

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1981

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder could I ask the House Leader (W. Marshall) if the Premier is going to be in his seat today?

MR. MARSHALL: (inaudible) He is in his district today.

MR. NEARY: He is in the district today?

MR. ROBERTS: Tell him it is not his district as he is going to find out on this day week.

MR. NEARY: When will he be back in his seat?

Could the hon. gentleman tell me?
AN HON. MEMBER: When he arrives.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: He will be back on Monday. Well, in that case, I will direct the question to the Minister of Health. Could the Minister of Health tell the House if the doctors in this Province had met any time in the last year with the Premier to report that they are dissatisfied with the fees that were negotiated the last time around and if they threatened the Premier that if they did not get substantial increases this year, that they would resort to double billing in this Province?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that. I do not know. I do not know if they met or not. I do not think that the doctors were dissatisfied with the increase or the arrangement that was made last year.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate if there are any discussions ongoing at the present time in connection with doctors fees and, if so, if the discussions involve a proposal by the doctors for double billing in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, last year there was a committee set up of the Newfoundland Medical Association, the Province and Medicare Commission to look into all aspects of billing, doctors salaries and doctors fees and tariffs and so on.

MR. NEARY: That is the one they gave the report-

MR. HOUSE: And it was decided at that time it was an internal report, that there would be - no, we would not be extra billing at that time. And there has been nothing since that, Mr. Speaker, there has been no committee active since that. The doctors are meeting with the Newfoundland Medicare Commission. That is a yearly thing. They have meetings regarding their tariffs and so on.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate when he expects the current round of negotiations or discussions with the doctors for a new set of fees, when he expects to be in a position to make an announcement on the outcome of these discussions?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the arrangement - usually the arrangement is made from year to year and usually whatever is done is retroactive to April 1st.

MR. W. HOUSE: I have no idea what time any settlement or any - they are not. of course, a union group so there are no formal negotiations. So, therefore, I cannot say what time I can expect it, but it is sometime, hopefully, within the next couple of months.

MR. S. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Will the minister indicate to the House that in the event that the doctors cannot reach the schedule of fees that they feel they may be entitled to and threaten to follow the trend across Canada of double billing, will the minister step in and introduce legislation to block double billing in this Province, as has been suggested by the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mdme. Begin)?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question and I am not going to answer that one. The fact is that doctors are not permitted by legislation to double bill in Newfoundland now.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). Could the minister advise the House how the school system in Churchill Falls is presently administered? Is it publicly or privately?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the school at Churchill Falls is owned and operated by the company, by CFLCo. It generally has to comply with the curriculum guidelines and other regulations prescribed by the department, but it is a private school owned and operated by CFLCo.

MR. G. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). Is she aware of any proposed changes taking place where this private school system will be going into the hands of the Integrated or the Roman Catholic School Board?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the possibility of having the school at Churchill Falls transferred from CFLCo to one of the school boards in Labrador, under either the Integrated or Roman Catholic Education Committee has been explored in a very preliminary way. Before Christmas, in late 1980, there were a couple of meetings about this in Churchill Falls attended by the member for the district, my colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). As I understand it, the position taken by CFLCo is that it will not proceed with any divestiture of the school without first having a clear indication of the approval of the parents and residents of Churchill Falls, and that the position expressed by the parents and

MS. VERGE:

residents is that they are happy with the present arrangement, that they do not want any transfer to any school board, and to the best of my knowledge, there is no present intention to change the arrangement which people are generally satisfied with.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, am I left to believe that there is no intention of changing the system? And with that in mind I would like to ask the minister, is she receiving any representation from the parents saying that they do not want this school system to change?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have only had one direct approach from residents of Churchill Falls. It was an invitation from the Parent/Teacher Association to attend one of their meetings before Christmas to which I just referred. The telegram, I think, arrived only a day or two before the meeting so I was unable to get there. But subsequently, a meeting between the parents and CFLCo representatives was attended by the member for the district, my colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) and I received a report on the meeting from him. Since then I have not heard from anyone in Churchill Falls and I can only assume that people are content with the continuation of the CFLCo school.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: As education does fall under the minister's jurisdiction, before any firm decision will be made, before CFLCo will pull out of the school system, will the minister and/or her officials be visiting Churchill Falls and

MR. WARREN: meeting with the parents of those students before any decisions are made?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the officials of my department regularly visit the Churchill Falls school in any case, to monitor the programmes and the quality of education at the school. The parties to any transfer from CFLCo to the DECs and the DEC School Board would be those agencies, CFLCo, the DEC, the school board and most important the parents and students for whom the school is operated. And if all of those parties unanimously requested a change, then, of course, the department would be pleased to go along with it. But to specifically answer your question, there are regular visits by the officials of the department to that school in any case and if a need arose for a visit from the minister, then I would be very happy to go to Churchill Falls.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much , Mr. Speaker. I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I happened to catch the Minister of Justice last night on television when he was talking about cabbages and junk and the Regency Tower situation.

MR. ROBERTS: He was somewhat tangled up in his own verbiage last night.

MR. THOMS: He indicated at that time that there would be an amendment coming in to the Landlord and Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act in this Province sometime in May. Could the minister indicate why it will take so long to prepare an amendment which should be a relatively simple amendment to the act?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, what will be brought in will be a number of amendments to the Residential Tendancies Act not only with respect to prohibiting massive evictions, group evictions, from apartment complexes but other matters as well. We feel it will be early May by the time the legislation is appropriately drafted.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, because it is a group eviction and somewhat of an unjust and unfair one at that, and it is a matter of urgency, I believe that the minister should bring the amendment before this House immediately. And I can ensure him that he would get full support from this side of the House to get that particular amendment through. My question now, my supplementary, is whether or not your

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 915

AH-2

MR. THOMS: contemplated amendment to the act will cure the problem that we have right now? In other words, will it be retroactive so that it will invalidate the present eviction notices that have been given?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, obviously "you know, retroactivity can have a number of meanings in this context but I will say this, that -

MR. ROBERTS: But we are only concerned with one -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - the legislation when passed will make illegal the execution of any notices even already given. Obviously it will not be retroactive in - and I do not think this has happened before, but if such a group eviction had taken place six months ago, if it had-I do not think it has -it obviously would not invalidate that but it would deal with the present situation, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: So the people who had been given the boot will not be put out?

MR. THOMS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: I am not quite sure if the minister answered my original question which was is he prepared to bring in the amendment dealing, right now, only with the problem that exists in connection with Regency Towers? The other amendments we can deal with down the road, but would he bring in the amendment immediately to put the minds of these people at ease? You know there are some older people involved here and young people so that it is an important amendment, just that one particular amendment.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think the

MR. OTTENHEIMER: minds of the people can be quite at ease. There are a number of amendments which we will be bringing in in early May - it could be earlier, but certainly no later than early May. The hon. gentleman has indicated his and his colleagues' support thereof and, obviously, without being able to read people's minds, I would have anticipated their support. And I think people's minds can be perfectly at rest. When the legislation is passed and signed, it will render a nullity any existing notices which have not taken effect with respect to group evictions.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. As the minister knows, the teachers are presently in the process of voting on a conciliation board offer. The popular perception in the Province is that we may indeed be looking at a strike by the teachers and I want to ask the minister this question specifically. In the event of a strike, in the event that students of this Province lose a week or two or five weeks of school as a result of a strike, will those students be required to go back to school during the Summer to make up for the time lost during the close down of the schools as a result of the strike?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, that is an hypothetical question. I would disagree that there is a popular perception that the teachers are going to go on strike and I certainly hope that that will not be necessary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that is not an hypothetical question. Some teachers in the schools right now are preparing their students in the event there is a strike and telling them - although they do not make the decision, they are telling them that they may have to come back to school after the normal school closing time. Now, I am asking the minister, what is the Department of Education's position, because she is the person who has to make that decision and not the teachers? What will the government's position be if the students do indeed for any reason lose four or five weeks school prior to the end of the school year? Will the Department of Education be prepared to say that those schools will be kept open during the Summer in order for them to make up the time?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, again I have to say that this is an hypothetical question. We are not expecting any interruption in classes for students.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Here we see government by crisis again, Mr. Speaker. Now, let me ask the minister, has the Minister of Education, knowing she has teachers now voting on a conciliation board report, and the popular perception, whether she wants to admit it or not, is that that report will be rejected and the next step is to strike, now has she considered the possibility? Has the minister considered the possibility? As Minister of Education, does she have any contingency plans in the event there is a strike? And I want to stay on that point specifically, has the minister in her role as Minister of Education considered what she will do in the event the school children of this Province lose any period of time in school as a result of the strike?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite obviously has an incorrect understanding of the procedure now being carried out by teachers. There is presently being conducted a vote -

MR. FLIGHT: We know what is happening.

MS. VERGE: - specifically on the conciliation board recommendation.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) a strike vote.

MS. VERGE: A strike would not automatically result no matter what the result of that vote.

MR. FLIGHT: I know that, I just said (inaudible).

MS. VERGE: There would have to be a second and separate vote specifically on the issue of strike. And again I have to disagree that there is a popular perception that the teachers are going on strike and say that I trust that that will not be necessary.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the minister has a better perception of labour relations than the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). We know, Mr. Speaker, this House knows what the process is, we know they are voting to accept or reject the conciliation board offer, we know then there will be a strike vote taken unless the minister can do something to avert that strike vote. We know that and everyone in Newfoundland knows it. And then we know that in the event there is a strike, the students of this Province will lose X number of days of school. And I am asking the minister a simple question, has she given any thought to what she will do about that? Will she force the children back to school during the Summer or not? Will she allow the exams or whatever to take place

MR. FLIGHT: when the strike is over irregardless of how much school they miss? Now that is not a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, We are going down the road towards -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - that situation and I want to ask the minister to answer that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I really have nothing new to add to what I have said previously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: It is a hypothetical question. We as a government do not negotiate in public and we do not cross our bridges until we come to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile

MR. NEARY: A supplementary for the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker, a similar question to the one my colleague asked in connection with the nurses and the x-ray and lab technicians. Does the hon. gentleman have a contingency plan in the event that the hospitals are shut down? What will the hon. gentleman do if they must have something in mind if the x-ray and lab technicians pull the plug and the nurses pull the plug? Does the hon. gentleman have any plans to cope with that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are negotiations going on now with the nurses. I believe they are waiting a conciliation board, or a conciliation board has been offered in that particular case. There are negotiations getting under

MR. HOUSE: way in other branches and we do not have immediate plans, we do not anticipate, we are not going to anticipate strike action immediately. We had situations arise years ago, a year or two ago, I think, and, of course, we were given ample time to get everything put in place and the same thing will apply in the event of a strike now. But I cannot anticipate that because negotiations are still in progress.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), Mr. Speaker, could be asked the same question. What happens if the warders at the penitentiary go on strike, does the hon. gentleman have a contingency plan? Will he be calling in the army or the navy or the air force or putting the Newfoundland Constabulary in there like they did at the Waterford a couple of years ago? What will happen at the penitentiary if the

MR. NEARY: warders go on strike? There is every indication, by the way, that there may be a number of major strikes this year with the government's attitude of not negotiating in good faith and so forth. The government must have some plan in mind, because they are on a disaster course and they are going to bring on these strikes. So what will happen if these strikes occur?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the warders of the penitentiary, my understanding is the negotiations have gone very well. There is absolutely no indication of a strike whatsoever. There is absolutely no indication of a strike. The negotiation has run without any great difficulties or great points of difference between either side. I do not anticipate any problem in that regard whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman should take over all the negotiations in the Province, take them out of the hands of the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins). If things are going so well with the warders, would the hon. gentleman indicate what wage offer has been made to the warders at the penitentiary who are making negotiations go so good? Is the government offering a wage package over and above what the other groups have received?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to inform hon. members that I certainly have not been involved in any negotiating with the warders, but obviously I am interested in and informed on the progress that is made. But my understanding is that the negotiations, with respect to the contract for warders have - negotiations have been quite smooth, that there are no major difficulties.

