that type of aircraft throughout the Island. We hope not; we would all like to fly the jet rather than a turboprop or a smaller plane, and most of us have become used to the comfort of a larger plane throughout most of this Province.

MR. DAWE: You do not mind flying a turboprop, but you have got to have one built in this century.

MR. HODDER: To respond to the hon. Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) remarks, yes, there are good



MR. HODDER: turboprop aircraft, the Dash 8 or the Dash 9, which would be a welcomed relief. And I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, if a private company were to bring a Dash 8 into the Province just for in-Province transportation, whether they would not do very well and make a very good profit with that type of aircraft. Because I understand that is a very comfortable aircraft and a very fast aircraft. But, Mr. Speaker, we do have two airports on the West Coast and we do have a large population who are reasonably isolated from the rest of the Province. We do have industries and people who work in those industries who must commute between St. John's on a very regular basis. And I would agree with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that the type of transportation that we are now receiving, the type of schedules that we are now receiving is certainly not acceptable. But I would disagree with the member for Stephenville on a couple of things that I heard him say which I think might not be the right approach. If we are dealing with Eastern Provincial Airways, I do not think we are dealing with a pirate and I do not think we are dealing with someone, who, if you criticize him, will come back and give you the jack-boots because this particular town decided against him or made a release against him or disagreed with him. I think the best way to approach those things is to push issues, to make your case,

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is taking the Liberal approach.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, no. But when the hon. member stands in the House of Assembly and says that we are dealing with a freebooter, we are dealing with this or that, I do not think that is so, Mr. Speaker, and that is the sort of negative response which does not do the town or the people of the area any good.

MR. HODDER: I think, Mr. Speaker, that in negotiating with any company, or negotiating with any airline, that we have to put forth the most positive aspects of our town and I for one believe that there are many positive aspects. I also think, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: I imagine they (inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I did listen to the member. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, as well, that the Town of Stephenville should have been there with Mr. Steele.

MR. STAGG: The town was there.

MR. HODDER: The town was there, but not the Transportation Commission. I for one would like to find out the thinking behind this particular scheduling. You know, I disagree with the member. I am quite sure that if we looked at the scheduling, and why it is, it has no doubt to do with the company trying to get as many people on its planes so that the airline pays for itself.

We do know that a couple of years ago Eastern Provincial Airways was one of the few companies in Canada that made a profit. I for one have no problem with a company making a profit, but I do have a problem with the Stephenville schedule. I think that the approach that the member should take, and I think the approach that the people of Bay St. George and Western Newfoundland should take is to negotiate and not to boycott.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There are going to be more problems before long.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, I believe this Province should have a good transportation system, and I think that the lack of a good transportation system, particularly an air transportation system in this day and age is a detriment to the business of the area. And I think

MR. HODDER: that the more that Western Newfoundland is isolated from the rest of Newfoundland, the harder we will find it to become economically viable as an area of this Province. But I do believe that in our approach to this particular problem that we must see where the other person comes from and we must sit down and negotiate in a very, very serious manner.

I myself was not consulted or even knew about those particular meetings when they occurred. I certainly would have liked to have been to the meeting. As the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) indicated, he as well would have gone to the meeting had he known. I will in the near future be trying to find out what I can and will make whatever representation I can for a better air service not only in Stephenville but for the Province. I think that we need a statement now, or we need to find out what the intentions of Eastern Provincial Airways are for the Province for the future.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's approach to Eastern Provincial Airways, is much the same as the member for Stephenville's, to call the President of Eastern Provincial Airways a freebooter or a pirate, that sort of thing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not say that.

MR. HODDER: Well, the member for Stephenville just did.

MR. STAGG: I did not do that. I heard the hon. member say it, though.

MR. HODDER: The Premier has used the same tactics with Eastern Provincial Airways,

PREMIER PECKFORD: All I did was ask EPA for a study that they did. If the study proved that they had to move, then fine, so be it, but they absolutely refused. They have done another thing.

MR. HODDER: I have not addressed the move to Halifax, Mr. Speaker, but I am talking about transportation but the confrontational atmosphere.