MR. NEARY: Have they been made an offer?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. The negotiations are in progress and my information is, going quite smoothly.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), Mr. Speaker, could tell us -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins), could tell us what wage offer has been made to the warders at the penitentiary?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate what the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) says: These negotiations are going on. They do not go on in public. That is not the essence of collective bargaining or the arrival of new contracts -

MR. NEARY: In other words, you will not tell us. You will not tell us, that is the answer.

DR. COLLINS: - with the units and I can only reiterate that these are going quite smoothly and we anticipate and hope for a very successful outcome.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is back to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) generally with respect to the present situation with the NTA. Will the minister confirm or - is the minister aware that the teachers are indeed in the classroom today advising their students, the students of this

MR. FLIGHT: Province, the grade VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XIs, that they may indeed have to come back to school this Summer to make up for lost time as a result of a strike? I want the minister to know, she probably does, that that causes some undue concern and some stress amongst the student body. What is she doing about that? Is she aware it is happening and what is she doing about it?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would be most surprised if that is happening because a strike on the part of teachers is not imminent. There are a number of steps in the procedure which would be conditions precedent to such a development. And I do not think there is a widespread expectation of any disruption among the students in the classrooms.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable. Here is the minister responsible for education, responsible for the well-being of the students in this Province, and she says she would be surprised if this happened. Well, who is supposed to know if the minister is not supposed to know what is happening in our schools? So I am asking the minister now will she undertake to determine whether or not the teachers are, indeed, for whatever reason, telling the students that they may have to come back to school in the Summer. And this is as a result of a strike that all Newfoundland is expecting because of the inactivity of the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there are over 7,800 teachers in our Province teaching about 148,000 students in 666 schools and I really do not know what is happening in every classroom in every school in the Province. I do not think that is my job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a new topic for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). In connection with the extension of municipal boundaries around the greater St. John's area, would the minister indicate to the House if all the residents who live in areas outside the city of St. John's, like Airport Heights, Shea Heights and in the other areas that would be included within the municipality of the city of St. John's if the plan goes ahead, will these people be given an opportunity to vote, to have a democratic vote, a secret ballot before the boundaries are extended, to let the people decide whether or not they want to become a part of the city of St. John's?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, it is not our plan to do that as yet. We will be guided by the recommendations from the commissioner holding the inquiry. I cannot say exactly what our plans will be, it will depend on the report from the commissioner and his recommendations; then there will be a decision by Cabinet.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely startling. Where you have an area like Airport Heights where the people are strongly objecting to becoming a part of the city of St. John's, they prefer to have their own municipality or continue under the Metro Board, the minister is now piling the responsibility of deciding whether or not a secret ballot should be held to give these people a chance to determine for themselves what they would prefer, the minister is now telling us, I presume, in weasel words, that the government is leaving it up to the commission that is investigating this matter, and

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 919

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: the government will not take the
bull by the horns and make a decision itself on whether the
people should decide in a democratic way whether or not they
want to become a part of the city of St. John's.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman started a series of questions, the hon. minister has answered. The hon. member is now asking a question and commenting upon the answers given by his interpretation of the answer of the hon. minister. He is not asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council (W. Marshall) did anticipate maybe because I was about to ask the hon. member is he has asked this question. I am not quite sure if he has. Any further questions?

The hon. the member for Windsor- Buchans.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister going to respond?

AN HON. MEMBER: She did not answer.

MR. FLIGHT: That must be the response.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, somebody had better stand. There are only two minutes remaining.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask one more question of the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: I want to ask another question of the Minister of Education, with your consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister got up, Mr. Speaker, and told us how many teachers we have in the Province and how many students in the Province. She forgot to tell us -and it is she who is dealing with them all - she forgot to tell us the number of the

MR. FLIGHT: people who prop her up, Mr. Speaker, who are supposed to advise her on educational policy and keep her informed as to what is happening in our schools. And I want to ask the minister now, Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact, she has been advised this morning that is a fact, there is a lot of concern in our classrooms about the kind of thing we have been talking about, stress and concern by the students that may have to come back to school in the Summer and that is because the teachers are telling them that might happen. Will the minister give us an undertaking that she will check that out and find out if indeed it is happening and deal with it and if it is happening how does she intend to deal with that kind of thing?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
That is a question that has already been asked -

MR. FLIGHT: No, it has not, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure it has.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule that that is a question that has already been asked and the member cannot ask the same question a second time.

Any further questions?

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the new Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe), now that he is installed in office, would he tell the House if the bridge, now, that was washed out in his own district -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - down in Codroy, that was promised to be replaced before the last Provincial general election, if that bridge will now be built by the Provincial Government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the fact that I am now the Minister responsible for Transportation will not lessen nor, I would suggest, increase the effort that I have been putting into having that particular structure replaced over the Grand Codroy River. The project and the studies and the engineering results are in place and based on what the Budget will bring about over this year or in years down the road, that bridge will definitely be replaced and the people of Codroy Valley will have their bridge in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is really not a supplementary. It is really a new question to the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Well, a final new question.
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I want to talk - I do not know if the minister has familiarized himself with the problem here on the parkway. There is no evidence yet that there is any work being done to put in the overpasses or to make the improvements that were recommended by the students there.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman tell us if he has had time to take a look at the parkway? When can we expect work to begin to make the parkway that goes straight down through the university campus a little safer for the students and the pedestrians who travel over that parkway?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had time to deal with that particular matter in any significant detail. As a matter of fact, I have not had time to discuss it at all up to this point but I will certainly do so in the very near future and report back to the House, if necessary, on the progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Presenting reports by standing and special committees.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 28 of the Financial Administration Act I table warrants related to the Departments of Finance, Health, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: - if the minister could tell us whether there are any other special warrants? The House has now been in session for over a month. Are there any other special warrants - they can only be issued, of course, before the House meets, as I understand it - are there any

MR. ROBERTS: other special warrants that have not been tabled that were issued before the House met?

MR. NEARY: He does not know. He made a fool of himself on television last night and now he does not know.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, there was a question on the Order Paper yesterday from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I do not have it in front of me but in general it was whether any representations during the past three years had been made to the federal government with respect to change in the laws regarding marijuana? That was essentially the question.

From the period of July 1979, of which I have personal knowledge since I have been minister, and previous to that there is nothing in writing to that effect but that does not mean representations were not made. It could have been verbal at federal/provincial meetings. From the period of July 1979 there has only been actually one—and these things usually take place once a year, but because of various factors there has only been one meeting of federal/provincial Justice Ministers and at that particular meeting—and actually that was under the Clark administrations, Senator Jack Flynn was the federal Attorney General—the matter was discussed in the perspective or in the context of review of the Criminal Code and alterations, amendments to the Criminal Code.

AN HON. MEMBER: Criminal (inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes. There was general discussion and then, as I recall, what was due to happen then was that this matter was to be studied and some specific proposals

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 921

AH-3

MR. OTTENHEIMER: put forward for a future meeting of federal/provincial Justice Ministers which did not take place. There was a change of administration in Ottawa. There is a meeting scheduled for sometime

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

in June of the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) and provincial counterparts when I would think this matter will be discussed.

MR. NEARY: What is this Province going with, decriminalizing marijuana?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Put it this way, and obviously one makes a distinction between the decriminalization and the legalization. What the hon. gentleman is suggesting, obviously, is the possibility of its being decriminalized but still of its being illegal.

MR. NEARY: That is right, yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And I am not attempting to avoid the answer here. I think what one needs to know, and what so far we have not had a satisfactory reply to, is if it is to be decriminalized but still illegal, what and how is distribution looked after? That is the problem. If it is illegal, then the distribution remains illegal and then it would appear that the distribution is in the hands of criminal elements. The only other alternative, I suppose, is things like liquor stores or legal outlets and I do not think, you know, that that would be in keeping with the wishes of the vast majority of the people of Canada. So certainly, I would not be for its legalization and I would need a lot of convincing with respect to its decriminalization.

MR. NEARY: You do not agree with the Criminal Code?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But I think there have been a lot of improvements in the administration of justice, say, in the past year or so in this respect whereby a lot of people for possession, first offence or that get unconditional discharges. In the sentencing I think there have been some progressive developments, but I think the whole question of distribution has to be looked at before any final opinion can be made with respect to its legal status.

MR. NEARY: The question of simple possess giving a young person a criminal record, the minister do not agree with that, does he?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No. But I would need a lot of convincing before I would agree with too great a liberali of the law. Now, the question of sentencing and that is a matter and a lot of area of common sense comes in there, but with respect to the law itself, I think that I would need a lot of convincing before I would support a liberalization in the law itself. Obviously, there has to be a great deal of discretion, I think, in the courts.

MR. NEARY: A pretty good answer.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers to questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from twelve residents in the district of Torngat Mountains who support the College of Trades and the Workers' Compensation employees who are on strike. The prayer of the petition reads: "There are presently two groups of government workers on strike within the Public Service, namely, the Workers' Compensation Board and the College of Trades and Technology for far too long with no apparent attempt to settle this costly dispute. The

MR. WARREN: current dispute between the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and workers at the College of Trades and Technology, and Workers' Compensation Board, was unnecessary and never should have occurred; that the offer of eight per cent is inadequate to compensate for the rate of inflation; that something is wrong where government refuses to appoint a mediator to help settle the dispute at the College of Trades and Technology and for workers at the Workers' Compensation Board; that the government is not making a reasonable effort to bargain with the two groups in good faith." I believe, if we watched television last night and listened to the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins), it is a fact.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, recommend and request that government make a more determined and concentrated effort to settle this dispute by bargaining in good faith and more specifically by appointing a mediator to try and settle the dispute."

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, so do twelve other people in the district of Torngat Mountains which by far, is the most remote area of this Province. And those people living in that section are finding it themselves, very, very difficult to live from day to day when they, themselves, have to pay \$60 and \$70 for a drum of stove oil to heat their own homes. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a disgrace. It is a further disgrace to see the President of the Treasury Board last night on television making a fool of himself, making a complete shame of himself and a shame of this government which represents this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is bringing a petition to the House which, of course, is his prerogative to do.

MR. MARSHALL: There are rules with respect to presenting petitions; he must confine himself to remarks with respect to the prayer of the petition, it is not debated. He is getting in now to areas about the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) last night on television and other matters that are quite extraneous to the pith and substance of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour that is not a point of order. My hon. friend may have been drifting slightly away from the petition but whether or not the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made a fool of himself on television last night, Mr. Speaker, that is up to the minister. My hon. friend is merely stating a fact, merely stating a fact. I do not think my hon. friend is drifting into the realm of debate. He is merely stating the facts of the situation. The minister last night would not go on with Mr. Fraser March, the President of NAPE. He would not go eyeball to eyeball, face to face, too cowardly to do that, and I think my hon. friend is quite right when he makes a statement that the minister did make a fool of himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to the point of order, I believe the hon. member was drifting a little way from the petition and that sometimes leads one to drift into the area of debate. So I would caution him against that because while the Standing Orders are quite clear, there is also in this House - there appear to be some courtesies extended to members, if you want, that are not sanctioned by any particular rule. But if it begins to get too much out of order, then the Chair will definitely intervene and call the member to order.

I might remind the hon. member, as well, that

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

he has about thirty seconds remaining of his five minutes allotted time.

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you -

DR. J. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

My understanding, and I just do not have it with me right now, there are certain guidelines in our Standing Orders in the matter of Presenting Petitions, that they had to be presented in a certain order and so on and so forth, there had to be a certain number of signatures and so on. The hon. member in presenting his petition held in his hand a number of cards. My point of order is, to raise the question, is this petition based on those cards? Are the signatures on the cards or are the signatures actually on the petition? Because my understanding is that these cards are not in the form that would amount to a petition to this House of Assembly.

MR. S. NEARY:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. gentleman is doing what my hon. friend said, a few moments ago, he did on television last night. This petition is in order. Your Honour, will recall the other day, I think, there was seven or eight similar petitions presented and I am going to let Your Honour have a copy of this because it is signed. There are four original signatures on the petition, the cards are merely accompanying the petition, cards that were signed in the various districts around the Province. And I understand the minister has refused -

DR. J. COLLINS: How many names are on the petition?

MR. S. NEARY: All that is required is three, there are four on this and I am going to send it up to the Speaker so he can have a look at it. The petition is an original petition -

DR. J. COLLINS: How many names from that district were supposed to be on the petition?

MR. S. NEARY: It does not make any difference where they are from. They could be from LaPoile -

DR. J. COLLINS: So this is just four petitioners?

MR. S. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. J. COLLINS: This is a petition just from four individuals?

MR. S. NEARY: No, but the cards are accompanying the petition. That is stated on the petition. I understand my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has outrightly refused to table petitions that were petitioned on behalf of his own constituents, which is most unusual in this House. Whether the hon. gentleman agrees with them or not, he should have the decency to let them exercise their democratic right in presenting a petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

With respect to the point of order it is a matter that I have obviously anticipated because the issue has come up in the past on a number of occasions. And the question of whether or not the cards themselves can form a petition, obviously if you read them, they cannot. They are not proper petitions. But my understanding - and again the Chair is in a difficult position because the procedure for presenting petitions in this House does not allow the Speaker or the Chair to have a look at the petitions until after they are tabled. So the Chair really has no idea other than because of the number of occasions that members have been told the proper procedure for presenting petitions, that they are doing it properly.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): In this particular case, a part of the petition, the final paragraph says: 'That accompanying this petition are a number of signatures of residents', and I understand this is the same petition that has been presented in the House, 'residents who support this recommendation'. Now, we certainly have had situations in the past where petitions have been presented by hon. members who have attached various items. In fact, I recall one not too long ago from the hon. the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) where he attached a newspaper article, a photocopy of a newspaper article, and there were others frequently where they attached letters of recommendation or whatever from various town councils and so on. So the question of the petition, there is no doubt about the petition, it is certainly a legitimate petition and the attachment of the cards is, in my mind, no different than any other attachments that have been presented to petitions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: So I would have to rule that the cards can be certainly attached but as long as the petition itself is a legitimate petition with the appropriate and proper number of signatures.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: May I just make a point that I accept the hon. Speaker's ruling totally, of course. In other words, this is a petition from four individuals.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must advise the hon. member, I am very sorry but his time has expired.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. This is one in a number of petitions that are being presented to this hon. House. On Tuesday, I think it was, practically the whole afternoon session of the House was taken up in presenting petitions which accompanied large numbers of cards. Apart from the petition that was presented a few years ago in connection with the increase in hydro rates, electricity rates, in this Province, apart from that one which was the biggest petition ever presented in the history of this Province, this one now is probably the next largest petition, the largest number of signatures ever put on cards and on petitions in support of a cause in this Province. And it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, the way that the government chooses to side-step the issue.

We saw the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) last night and he could not even tell the people of this Province whether or not workers at the College of Trades would be entitled to social assistance payments in addition to their salaries. They would qualify for social assistance-even though the Minister of Social Services' (Mr. Hickey) officials had already told Mr. March that they would, the minister said that they would not or he did not know. And I think that is shameful, Mr. Speaker.

There is a move on foot now I believe, we have been hearing some talk about it in the last couple of days, to get the parties back to the bargaining table. Well, I hope that will be successful, Mr. Speaker, but I have grave doubts whether it will be or not with the attitude of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). The Minister of Labour and Manpower twisted

MR. NEARY: what the negotiating team of NAPE said. The minister interpreted their wanting to get back to the bargaining table as showing a weakness in their position. The minister told the House and told the people of Newfoundland on television that it looked like NAPE was backing down, when in actual fact that was not true, Mr. Speaker. NAPE has always been willing to get back to the bargaining table, and they are always willing, as I understood from Mr. March last night, to shift their ground. It is the government who have dug in, taken the hard line and have refused to bargain in good faith. And I would suspect if they keep up this policy, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have an awful lot of labour strife and trouble in this Province in the next few weeks and months. We are going to have a long, hot Summer of labour disputes in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this petition ask for? It asks for a mediator. And I got the impression from Mr. March last night that although he could not say for sure whether they would go 100 per cent for the recommendations of a mediator, he was pretty certain that they would go along with any recommendation that were made by a mediator. The government will not even consider it, they are just saying no, they are shutting the door, slamming the door in the faces of the strikers and in the face of NAPE and they are saying no, no mediator. And I think that is too bad, Mr. Speaker, because the government is on a disaster course and if they keep this up they are just inviting trouble.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rights of these four individuals to submit a petition to this House, and in doing so, I would possibly like to make a comment

DR. COLLINS: or two, perhaps in relation to the remarks that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made in supporting the same rights of these petitioners.

Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will recall that on a previous occasion the hon. the member for LaPoile supported a petition which called for mediation and in doing so he indicated to this hon. House that the union had a short hymn - he made the statement, therefore he has to be responsible for the meaning and the content of this statement - that the union had a short hymn that they would accept mediation as a binding force on them. This was stated by the hon. member equivocally and without any doubt. In other words, he was saying that in effect the union was asking for arbitration, because that is what binding mediation is, arbitration, and arbitration is binding on both sides.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly not the case, as was stated on television late last night by the President of NAPE. On two occasions during that interview with a

DR. COLLINS: TV interviewer he stated that the union would not consider the report of a mediator if such was appointed as binding on the union, that they would not necessarily go along with the report of the mediator. So I think that that has to be clarified and it is unfortunate if this hon. House was left with the wrong impression as to this matter of mediation. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that Treasury Board has not received any requests from the union for mediation in a form that in which we could understand what was being requested. Mediation is not something that is defined and laid down and, therefore, we cannot go to an act and say, yes, this is what mediation means. Mediation is not in that form. Mediation is something that has to be spelled out by both parties and as to the meaning of it, the form of it, what effect it will have and so on and so forth, and this has not been done in terms of relations between the NAPE and Treasury Board.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, after the hon. minister's joke, trying to get down to a serious matter here, a very serious matter. I would like to present a petition similar in terms, identical in terms, in fact, to, I suppose, ten or a dozen that have been presented by this side of the House in the past week or so. It is interesting to note that I believe not one petition has been presented by members in the government or in the back benches on the government side of the House which is, Sir, regardless of what their stand as a government in principle may be, would seem to be a derogation from the rights of their constituents to have petitions presented in this hon. House, one of the most basic rights of all constituents with respect to their people's House, the House of Assembly.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will not read the petition in full, it has been read many times before, I will, however, just for the record, read that portion which my hon. friend was not able to read because of the unnecessary interruptions on points of order from across the House and that is the pith and substance of the petition, namely, "that, therefore, we the undersigned recommend and request that government make a more determined and concentrated effort to settle this dispute by bargaining in good faith and more specifically appoint a mediator to try and settle the dispute," a point which has been adverted to by my hon. friend, the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) this morning.

"Accompanying this petition," my petition goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "are thirty-two signatures of residents of the district of Twillingate who support this recommendation." The petition itself has three signatures and my own, four signatures in all, supported by thirty-two signatures from the district of Twillingate.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that it is a grave indication of weakness when nit picking and hair-splitting has to go on with regard to whether these cards represent the petition or not, Mr. Speaker, I think it is blindingly obvious to everyone in the House that the people who signed these cards and the people who signed the face of the petition are all in support of one and the same thing, namely, a settling of this strike -

DR. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, has been raised by the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member in presenting the petition, indicated that there were a certain number of signatures on the petition,

DR. COLLINS: a fairly small number, and that there were a number of other documents indicating that the individuals who signed those documents supported the petition. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we could have the hon. member read out from these documents where it does state on them that the person signing is indicating support for the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): That is not really a point of order -

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is a breach of the rules of the House to interfere with or take away from a member's five minutes to present a petition by such specious points of order or not. Mr. Speaker, I mean, it is a terrible thing when in this hon. House a member's rights are taken away from him by specious points of order such as the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is about to present once more.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
A point of privilege has been raised by the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated that in presenting his petition he had documents stating that the persons signing the documents supported the petition. Now, if that is true, I will withdraw my point of privilege and apologize most abjectly. If it is not true, in other words, those documents signed by the individuals do not state that I, the person signing, support the petition to which this document is attached, I suggest that the privileges of the House may be interfered with. In other words, that the correct information is not being presented to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, I would have to say that the Speaker's role in determining whether or not there is a point of privilege is not to determine whether there is a breach of privileges but whether or not there is a prima facie case. I am not sure that in this particular matter

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): there is a prima facie case but I
can repeat-I am unfortunately gone past the allotted five minutes
that the member for Twillingate has but while I have the
floor I will continue - I can repeat a ruling that I made earlier
that the petitions, as I have seen them, are quite legitimate
and quite in order and I have allowed and ruled that it can be
permitted for these cards to be attached to the petition. That
was clear earlier so that matter, I believe, has already

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

been covered. There may be a difference of opinion -

MR. THOMS:

a man.