You know, Mr. Speaker, day by day by day we find that in this Province more people

MR. HODDER:

are coming around to realize that confrontation of the nature that we have seen over the past four or five years is not working; it is not working on the offshore, it does not work when you are dealing with Eastern Provincial Airways, it will not work with the Town of Stephenville. If we have any bargaining tools or areas to bargain in, we are certainly not going to be able to do it through confrontation. I think when I stood up I said to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that I agree with what he said about the air service schedules in Western Newfoundland, but I took exception to what I detected from his speech to be almost a confrontational attitude. If I took the hon. member wrong, then I apologize to him. But I would say as well that, in the negotiations over Halifax, some rash statements were made by the government at that particular time, I do not think these, either, Mr. Speaker, are something that will gain us any points in the long run and I think we have to accept Eastern Provincial Airways, we have to look at their problems, we have to understand. I do not believe for one moment that the airline was pulled out of Newfoundland because a person said, 'I do not like you or I do not like the Province.'

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. the member's time has expired.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I may get an opportunity now to finish the remarks that I was making earlier, and I thank a couple of my colleagues who wished to speak but did not speak to give me the extra time on this subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member

MR. STAGG: for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has expressed a certain amount of dismay that I would be aggressive on this subject, and less than charitable and less than complimentary towards Mr. Steele. Lest there be any ambiguity in that, I am less than charitable towards Mr. Steele and I am not a great admirer of Mr. Steele any more. That is my position. There is no group of people who have been more conciliatory and helpful to Mr. Steele over the past number of years than the Transportation committee in the Stephenville area. I have travelled to Gander on a number of occasions myself to meet with Mr. Steele, to meet with his people and to discuss with them the transportation problems in Western Newfoundland. And there was even a time, only a couple of years ago, when Mr. Steele said he wanted to consolidate all of his service in Stephenville. Eastern Provincial Airways would only fly out of Stephenville. Now why, suddenly, two years later, when by all reports Stephenville is one of the economic bright lights of this Province, why suddenly are we being serviced by Eastern Provincial Airways' 1940s style DeHavilland 748? I asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) of what vintage that airplane is and, apparently, it is just a post-Second World War vintage aircraft. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of aircraft that Trans-Canada Airlines serviced Newfoundland with up until about 1960 or thereabouts. The North Star, was that the famous name we had for the DC 7? Anyway it was a famous aircraft in its day, and the DeHavilland is in the same category, it is an old aircraft. In our community we pride ourselves of air transportation as a vital lifeline to our economic well-being and also for the travelling public in our area. Suddenly we go, in the mentality of Eastern Provincial Airways, from an airport that should have all of the service for Western Newfoundland and then

MR. STAGG:

to a poor level of service. And they made some very extensive arguments before the Canadian Transport Commission in Deer Lake to give reasons why all of the operations should be centered in Stephenville. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we on the West Coast are still suffering, the by-products of the ill-will that developed between our two communities, the two catchment areas, Deer Lake and Stephenville, we are still suffering the ill-will that resulted because of Eastern Provincial Airways' intervention into that and saying they wanted to service the West Coast exclusively through Stephenville. I suppose it would be very difficult for Stephenville people to say that they did not want them, but many of us, myself included, indicated that we agreed with the two airport concept and we wanted Stephenville to get the air service that it deserved. Well, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that Stephenville deserves a heck of a lot better air service and the person who has the authority AT THE PRESENT TIME is Eastern Provincial Airways, and they are not proposing to give us the kind of service that we have been used to or that we deserve. And if that means being critical of Mr. Harry Steele, who, by the way, is a rather unique individual, then I am. I have never known in my days an individual who had in one week taken a major industry out of a province. Mr. Steele's taking Eastern Provincial Airways out of Gander is a crippling blow to that community and it is to the credit of the people of Gander that they are withstanding it as well as they are. Imagine taking 300 people, or however many people, out of Gander and going off to Halifax. And, as the Premier says, all we were asking for is the economic justification for it, and where are