Take it like a man. Take it like

MR. SPEAKER:

already been made.

- but unfortunately the ruling has

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I realize my time is up. I merely want to ask the hon. House to receive this petition and have it referred to the department to which it relates, Mr. Speaker, and also just add the final observation that \$150 or \$160 a week for a person in this day and age to live on is a disgraceful amount of money for this House to be voting for the government to spend, Sir, and I would like to see any member of this hon. House live on \$8,000 or \$9,000 a year. It is disgraceful in this day and age and the hon. minister should do something about it, without trying to give the impression of strength and the idea that he is trying to break this union.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the right of the small number of petitioners, I forget what it is, five or six, in presenting a petition to this House. And as the hon. member who presented the petition alluded to documents attached to it, I think I would like to read to the House a similar document. I have every reason to think, Mr. Speaker, that this document is identical, except for the signature possibly and the address on it, to the document that the hon. member read.

Now, on one side the document

reads at the top, "No postage stamp necessary if mailed in Canada." The next line, "Dear Sir or Madam," the next paragraph, "There are presently two groups of government workers

DR. COLLINS: on strike in an effort to obtain a decent living wage. I believe the offer from the employer is an insult to the dignity of Newfoundlanders."

The next paragraph, "I ask you to look into the petition and to use your influence to bring an end to these disputes," and then it goes on and gives the signature and the address.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: On the other side, Mr. Speaker, at the top it says, "Put yourself in this picture." Underneath this there is a short phrase which says, "This person is on strike," and then it gives a silhouette of a profile, underneath it says, "If you were him you would be on strike too." On the other half of this side, the first paragraph reads, "We cannot show you the picture of the person on the side. We are too embarrassed. He is too embarrassed. The only one not embarrassed is the government."

The next paragraph says, "Picture this, this man works at the College of Trades and Technology in St. John's. For thirteen years he has worked for the government and still takes home less than \$140 a week." Underneath it says, "Put yourself in picture and can you support your family on \$145 a week."

MR. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down!

DR. COLLINS: Nowhere in this document does it say, Mr. Speaker, that the person signing this document supports any petition being presented to the House of Assembly. It is a statement of fact and these are in fact, Mr. Speaker, addressed to MHAs. They are not addressed to the House of Assembly as such, so they themselves do not constitute a petition. They are addressed to MHAs, and the people signing these cards, these documents I suggest, Mr. Speaker, are individuals communicating

DR. COLLINS: directly with their MHAs. There is nothing in this communication, they support or do not support any other activity such as the presenting of a petition to the House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support the petition ably presented by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe). I believe that the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) not only showed what kind of turmoil, state of shock that this government is in, but he also read what a state of shock that this government is in.

MR. TULK: The same shock the Premier is in.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I believe in the President of Treasury Board supporting the petition. This is exactly what Elizabeth Drover in Sunnyside is saying. "We are sick and tired of the low wages that this government is paying to the people on strike." And this is what she is saying there, and the minister appeared to be lacking a little bit of education to read what exactly is on there and what the person is saying that, "Look, this government is an insult to the people - what this government is offering - and therefore, you, as our elected member, you as our elected member, get after the government and ask the government once and for all to wake up and realize, wake up and realize that you are using the people on strike at \$145 or \$150 a week." And it is ridiculous for a government of this day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - a government of this day to be so childish, to be so childish, and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) to get up on points of order when he does not have a leg to stand on, because he knows that this government is just pushing the strikers further and further in the hole, day after day after day. It is a shame. It is a disgrace. And it is something that the President of Treasury Board should be completely ashamed of.

MR. SPEAKER: Further petitions?

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present the same kind of petition that has been presented by my colleagues, and again I will not read the petition. It is supported by 306 signatures on these cards from residents in the Terra Nova district and in the district of Bellevue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the card. I do not know what the hon. the President of Treasury Board -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: - thinks that the people of my

MR. T. LUSH:

district wanted me to do with these cards. I do not know if he thinks they wanted me to throw them in the garbage. But I can assure you that the people, the 302 people who sent me those cards wanted action. And if action was getting the cards on the table of this House, that is what they wanted.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House, as a member concerned with the welfare of the constituents of my district, I am going to see that it gets to the table of the House, I am going to see that it gets recognized.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, referring to the cards as the minister did, I can tell you I know what I would do in response to, 'Put yourself in the picture'. I know what I would do, Mr. Speaker, and it is absolutely ridiculous to find such callousness and -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I am a bit fearful that the issue of the cards is now beginning to override the issue of the petition. And the rules are clear that members presenting petitions should confine themselves to the statement of the party's petitioning, the number of signatures and the material allegations of the petition. I believe the hon. members for the last few moments have been referring to the cards, which I have allowed to, at least, be attached to the petition, but members should confine themselves to the petition, the prayer of the petition, the number of signatures and material allegations on the petition.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, quite naturally I accept your ruling but I assume since the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) referred only to the cards, that I might have been given the opportunity to respond.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Just a further clarification, if I may. I think I said at the outset that in the last few moments members have been referring to cards on both sides. So I (inaudible) the ruling.

MR. T. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me, Mr. Speaker, no pride in having to come to this hon. House to - what shall I say? - to speak for people who work for such low wages. I wish I did not have to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, I support this group.

Mr. Speaker, it has been tremendous to see how these workers have stood up in the long time they have been on this strike and to find how their union have worked in such a determined way, have given everything, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to try and resolve this strike. They followed all of the rules, Sir, that one is supposed to follow in trying to resolve the strike. They had asked for a conciliation board, they were denied it. They asked for a mediator, they were denied it. And now, Mr. Speaker, they are coming again and asking for a mediator. And they have demonstrated that they want to get back to the bargaining table, they have demonstrated it time and time again although government were not so ready to acknowledge that they wanted to get back to the bargaining table. And now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad, as one member of the House of Assembly, and I am sure all members on this side are delighted, that it looks like both sides will be getting back to the bargaining table. And I hope they will get back and bargain in good faith and that these workers can get back to work and work for respectable wages, that they can be paid a decent wage so they can take care of their families and live in a way that is in accordance with 1980 standards.

MR. T. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and hope that the whole labour dispute will be resolved, certainly to the satisfaction of the workers concerned.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and support the petition so ably presented by my friend for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). To stick to the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, it is simply asking that a mediator be appointed. I think the union has shown that they are prepared to meet and have a mediator appointed and to get down to the business of resolving this unfortunate situation.

Mr. Speaker, I support their petition, as I have said before, because they have a right and just cause. This has been supported by some 35,000 or 40,000 Newfoundlanders who did take the time and trouble to give indications by signing these cards that they, as well, support the cause.

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth of the matter is- look, I am married, I have a wife, I have four children. There is absolutely no way that I or any member of this House can support a family on \$9,000 or

MR. THOMS:

\$10,000 a year. It is poverty wages - \$144 or \$145 a week. It is simply, Mr. Speaker, impossible to do that. And I said their cause is just, it is right, they deserve it and they need it and this administration must recognize that fact. And I resent - I have nothing against teachers, but how many teachers, Mr. Speaker, in this Province today are making \$8,000, \$9,000 or \$10,000 a year? How many of them? I would hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, that there is not one single, solitary teacher - that most of them are double that or more and they are looking for an increase. But I find it repellent and repugnant that this administration should make these workers who are on poverty wages, and believe you me, Mr. Speaker, \$144 a week is poverty and there is not one single - the only one, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House who had the guts to stand on his feet and to support -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. member is using unparliamentary language, I believe, in using the word 'guts'.

MR. THOMS:

No, I do not think so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

'The hon. member is the only member who had the guts' is unparliamentary.

MR. THOMS:

No, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to it for just a second?

MR. SPEAKER:

I have asked the hon. member if he will withdraw it.

MR. THOMS:

I will certainly withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but -

MR. SPEAKER:

Maybe he could use another word.

MR. THOMS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

We will discuss it afterwards.

MR. THOMS:

I certainly withdraw it but the

MR. THOMS: only man to have the intestinal fortitude, although, Mr. Speaker - it is unparliamentary to say the hon. member lacks guts but it is parliamentary to say that he had the guts, this was the point I was going to make.

MR. NEARY: What he said was it was better if he did not say it.

MR. THOMS: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, he is the only man who had the decency to stand on the other side of the House and say that when I put my signature on a card in support of these workers, I meant it. I am not going to backtrack like the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) did.

MR. WARREN: Or the former Minister of Transportation.

MR. THOMS: He had the decency and the honour, although he has yet to present a petition in the House and, hopefully, he will be doing that. And I have a great deal of admiration for my friend from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas).

MR. WARREN: A good man.

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, these workers are on poverty wages. This administration should be ashamed, they should hang their heads in abject shame for forcing these people to be on strike. They should not be on strike, they should not have to go on strike. They are simply coming now asking that a mediator be appointed. They are supported, Mr. Speaker, by 35,000 or 40,000 other Newfoundlanders, visibly by these cards, and I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they are supported by half a million in this Province. There are only thirty-two or thirty-three people, all of them on that side of the House, who do not support these workers, with the exception of one.

MR. WARREN: So far, so far.

MR. THOMS: None of the rest will support these workers and I find that a crying shame, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: To the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the right of the constituents of Terra Nova to petition this House, I would like to make a couple of points. Some of us on this side have been accused of not presenting petitions that were allegedly presented to us. !

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CARTER: That is not right, that is wrong, that is not correct. The hon. gentleman is not being correct.

MR. NEARY: Too cowardly to do it.

MR. CARTER: The hon. gentleman should keep his mouth shut when other members are speaking.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) cowardly and (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would protect me from the disreputable gentleman opposite?

The point I wish to make, Mr.

Speaker, is that cards have been presented to us, a large number of cards were presented to me by a couple of concerned workers.

MR. NEARY: Well table them. Table them.

MR. CARTER: I cannot table cards. I would like to table the hon. gentleman or any part of him -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CARTER: - but I cannot table cards.

What I am doing is I am responding to these cards, each and every one of them. This is my response which I will table, and I think it contains rather more meaning and sense than the hot air that has come from the other side of the House.

'Dear Constituent' - I name the person who is on the card -

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

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

MR. NEARY: Your Honour, I think, was about ready to intervene anyway but Your Honour knows what the point of order is, that the hon. gentleman is completely irrelevant, either he is going to support the petition or he takes his seat.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) supporting it in his letter.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Again it puts the Chair in a very

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

difficult position because the rules are clear, you must confine yourself to the prayer of the petition and to the number of signatures attached to it. Now, the hon. member is talking about something, a way in which he is going to respond to the cards that he has received and it is a very, very cloudy issue. In fact, I would prefer not to even rule on it right now and maybe think about it and if I rule that it is in order, allow the member another opportunity the next day. Right now I am not prepared to rule on that because it is a very cloudy area.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. CARTER: Yes, to that point of order, this letter addresses itself absolutely to the meat, to the prayer of the petition. It could not be more on - and I am sure that when Your Honour hears it, you will not only allow it, you will allow it twice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? Thank you. That takes me off the hook.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

'Dear constituent,' - or I name the person whose name is on the card - 'In replying to your petition' - I call it a petition because they think it is a petition; I know it is not, all I got were a few cards but they signed it believing it to be a petition so I certainly am not going to disabuse them. 'I am replying to your petition which was presented to me on March 31, 1981. I am glad to see that you are as concerned as I am over the plight of our fellow Newfoundlanders and are interested enough to sign a petition on their behalf. The workers at the College of Trades and Technology and at Workers' Compensation have declined to accept an offer that has been

MR. CARTER: approved by some 5,500 of their fellow government workers in the same category.

MR. NEARY: That is enough, Mr. Speaker. Now I withdraw the leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
I understand leave has been withdrawn.

MR. NEARY: It is completely out of order, ridiculous and the hon. gentleman should be forced to take his seat.

MR. CARTER: No, I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I do not want the place to get into a big uproar. I have already said that I will reserve my ruling on the point raised earlier. The members to my right agreed that I would not have to rule on it right now but they would give you leave to read the letter. Now they have taken away that leave and unfortunately, the Chair has no choice but to ask the hon. member to restrain himself and to wait until I do make a ruling. And it may be a ruling in favour of the hon. member, I do not know.

MR. CARTER: I will table it without further comment and await the ruling of Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly, the member has already -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)not on that. Not on that.

MR. CARTER: Well, the Speaker's rule -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member has read from the letter; therefore, he must table the letter anyway.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I await your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Further petitions?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is the second opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that I have been given to present a petition on behalf of 230 constituents from the district of Carbonear, and that in itself, Mr. Speaker, is somewhat of a surprise to me because Carbonear is not essentially known as a union district. There are not a lot of union members over there, but apparently this particular issue has drawn a lot of attention and subsequently, what I consider to be quite a large number of constituents considering the circumstances, have offered their support for these workers at the Workers' Compensation Board and the College of Trades and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, the material allegations contained in this petition, as I was just studying it before I got up to speak, if not directly far-reaching, are certainly indirectly. And it has been my understanding in this hon. House that when material allegations are not, of their very nature, specific, then there is a fair amount of leeway in discussing applicable points, if you like. And my opinion is that the allegations presented by the workers involved in these two instances go right to the heart, right to the core of government policy in relation to labour disputes. What, in effect, they are saying when they say that the strike was unnecessary to begin with, when they say that the government has not been reasonable in appointing a mediator, when they say that the offer of 8 per cent is inadequate to compensate for the rate of inflation, when they say that the current dispute is a costly one and there has been no apparent attempt to settle it, you cannot just take those specific isolated things and say, well, they are in themselves specific allegations, because they all point directly to government policy in the labour management field, and how this government has not taken its responsibility in relation to labour in this Province in a very serious and mature manner. And until

MR. MOORES:

that very crux, that very essence of the point is attended to, then there will be no settlement of this dispute. And it does not matter if the workers in somewhat of a redundant manner have brought these cards, which quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the decision of members opposite is, I believe that when a petition is being presented to this House the circumstances under which - the available circumstances under which signatories can be gotten, if you like, have to be considered. We are living in a very different age than we were in 1850 when the rules pertaining to petitions were created to cover this Legislature. One time in Carbonear, for instance, I could cover the whole town in five minutes, now it takes eight weeks to do that because of a variety of circumstances that have occurred in 100 years. And I believe it is the responsibility of this House, particularly the government in dealing with petitions, to recognize changes over the years, changes in tradition and custom. And I believe, contrary to what the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) said, that this is in 1981 a reputable and responsible method of presenting a petition to the House of Assembly. And I think the red herring that has been brought in on these cards this morning is not at all responsible on the part of the government.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition unequivocally, if for no other reason than I have always been union. I have been for years, until coming to the House of Assembly, a member of a union. I was involved, to a great degree, in the Province of Ontario with labour unions and I know the very great significance that unions have today in our society in creating necessary balances between those who wish to bully and to browbeat them, and as balancing the need for workers in this country to be given a fair and decent wage.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. I do not know if all these petitions are going to do any good or if they will just continue to fall on deaf ears but let me say this in support of the petition, Mr. Speaker, let me try to bring in a new point that I do not think has already been mentioned except by the minister, that the government's argument, the government's defence for not negotiating with these two units in good faith, is that if they budge from their eight per cent the 5,500 employees who have already signed would then demand the difference between eight per cent, which they received, and what these two bargaining units would get. And that is their argument, Mr. Speaker, and I say to that, that is sheer nonsense. In other words, what the government is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that they have already taken a decision, that for all workers in the Public Service there is going to be a straight, across the board, eight per cent. So there is no point in - How can they say they are negotiating in good faith? There is no point in negotiating. They have got their minds made up. Their minds were made up before they went to the bargaining table, that these two units were going to get precisely what the 5,500 workers who have already signed agreements, what they got, eight per cent.

That is not negotiating, Mr. Speaker. That is not give and take. That is not negotiating in good faith. These units are separate units unto themselves. And how can the minister use the argument, Mr. Speaker, that for similar work, for similar work - he says, "Well, nurses may be entitled to more. The warders at the penitentiary may be entitled to more than eight per cent. The teachers may be entitled to twelve, thirteen, fourteen per cent." What a weak defence, what a weak argument, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: In other words, what the minister is saying is, "The rich can get richer and the poor get poorer." Eight per cent of a teacher's salary, eight per cent of a nurse's salary, eight per cent of a warder's salary is substantially more than eight per cent of an employee at the College of Trades or an employee at the Workers' Compensation Board.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! To a point of order. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) keeps talking about eight per cent but we have already heard in this House of Assembly. We have all-

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: May I state my point of order surely? What manners? Manners of a pig.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair cannot determine whether it is a point of order or not unless it hears it.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the members across the way have been constantly referring to eight per cent but it has been made quite clear by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the offer is not eight per cent but considerably more and I think that point should be made and made again and if anyone makes a counterpoint they should be straightened out on that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member, I believe, has made the point that he said should be made but, unfortunately, it is out of order to make it during this particular point in time.

It is a difference of opinion and not a point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: When the hon. member was making his point of order, Mr. Speaker, he said that the hon. members of the opposition had the manners of a pig -

MR. THOMS: Unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: - and you know, Your Honour, that that is completely unparliamentary and I ask Your Honour to direct the member, who continuously uses unparliamentary language in this House, lowering the decorum of the House, that Your Honour either name him, or the Premier when he gets back in the House on Monday have a talk to this gentleman, give him the same lecture, schoolteacher/schoolboy/kindergarten lecture that he gave us here in this House yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to the point, really, I have to admit I did not hear the hon. member refer to the members on my right as whatever it was. I will check Hansard or the hon. member may wish to save some time-if it is, in fact, the case, then he would certainly be sure and withdraw.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I quite freely admit that I accused hon. members across the way of having the manners of a pig. I now withdraw unequivocally, they have not got the manners of a pig.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think this is an appropriate time perhaps to make a ruling that may stand, hopefully, forever. Because I believe it is fair to say that on both sides of the House when an occasion has arisen where a member has been asked to withdraw unparliamentary remarks, it is always with an if, and, or a but and somehow to the Chair it does not appear to be an unequivocal withdrawal.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): So I would suggest to hon. members now, and I will make it a ruling so that it will stand as a ruling, when members are asked to withdraw unparliamentary remarks the procedure will be; "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw those remarks," no more and, ifs or buts. Fair enough?

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), would you be kind enough to use that procedure in withdrawing those remarks?

MR. CARTER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. As always I am in your hands and I do exactly that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I must advise the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that his time for speaking on the petition has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now a point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has again defied Your Honour's ruling. Your Honour used the words, "I withdraw the remarks," and the hon. member did not do that and I ask Your Honour now to direct the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) to do just that, withdraw the remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood that is what he did.

MR. CARTER: Your instructions were somewhat lengthy and I withdraw unequivocally any remarks that I may have made that offended the hon. gentleman. What more can I do?

MR. NEARY: That is an 'if' again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I believe the second time that he withdrew was quite acceptable to me. As long as it is acceptable to the Chair, that is the point I want to make.

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 933

AH-4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
petitions?

Where are we now? Any further

The hon. member for Torngat
Mountains.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just wondered if the hon.

gentleman would give me leave to make a statement on
behalf of the government? It will only take a minute.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

MR. WARREN:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, over half an hour

ago the Premier's

MR. MARSHALL: Office was informed by the Prime Minister's Office of the appointment of Dr. Anthony Paddon - it was going to be announced within a half an hour - to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - succeeding the present Lieutenant-Governor. I can say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Good Choice. Excellent choice.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I can say, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) taken away from the snobs in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Taken away from the aristocrats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) were neighbours for years?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must ask the hon. member for LaPoile please to keep it down so we can hear what the announcement is going to be and what other remarks are going to be made.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I can say that the government looks upon this appointment with a considerable degree of pleasure. Dr. Paddon, of course, is a most distinguished Newfoundlander. He was born in Labrador. He has rendered yeoman service to this Province both in his medical practice and his association with the International Grenfell Association and in other areas. I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to say that government is particularly pleased because, as everyone is aware, all members of this House and particularly this government are very concerned with the fostering of the unity of this Province, and very concerned with the unity of the Province, the mainland part and the Island part of the Province. So it is extremely pleasurable to us that Ottawa has seen fit to appoint a native

MR. MARSHALL: Labradorian to this highest position in the Province. So, the fact that Dr. Paddon himself is a man of considerable stature and distinction, coupled with the fact that he is a native Labradorian, gives us a double source of pleasure. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not fail to - I might say that Dr. Paddon's appointment is due to take place early in July - on behalf of the Premier and the Province I would be remiss if I failed to express the appreciation of the government for the tenure of the present Lieutenant-Governor, the hon. Gordon A. Winter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: His tenure, Mr. Speaker, has done much to enhance this already high and exalted office, and for many years the exemplary manner in which he has carried out his duties will serve, in many years in the future, as a real example to his successors in office.

And finally, may I say though, Mr. Speaker, with a certain amount of sadness, may I note that government was informed about this about a half an hour ago in a call from the Prime Minister's Office to the Premier's Office. Unfortunately, the Premier was not in his office at the time, he is in the district. Of course, it is a matter of protocol and courtesy that a call like this will be made and we certainly welcome it. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it is Ottawa's prerogative to appoint and we certainly welcome this particular appointment, but I have to note that it is rather unfortunate that there was a leak to the Daily News, to the CBC in Goose Bay yesterday, last night, as to this appointment which emanated from Ottawa. And, Mr. Speaker, we find it rather disturbing that in a high office -

AN HON. MEMBER: How embarrassing, really?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - such as this, Mr. Speaker, that protocol and the normal courtesies of life would be overlooked in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the -

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I am sorry - to the motion?