MR. STAGG: the studies and so on which were never given. Basically, we were given fairly glib and flip and arrogant answers on behalf of Mr. Steele that he will do what he bloody well likes, 'because I am the owner and I have a duty to my shareholders and I have a duty to the private sector and I have a duty to every businessman in Canada to do what I can to maximize my profits, and if that means I have to pull out of a certain area, well and good!' Now, that is the man who, in February of this year, made that statement, and he came in here to the bastion of private enterprise, here in St. John's, made a speech before the Board of Trade in St. John's, and what did we see on television? We saw the businessmen of St. John's giving him a standing ovation! Now, I have never been so disgusted in all my life to see that, a person who had done that, who would give the government of the Province no reason for what he was doing, to come in and to get a standing ovation from the businessmen of this town. I say it is disgraceful! Their names will live in infamy. I would like to have a picture of every one of them standing up and to be able to remind them of what they were doing at that time, and what they were doing to us, the people in other parts of the Province. Because it was sheer arrogance and it made no sense.

MR. NEARY: What did you expect him to do, go bankrupt?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the whole point. It was not a question of bankruptcy. You just put your finger ringt on it. That is the point that has never been clarified or sustained. They did not mean that they were going to go bankrupt. That is the question those people will not answer.



MR. STAGG: That is the point. I could not have said it better myself, Mr. Speaker, You will notice that I remained quiet while that interjection was made. That is the point, Mr. Speaker. Are we to take the word of people who say, 'I am going to go bankrupt, therefore I have to follow a certain course of action.' 'Oh, I have to move out of Stephenville. I have to take

MR. STAGG: my 737s out of Stephenville.

I have to give you a 748, a forty passenger plane.

Four o'clock in the afternoon you leave Stephenville and you fly to St. John's and you cannot get back until two days later because you cannot do your business in the morning.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The 748 is the worst turboprop plane that there is for passenger flying in the world.

MR. STAGG: The worst airplane in the world?  
I would not doubt it. I have seen them lumbering along -

PREMIER PECKFORD: They are leasing them from Austin Airways in Ontario.

MR. STAGG: - the airports in Atlantic Canada. I mean, it is just disgusting. I suppose they are much the same as the DC 3. I mean, it is terrible.

Mr. Speaker, this is my opening salvo where I intend to let Harry Steele and his shareholders and the great private sector know that as far as I am concerned, if that is the way they are going to be involved in transportation in this Province, then the unfettered private sector has no business in transportation. Because transportation exists for the transportation of the public, it is not a pot of gold for the raising of money for the entrepreneurs who use that method of raising money to get involved in their many other enterprises - Newfoundland Capital Corporation, for instance, and their adventures.

MR. HODDER: Let us see what happens to CN.

MR. STAGG: What?

MR. HODDER: Let us see if you are going socialistic and see what happens to C.N.

MR. STAGG: I saw what happened to CN. Look, I look at Air Canada. I see Air Canada as the criteria and the model that we should be concerned with for air transportation. I see nothing wrong with Air Canada. Air Canada moved into Newfoundland with Confederation, and they moved into the West Coast of Newfoundland and they have been good corporate citizens, they have given us good service, they are presently flying fish out of Western Newfoundland, they are entrepreneurial. And what is Mr. Steele and his people? They are not entrepreneurial, they do not seem to have any vision for transportation whatsoever. And the fares, Mr. Speaker, the fares are absolutely ridiculous. It costs \$125 -

MR. HODDER: Is this the way you negotiate? Put up something!

MR. STAGG: The hon. member's obsequious way of negotiation, obsequiousness, that is what the hon. member is exhibiting there. That is what all hon. members opposite have exhibited throughout their so-called careers. It is absolutely disgusting, Mr. Speaker. The member said we should negotiate. What are we going to negotiate with a person who will not give you any information, who does not want anything to do with you?

MR. HODDER: Call him names.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Yes, I will get down to calling names, and get down to kicking and gouging, to whatever it takes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has expired.

In recognizing the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I must remind him that he only has about three or four minutes because the three hours for the Concurrence debate will have elapsed by that time.

MR. NEARY: The three hours will have elapsed?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply briefly to what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman did not mention anywhere in his remarks that this is a Newfoundland company, registered under the laws of this Province, and, therefore, the administration has it in their own hands to get all the information they want from a Newfoundland company - I went down in the registry office and got the share list - registered under the laws of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and the hon. Premier cannot hide behind the fact that they are licenced by the CTC. They are a provincial owned company and, as a provincially owned company, the hon. the Premier and the administration have every right to set up a Commission of Inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act to send for witnesses, to send for document and get all the information they want.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously they do not intend to do it. I regret very much that the time is running out on this particular item, Mr. Speaker, because I had so many other questions that I wanted to ask. We have not gotten any answers from the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), or from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who is double-dealing with the people of Bell Island and who will pay the price for that.