MR. LUSH: Yes.

MR. CARTER: A point of order, before the hon. gentleman gets up.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I distinctly heard the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) say that this job should be taken away from the snobs in St. John's. Now, Mr. Speaker, one person you cannot insult in this House is the Lieutenant-Governor. And I think that that remark should be withdrawn absolutely and unequivocally in line with your previous instructions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No way! No way!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order. If anything, it was a compliment, Mr. Speaker, a message of congratulations to the people who made the appointment.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the Chair will have to check Hansard. The Chair is not aware of such a comment. There are so many comments going back and forth, it is difficult to keep track of them all anyway. There is a motion, I presume of congratulatory comments, to the new Lieutenant-Governor and also thanks to the former Lieutenant-Governor.

The hon. member for Terra Nova speaks to that.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we want to be associated with this congratulatory note and I think this again demonstrates the Prime Minister's concern for Newfoundland and his very profound insight into Newfoundland, to appoint

MR. LUSH: such a distinguished Newfoundlander as Dr. Paddon to the office of Lieutenant-Governor, a man, Mr. Speaker, of impeccable integrity, a man of great stature, a man of tremendous initiative and a man who understands rural Newfoundland in particular, a man who understand the social fabric, the culture of rural Newfoundland, a man that was born in Labrador in

MR. T. LUSH: Indian Harbour, so a man thoroughly familiar with Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this is an historic day for the people of Labrador and of Newfoundland, to know that we have a man of such stature and a man of such integrity taking over the office of Lieutenant-Governor. And we want to congratulate the Prime Minister on his selection of such a great man. We are sure that all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be immensely happy, and we want to join with the government in its congratulatory note and, also, of course, our appreciation and thanks to the present Lieutenant-Governor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): You have heard the motion. Those in favour, 'aye',

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: contrary 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'nay'.

MR. SPEAKER: Carried.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains-
petitions.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 274 people from the community of Nain in Northern Labrador, the most northerly community in this Province. The prayer of the petition reads, 'We the undersigned residents of Nain, Labrador, are angry and frustrated about the recent deterioration of services provided by Newfoundland Hydro, compounded by a drastic and unusual increase in our bills. We are petitioning the government to demand an investigation into and compensation for the following: number one, frequent interruption of services without adequate notification to residents resulting in disrupted household schedules, damages to personal property and other undue hardships, such as lack of heat and running water; number two, increase of over 100 per cent in kilowatt hours used reported by many households in December, well above average increase expected for this time of year causing unexpectedly high bills and numerous cut-off

MR. WARREN: notices at a time when families can at least afford to be without such services and; number three, meters are not changed and tested every two years according to regulation, and several households feel that their meters may not be giving accurate readings.'

Mr. Speaker, one final sentence there. 'We received our January bills with disbelief' and they ask a simple question: 'How could Newfoundland Hydro expect us to pay so much for such an inadequate service?'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) does have the same petition and I am sure he is going to speak on behalf of the petition. However, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have to stand in this House and say that the residents in Nain are definitely receiving a most inadequate service from Newfoundland Hydro. Mr. Speaker, I have seen hydro bills up as much as \$150-odd for one month. I have seen a hydro bill in the tiny community of Makkovik where the house was only occupied for eleven days, and the hydro bill was \$324, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. BARRY: They must have had their windows open.

MR. G. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker, the house was occupied for eleven days and that is not all, he gets a reply back that there is nothing wrong with the meter, Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that the people in coastal Labrador are paying the highest for Hydro electric rates than anywhere else in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we must consider - I would like to advise this hon. government that a lot of the homes that are, in particular, in the Torngat Mountains district, were built by the provincial government years ago, in the past twenty-five years, a lot of those homes were built by the provincial government and naturally, Mr. Speaker - even the ones that went up the last three or four years, do not have the proper insulation and these homes are part and parcel of this provincial government.

MR. G. WARREN: And I would say probably if there was more insulation in those houses, if the provincial government would complete the project that they started about twenty-five years ago, ten years ago and even five years ago of upgrading those houses with proper insulation—because those houses are the property of the Newfoundland Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe

MR. WARREN: there should be an investigation into the hydro rates in Coastal Labrador. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that 80 per cent of the people in Coastal Labrador at this time of the year, because there is no other employment, are either on social assistance or on U.I.C.; 80 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think my percentage is too far off, are on either social assistance or U.I.C. And, Mr. Speaker, when we can see that these people are paying such an extraordinary amount for hydro bills, where in the heck are they finding money to buy the necessities such as sugar, flour, butter, milk and so on, Mr. Speaker.

So I ask the minister to ask Newfoundland Hydro to have an investigation into those discrepancies in Nain, in particular, and probably when they are doing Nain they could also check through the other communities along the Labrador Coast.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to get up and support the prayer of this petition - not to support all of the comments made by the hon. member opposite because, as I will mention in a moment, he did stray from the prayer of the petition and went further than the residents who signed the petition have gone.

Mr. Speaker, it is conceded that there have been a number of power outages at Nain and that there have been problems, and I am not satisfied with the service which the residents at Nain have been receiving. I have already requested a full and complete investigation and report from the power distribution district which is administered by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

MR. BARRY: I have already received an interim report, Mr. Speaker, which I will be happy to present to the House in a moment, but I have not been content just with the interim report either. I have requested members of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, the power distribution district, to go to Nain and to arrange to have a meeting with the community council at Nain and this meeting has been now set up for April 13th, I believe is the date, and I will make the officials of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro accessible directly to the residents so that they can put their complaints and their concerns directly to the people who are involved in managing the electrical system at Nain.

I do not want anybody in this House to feel that we are content with people anywhere in this Province, whether it be Nain, whether it be the Burin Peninsula or anywhere, suffering a series of power outages without a complete and full investigation and rectification, Mr. Speaker, by government and by Hydro.

So that is the general background. I have already taken steps to see that this matter is fully investigated.

Now, the interim report that I have received, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the problems that had to do with the actual power outages have been solved. There was an ongoing series of problems that apparently resulted initially, Mr. Speaker, from certain contamination of the fuel which was stored in the tanks at Nain. That resulted in some stuck fuel injectors, apparently, that resulted in the breaking down of a number of the units, not all at the same time, but certain units broke down. There were certain bearings that failed in the units, and what happened then was that when one unit was out of service the other units were not able to meet

MR. BARRY: the peak of the community and you had your power outages caused and brownouts, as it were, created because of the inability of the generators that were not inoperative to meet the load and the demand on the system.

I have a list of a number of units, one after the other, that got into problems. They have been totally overhauled now and I understand, I have the assurances of Hydro, that the same problems should not be experienced in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, in any event, I have asked the officials to go up to Nain, to make themselves available so that it can be fully explained and they can get the views of the people of the community of Nain.

Now, on the second point, Mr. Speaker, as far as the inaccurate metering of the actual energy taken, I have also requested a full report and investigation and whenever I get a complaint, whether it be from one citizen or a community, that electrical bills are too high, I have that fully investigated and a detailed report indicating where Hydro thinks the

MR. BARRY:

electricity has gone. And they go in and they find what utilities are used, do they have washers/dryers, electric heat and so forth, and try and establish just where the electricity may have been consumed - and usually it is found that there is some reason. Now, the hon. member mentioned a bill in excess of \$300 for eleven days. Now, there is something dramatically and radically wrong here, either the meter is out of whack, in which case there is a procedure for investigating the thing, or else the windows were thrown open and there was an attempt to heat the community of Makkovik from that house because that is, I mean, just totally impossible, in terms of any reasonable use of electricity, for an electrical bill to run into three hundred-odd dollars over eleven days. So I have asked Hydro to make sure that the citizens are aware, and I would ask the member to make sure his constituents know, first of all, that there is a system in place for investigating and making sure that meters are accurate; and secondly, to ask the member to ensure that his constituents are aware of the CHIP and the super-CHIP insulation programmes where they can obtain government assistance to supply insulation.

And, Mr. Speaker, the final point is that it is up to all of us - if 80 per cent of his constituents are on social assistance, it is up to the member opposite to co-operate with government to make sure that his constituents in the future have the jobs that will let them meet the needs, the reasonable electrical needs that they might have.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further petitions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

I would like to inform all hon. members that we have seven hours and thirty-six minutes used in the seventy-five hours, for interim supply.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - senior, seniority, senior member.

MR. THOMS: He has only one good eye.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this morning when

the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) rose in his place to welcome the appointment of Dr. Patton as the new Lieutenant Governor of this Province, he made a very, very serious error in judgment. The hon. gentleman could not resist being nasty at the end, and just for the sake of setting the record straight more than anything else, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that it was not an hour before that the call came from the Prime Minister's office, it was last evening when the information was conveyed to the Premier's Executive Assistant in this Province. The Premier's Executive Assistant knew about it last night. Now, whether he told the Premier, whether he was able to contact the Premier or not is another matter. So there was no need to be nasty on this auspicious occasion, no need of it at all.

MR. THOMS: And let the press report that too.

MR. NEARY: And I hope the press will report it. And we will see who is lowering the decorum of this House and who is downgrading and degrading politics in this Province.

MR. NEARY: That, this morning, was the ultimate in nastiness, the ultimate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he would get me some information, because before the Interim Supply Bill goes through, if possible, if I can possibly do it, I am going to have this information and it has to do with the government aircraft, with the number of times since January 1st, 1980, that the Premier's Office requested the government aircraft, the names of the passengers who travelled on that aircraft, the Premier's Office and the minister's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: - if I could only get the attention of the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am asking the Minister of Finance if he would get the number of times the Premier's Office especially, and the ministers requested the government aircraft to go aloft, what were the names of the people who were carried on the aircraft, carried as passengers on the aircraft, and what was the purpose of the trip? Now, has the hon. gentleman gotten that information for me?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman going to get me the information?

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon? Is the hon. gentleman going to get me the information?

DR. COLLINS: I will make my response to a number of items (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, yesterday I put the government under notice that there would be no television cameras in this House for Budget Day unless they make a commitment, I did not say they had to do it immediately, unless they make a commitment that somewhere down the road this session of the House, the microphones and the television cameras would be allowed to come in on the floor of the House to televise the daily sittings of the House live, live coverage of the House.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out for the benefit of anybody in the House who may be ignorant enough to think that it is the government who makes the decision on whether or not we have live coverage, as the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicated last night on TV - I do not know if he fooled the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) or not, or whether he fooled the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) or not, or the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) or not - it is not the government who makes that decision.

MR. CARTER: Rubbish.

MR. NEARY: It is not the government.

MR. CARTER: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: The Government House Leader, (Mr. Marshall) again in his usual nasty fashion, completely ignorant of the rules of this House, said that he would not accept an ultimatum from Mr. Neary. "The government will decide," he said, "the government will decide when we are going to have television in this House." The government will not

MR. NEARY: decide it. It will be this House who will decide it, not the government.

MR. CARTER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: The only way it can be done is with unanimous agreement of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Unanimous?

MR. NEARY: Unanimous.