MR. STAGG: That is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? Who said it was unparliamentary?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for St. John's North, on a point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Transportation was not listening, we certainly were down in this corner. The Leader of the Opposition just referred to the Minister of Transportation's dealing with Bell Island as being double-dealing, and he should take it back and take it back humbly.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will reserve a ruling on that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is one minute left, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the motion?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the motion?  
The motion is that -

MR. NEARY: I moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen there opposite do not seem to realize how the House is run. Mr. Speaker, it is tradition, it is custom in the past that when we get near 6:00 o'clock a member on either side of the House will move the adjournment of the debate. Mr. Speaker, that is an acceptable custom in this House. It has always happened. It has been happening in the past twenty-two years since I have been here. According to tradition and according to custom, Mr. Speaker, I move the -

You are embarrassing the House.

MR. NEARY: No - I moved the adjournment of the debate. Your Honour put the question and then the Government Acting House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) seemed to be in a trance, he did not seem to understand what was going on, and then the Premier wanted to get up on his feet -

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. Leader is just delaying, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I am not delaying, I am making a point of order. And then the Premier wanted to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Hansard will show, Mr. Speaker, the Premier got up then and wanted to start debating. Now Hansard will show that, Mr. Speaker. I would submit that my motion was in order, that Your Honour had put the question, and that the Government House Leader should make the appropriate

MR. NEARY: motion that the House now rise until tomorrow at 3:00 o'clock.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, there was approximately a minute to go in the Concurrence Debate of three hours when the hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate. Now the movement of the adjournment of the debate is a motion, of course, which is voted on like any other. Almost always it is not voted on, but with one minute to go this side did not acquiesce in that, you know, we would start off on Thursday with one minute and then go into something else. It makes things rather raggedy. So I am inclined to think that probably the time is up now anyway, so the whole matter is academic, because no motion on the adjournment of the debate was in fact called.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, maybe the motion to adjourn the debate should be put to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that -

MR. NEARY: Hold on, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bell Island moved the adjournment of the debate, and the Chair can put the motion to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not the member for Bell Island, it is the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, but Your Honour said the member for Bell Island moved the adjournment of the debate.

April 10, 1984

Tape 874

PK - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
of the Opposition.

I am sorry, the hon. Leader

MR. NEARY:  
time, Mr. Speaker.

That was true at one point in

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
until the clock runs out.

You are just trying to delay



MR. NEARY: No, I am not trying to delay.

It is six o'clock and I would submit -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The motion is that the debate be adjourned. Those in favour, 'Aye'? Those against 'Nay'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for the concurrence debate has now elapsed and the motion must be put. The motion is that the report of the Government Services Committee now be concurred in. Those in favour 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against, 'Nay'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is carried.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Before putting the motion to adjourn the House, I would remind hon. members that the Resource Committee will meet at 7:30 this evening to continue its examination of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries, Head Vlll. And I am sure all hon. members are looking forward to the vigorous defence and explanation and the clarity and succinctness of the explanations of the Hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Tomorrow, of course, is Private Member's Day, but on Thursday the order of business will be the concurrence debate on the Social Services Committee.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1984, at 3:00 P.M.

INDEX

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

10 APRIL 1984

The following is a list of all reports and studies commissioned by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development since 1980.

This is in response to a question asked in the House by Mr. Warren (Torngat Mountains).

- 1) Consumer Attitudes Study on Chicken, Pork and Lamb - Omnifacts, 1980.
- 2) Jacketed Storage (Vegetables) - Peat Marwick, 1980.
- 3) Broiler Industry Study - Woods Gordon, 1981 - 82.
- 4) Peatland Utilization - M.U.N., 1981.
- 5) Sheep Odour Aversion - M.U.N. - 1981.
- 6) Agriculture Land Preservation - G. Runka, 1981.