MR. CARTER: Wrong. That is not so.

MR. NEARY: It is so. Under the present rules the only -

MR. BARRY: Change the rules.

MR. NEARY: Pardon? Oh, change the rules. Then you need a two-third majority. That is not necessary, by the way, to change any rules, all we need is the unanimous consent of the House. And it is not the government that determines that, it is the House itself. The House is the master of its own rules. So technically speaking the hon. gentleman was incorrect again as usual.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman thinks (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman thinks he owns the House. He thinks he owns it. He does not own it. The House is still the master of its own rules and so, therefore, I hope that the press especially will take note that it is not the government that decides whether we have live coverage. Now, you need the support of 100 per cent of the members on the government side, as well as needing the support of 100 per cent of the members on this side.

And so, Mr. Chairman, so it will be with the simple information I asked the minister to get on the government aircraft. I gave the minister notice yesterday afternoon, I asked him if he would get me this information, and

MR. NEARY:

I am not going to sit in my seat, Mr. Chairman, and have the minister get almost \$.5 billion, \$500 million when he will not answer one simple question. The minister has not answered a question yet, has given the House no information. And am I asking for information to which the House is not entitled, Mr. Chairman? No, I am not. I am asking the House for information on the government aircraft to which the House is entitled, to which the people of this Province are entitled. And why can we not have the information? What do they have to hide? Do they have anything to hide? If it is all straight and aboveboard why cannot the information be put on the table of the House? So there will be no interim supply today, I guarantee you, until that information is forthcoming. And the people of this Province who do not get paid, that is if they do not get paid, and the people of this Province who cannot get their social assistance cheques, who cannot get their bills paid, 'Go and ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), or ask some of the government members, ministers, supporters, why the minister will not tell the House what they have been doing with the government aircraft.' Once we get that information, Mr. Chairman, then I have no problem. I have no problem in at least giving my support to the Interim Supply Bill. That is not an ultimatum, that is a request. I am merely, simply, asking what every member has a right to do in this House, what every member's duty it is to do, to ask for information, to get information for the people

MR. NEARY:

of this Province. And I hope the press will record this. If the Interim Supply Bill is held up it will not be the Opposition's fault, it will not be my fault. We are asking the minister to tell us , to tell us, to give us a list of all the times that the Premier's office and the ministers' offices requested the government aircraft, the names of the people they carried on the aircraft and the purpose of the trip and how much it cost? Now, is that unreasonable? Mr. Chairman, is that being unreasonable? Is that a part of our duties in this House? Why will the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) not give us that information? I hope the editorial writers in this Province will take note, the next time they take pen in hand to scribble a few words and condemn the Opposition for not trying to do their job, for not trying to get information for the people of this Province, I hope they will remember that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) it was who stonewalled, who would not give us the information. And I would just as soon, Mr. Chairman, myself, I would just as soon punch in the seventy-five hours on interim supply as I would on estimates, because we are going to be no further ahead. When we get to estimates the government has it all in their own hands. They can shift the estimates off the floor of the House, move them out into offices of buildings scattered around St. John's and they have it all to themselves. They do not have to answer any questions. Well, unless the minister is prepared to give me that information he may as well dig in now for a long haul, a long session. I would just as soon spend between now and the eighth of the month, when the public servants have to be paid, I would just as soon punch in the rest of the seventy-five

MR. NEARY: hours trying to get that simple little bit of information which the people of this Province are entitled to have.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak long in this but I have to address myself to the few remarks made by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), because I want to make this abundantly and crystal clear. The member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has a habit, from time to time when statements are made, of coming across the House and making certain statements which unfortunately get accepted. He made the statement, when he was speaking, to the effect that the Prime Minister's office had called the Executive Assistant of the Premier last night at eleven p.m. or last evening sometime. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the Committee and indicate the same thing as I indicated in the House, there was no call to the Premier's office last evening. The first call that came to the Premier's office was about three quarters of an hour prior to the welcoming announcement of it by the government in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I have checked this very carefully this morning, Mr. Chairman, when I saw the announcement of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MOORES: Why should he call?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I will get on to why should he call in a moment.

I checked this very carefully this morning when I saw the -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) remember.

MR. MARSHALL: I checked this, Mr. Chairman, very carefully this morning with all personnel on the Premier's floor, on the eighth floor this morning, I saw the

MR. MARSHALL: Daily News and at that particular period of time there had been no call whatsoever. Now, the hon. member from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) asked, why should they call? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the office of Lieutenant Governor is the highest office in this Province. It is a matter of appointment of the federal government that makes the appointment. In this particular case we welcome and applaud the appointment, and indeed congratulate the federal government on the man that they have appointed to exercise this high office. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, courtesy and protocol dictate that where a Lieutenant Governor, particularly a Lieutenant Governor, but any important official is appointed to a position in this Province, courtesy and protocol demand that the government of the province be informed, the representative, the government representing the people of the province, within the provincial context, be informed before anybody else. So it comes, Mr. Chairman, with a certain amount of sadness that we make this observation. But we have to make it because I think, you know, in this particular Province we cherish particularly the office of Lieutenant Governor and all that it represents, and we were entitled, this government, Mr. Chairman, was entitled to an announcement before they decided to give it Mr. Callahan's paper or before they decided to give it to the CBC in Goose Bay. The affront to the people of this Province by what they did is completely and absolutely inexcusable but at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we heartily, I want to say, endorse and congratulate the appointment for the reason that we have

MR. W. MARSHALL: already given. So I want to make that quite clear. There was no call until three quarters of an hour before we got up in the House to make the announcement. When we got the call, if we wanted to act like Mr. Rompkey and his representatives in Ottawa, we could have jumped into the House and made the announcement even before they did. But we waited out of respect for the Lieutenant-Governor and out of respect for the normal protocol and decency, waited for the announcement when it was due to be made in Ottawa. We waited for the three quarters of an hour and we got up and presumably it was made about fifteen minutes before that, when we welcomed the appointment.

So let there be doubt whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, about that. I have questioned the Executive Assistant of the Premier, Chief of Staff of the Premier, Public Relations Advisor of the Premier, all people on the eighth floor in the Premier's office. And they were here, Mr. Chairman, in this building, as they are most nights, until about eleven o'clock last night. No such call came in. And what the hon. member says - I do not know where he gets his information - is completely and absolutely incorrect.

On the aspect, Mr. Chairman, they have every reason - if the hon. member feels that because the federal government at Ottawa have every reason to treat the people of this Province, as represented by the provincial government, with such disdain purely and simply because this government chooses to assert the rights of the people of this Province within the Canadian Confederation, well, I am afraid - you know, I certainly do not share his views.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of T.V. in the House - now, I do not know what all of this is about but it was raised on interim supply - the hon. member is smarting again. Every time he jumps into it and he gets his legs cut out from underneath him he starts to smart. But let be known, Mr. Chairman, certainly it is a matter of this House but the way the hon. member got up in this House yesterday on the aspect of T.V. he said, 'Look, unless the government is going to have T.V. every day I am going to withhold unanimous consent for the broadcasting of the Budget'. So I mean, the obvious matter is that the hon. member is not a member of the government. I do not expect he will ever be a member of any government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: He certainly would not be a member of this government, Mr. Chairman. This government sits to the left of the Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this government sits to the left of the Speaker for historic reasons. I can think of no quicker way to have the government sit to the right of the Speaker than if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tried to join the government side, because the government side would be over there, fast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: So he is not, Mr. Chairman, a member of the government. I do not expect he ever will be. It is a matter of unanimous consent in the House whether there is T.V., whether the people of this Province are going to be able to see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) give the Budget Speech this year, is going to depend on each and every member. And if the hon. member for LaPoile chooses to withhold unanimous consent, well, the people of the Province will not see the Budget Speech as they customarily do on

MR. MARSHALL: on TV because of the member for LaPoile. I believe the hon. member for Placentia (W. Patterson) is going to consent to it and the member for Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow) and the member for St. John's Centre (P. McNicholas) and all hon. members except one. So, the point of the matter is the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) thinks that he can hold up the House himself and he can take the House and the government on his back, but we have other news for him. We are governing this Province, Mr. Chairman, to the approval of about-eighty or ninety per cent is our approval rating and I am afraid it would go in the other direction if we listened and took the counsel of the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to mention it but since the President of the Council (W. Marshall) brought it up a second time, I am going to mention it. It is my understanding that last night there was an attempt made by the Prime Minister's Office to contact the Premier of this Province. The Premier could not be reached so an executive assistant of the Prime Minister's Office contacted an executive assistant in the Premier's Office and he was advised. That is our information from the Prime Minister's Office.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Maybe we have a difference of opinion.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: By way of information I can tell the hon. member his understanding is completely and absolutely incorrect and erroneous.

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 940

EL - 4

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt):
ilege.

It is obviously not a point of priv-

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bring in the tapes.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Bring in the tapes: The Premier is

is acting like Mr. Nixon now, is he?

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is

it is my understanding -

AN HON. MEMBER:

- (Inaudible) debate now or (inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

No, he has already ruled on the

point of privilege. Oh, yes, I am back to debate. My understanding is that is what happened, okay?

MR. THOMS: Now, but be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, I find again - you know, I had an occasion to stand in this House yesterday and say how despicable I found the actions of the President of the Council (W. Marshall) in trying to shift the blame yesterday to take the heat off the Premier of this Province. Now, I find today that the President of the Council is incapable of coming into this House, announcing the appointment of the new Lieutenant-Governor and asking the House to write congratulatory letters to the new Lieutenant-Governor and also to the outgoing Lieutenant-Governor without being able to resist being nasty about it. Now, I just find it a little bit offensive especially, Mr. Chairman, after the day before in this House, when the schoolboy Premier of this Province stood on his feet and gave me a lecture, gave me a lecture on whether or not I should be permitted to exercise my right in this House of rising on a point of personal privilege. I have a right to do that. And Mr. Chairman, it is going to be a sad day in this House if, as the President of the Council would like to see it, the Opposition in this Province was completely muzzled. That is his aim, that is his objective, that is his burning desire. There is no such desire from most of the members on the other side of this House.

I am sure my friend, the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) encourages the Opposition to come in here and to ask good solid questions so that he can get on his feet and defend his actions. That is what parliamentary democracy is all about. But parliamentary democracy, Mr. Chairman, is not what we see oozing from the President of the Council who would like nothing better than to absolutely shut up this side of the House.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. Dictatorship.

MR. THOMS: That is his burning desire. Yes, he would like a dictatorship. That is not my idea of what this House is all about. I am learning and so are the people learning.

MR. NEARY: Bring in the Cameras.

MR. STAGG: Indeed they are.

MR. THOMS: Indeed they are. I heard the worker who is making \$144.00 a week yesterday saying what an ignoramus the member for Stephenville (F. Stagg) was. I heard that same caller, Mr. Chairman, saying what a splendid fellow the Chairman of this Committee is, what an absolutely splendid fellow. They went to his office, they sat down -

MR. NEARY: I concur with that.

MR. THOMS: - he listened to them, he talked to them, he tried to understand their problem, but not so with the member for Stephenville. They had no good words about the member for Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: Engrossed in ignorance.

MR. THOMS: And, of course, the member for Stephenville is going to find out exactly what his constituents think about him, come the next election.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council also decided to take my hon. friend from LaPoile to task for making a statement that he was going to withhold his consent for television cameras, when the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) of this Province presented his budget to this House.

MR. NEARY: One hundred per cent on the Open Lines this morning.

MR. THOMS: You know, again the President of the Council gets up and tries to make a big deal, a big issue out of this. But my friend from LaPoile (S. Neary), if and when

MR. THOMS: he does this on the fourteenth of this month, is exercising his parliamentary right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: That is a right that he has. I may not do it. My friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) may not do it. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) may not do it. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) may not do it.

MR. NEARY: No guts.

MR. THOMS: But he has the right to do it. I have never liked, and I do not think anybody in this Province ever liked the fact that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), that Tory member for St. John's North, refused unanimous consent of this House to have Mr. Smallwood's last speech to the House televised. That is alright. That is alright for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), he enjoyed that, he liked that. But let my

MR. THOMS:

friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) want to exercise his parliamentary right and there is something wrong with it.

MR. NEARY:

To stop them from pumping out their political propaganda.

MR. THOMS:

And the press, when they are reporting the incident in the House this morning, I am hoping that they will show the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) for exactly what he is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is that?

MR. NEARY:

They know all about that, a skinful of nastiness.

MR. THOMS:

A small-minded individual who could not come into this House and congratulate our new Lieutenant-Governor without playing cheap politics with it.

MR. NEARY:

Right. Nastiness.

MR. THOMS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are being asked today, we have been asked the last few days, to approve an expenditure of \$.5 billion - \$500 million in interim supply.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy society in which we live. It is not an easy society. Every time you turn around costs are going up and up and up. The wages of these people on strike at the Workers' Compensation Board and College of Trades are not going up to keep pace with it.

Mr. Chairman, wives are working in this Province and all over North America to the detriment of children. I believe to the detriment of children, wives are working. Mr. Chairman, why are they working? I think we all have to stop, all members of all Parliaments have to stop and ask that question, Why are they working?

MR. THOMS: They are not working to buy pleasure yachts, they are not working to buy Summer homes. They are not working to buy the luxuries of life, Mr. Chairman, they are working to buy groceries. They are working to buy groceries for their children to keep their children from suffering from malnutrition. Working wives are not working to buy new dresses or new cars or new shoes, the money that they have coming in, their wages, it is being used to put food and clothing on their children. And I think it is a very serious situation.

If I may just conclude, some day before too long, I believe that these people are going to rise up - I do not mean in any great revolution or anything, but I think they are going to bring it to our attention more forcibly.

MR. NEARY: A day of reckoning.

MR. THOMS: There is a day of reckoning.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
I will finish my thoughts on this some other time.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Seeing I have another chance to speak so far on this Interim Supply Bill - I have been away from the Province most of the week. I note there were a number of comments made pertaining to the fisheries and the fact that we are asking for a little more than \$7 million in this legislation. I think I will take the opportunity to put forward to the House the position with regard to some recent so-called controversy as it pertains to the fishery and the harvesting of fish stocks. And I want to make sure all members of the House understand, because I was somewhat annoyed when I saw the -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Chairman.

There is no quorum in the House,

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):
please?

Would the Clerk count the members,

MR. MORGAN:
boy, I guess.

They are all campaigning in Bellevue,

MR. NEARY:

They are not all campaigning.

MR. MORGAN:
are out there.

Well, I hope so, all your members

MR. CHAIRMAN:
bell, please.

There is not a quorum. Ring the

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

We have a quorum.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned

I wanted to comment, based on the fact that we are asking for more than \$7 million in this bill for fisheries, on some of the more current issues on the fishing industry. And it was very disturbing to me, to say the least, when I came back from a fish exhibition in Boston on Thursday, to see on television that same night the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Stirling) for the Province talking about trading away our Northern cod stocks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

MR. MORGAN:

Obviously he was totally

confused over the situation but it is disturbing when you have people in responsible positions not knowing the facts and going on television and talking that way, talking about trading away the Northern cod stocks for fish on the Scotian Shelf. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, there is no fish on the Scotian Shelf and that is the reason why the companies with the large trawlers are moving away from the Scotian Shelf, the lack of fish over there, to the Northern cod stocks. And then I saw him try to twist around and try and play politics with a major issue where we have plants down in Jackson's Arm and plants down in Triton and a plant in Charleston, a plant in Dildo, and I can go on around the Northeast Coast of the Province, this Winter, that were closed down because of an inadequate supply of raw material. At the same time the company who owned these same plants I just mentioned, took 8 million pounds of Northern cod away from the waters of our Province for further processing when they had these plants closed. Now, it has to be made clear that no politician in this Province today should play politics with such an

MR. MORGAN: important issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: And to try to twist the facts to make it look like the Newfoundland government was now fighting with the Nova Scotian government, was totally irresponsible on the part of the Liberal Leader in this Province, totally irresponsible.

MR. WARREN: Resign and let Neary take over.

MR. MORGAN: Because the fact is there is not a confrontation between governments, it is merely called a confrontation, a discussion or debate over us as a government wanting to make sure that the codfish that is caught in our waters off the Labrador coast, that fish be landed and processed in the plants owned by these companies, not telling these companies to take their fish and land it in somebody else's fish plants. If you have a fish plant in Triton put your fish in there, if you have a fish plant in Jackson's Arm put your fish in there, or in Dildo or in Charleston or in Lewisporte, where the same company owns all these plants. The plants are without jobs in the Wintertime and no Newfoundlander, whether it be on the Liberal side of the House or this side of the House, should ever question the need for additional jobs for Newfoundlanders, no one should ever question that. And that is all we are saying.

And I will be sitting down this coming week with the company concerned and we will discuss and debate and hopefully have a satisfactory arrangement at the end, because that same company right now today, this week, that same company's application is in for additional facilities in Trinity Bay, additional facilities in White Bay and in Pacquet. They want to get a licence to process in Pacquet, they want to get additional facilities in Bonne Bay, they want to build a new plant on the St. Barbe Coast,

MR. MORGAN: they want to double their expansion in Lewisporte - the same company, applications on my desk right now in the provincial office. And all we are saying to that company, and we will say it this week when I meet with them, this coming week, Mr. Jerry Nickerson, Mr. Harold Nickerson and the Vice-Presidents, I will say: "Gentleman, look, all we want from you people is this"-

MR. NEARY: Shocking.

MR. MORGAN: - the hon. gentleman who just spoke just says 'shocking'. When that same hon. gentleman - now let us be fair, let us look at it from a fair stand point - over in his own district this past Winter a Nova Scotian company called Highland Fisheries was taking fish back to Nova Scotia for process from the hon. gentleman of LaPoile's district (Mr. Neary), the Port aux Basques area -

MR. NEARY: Without a licence.

MR. MORGAN: - he was taking fish back unprocessed.

MR. NEARY: Without a licence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: Now, there was a bitter complaint from the hon. gentleman and rightly so, and rightly so I agree with him 100 per cent, In fact, it was brought to my attention immediately and I said, 'Well, if a Nova Scotian company is taking fish through Port aux Basques, landing it on the wharf, putting it aboard a truck and taking it back to Nova Scotia, something is wrong.'

AN HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: What was the complaint?

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, then there was a bitter complaint from the hon. gentleman and we were successful in stopping the operation. Now, the same hon. gentleman says 'Oh, no, Mr. Morgan is all wrong when he goes out and demands

April 3, 1981

Tape No. 943

SD - 4

MR. MORGAN:

Nickersons to put fish in Triton
and Charleston and Dildo and these places, he is wrong'.

So he is against the Northeast

MR. MORGAN:

Coast of the Province, but he is for his own district. A rather parochial point of view, I would say. That is wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is for nothing.

MR. MORGAN:

So let us be fair. Let us be fair about the whole thing. The situation is we should never try to twist this issue and make it a partisan issue because I am sure that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), being the politician he is, would never want to see jobs lost at any of the plants I mentioned on the Northeast Coast.

MR. NEARY:

Right. No way.

MR. MORGAN:

But we are losing jobs. The fact is we are losing jobs. At the same time the company is losing money in these plants. They are losing money. The plant was only operating for a very small part of the year. So that is one I want to clarify.

The other is that right now in our Province - I have to agree with one statement the Liberal Leader (Mr. Stirling) made a few days ago, he said the fishery was in a total mess in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. MORGAN:

And I have to agree with him 100 per cent. Never before have so many complaints - last week, for example, my secretary, my own personal secretary, spent three days doing nothing else but - what? - registering mail from bona fide fishermen putting in complaints, asking me to go to Mr. LeBlanc and try to get their licencing problem straightened up. Thousands of fishermen right now, and I say thousands of genuine, bona fide fishermen, who are denied the right to fish, full time this year and next year and who will possibly lose their licenses to fish, salmon, and lobster and herring and possibly caplin, with his quotas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. MORGAN: There is a situation where the Fishermen's Union has gone to Ottawa just recently, the Fishermen's Union, and stood firmly behind the things we are saying as a Province here, put forward, in my view, an excellent brief to the Federal Committee in the House of Commons, the Committee on the Fisheries and Agriculture, put forward an excellent brief, Mr. Chairman. They complained about the quota on the inshore gear, fixed gear inshore waters. They complained about the new gulf region going over in Moncton, New Brunswick somewhere, managing the Western part of our Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lay it on them.

MR. MORGAN: They complained about all these issues. They complained about the plan in Ottawa, which is still in Ottawa today, to allow the foreign nations to take 15,000 metric tons this year. If Germany, and France and England can get together, or Britian, and come to some agreement, and the EEC, Canada is still planning to sign the Canada EEC agreement -

MR. BARRY: Shame!

MR. MORGAN: - to allow foreign countries to come this Fall and take 15,000 metric tons of our cod.

MR. BAIRD: Shame!

MR. MORGAN: - when at the same time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Do you know how many jobs that is?

MR. MORGAN: - when at the same time we have fish plants which will be closed down because of no fish. Now, that is the kind of position the Fishermen's Union is taking and it is the right one. We have been saying it for months. In fact, almost a year now I have been saying it. These are bad policies -

N HON. MEMBER: 25,000 -

MR. MORGAN: the putting on of the inshore quotas and these kind of things are all bad policies and are creating confusion in the fisheries.

The Liberal Leader (Mr. Stirling) obviously was trying to score a point against me by saying, "The fishery of Newfoundland is in a mess," not realizing, of course, that all the policies that control the fishery -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right you are.

MR. MORGAN: - are coming from Ottawa, and Ottawa only.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Chairman, again I want to say, you know, I know the Leader was out - he is not here today in the House but I think we know where he is, out campaigning. Maybe the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can defend him but he goes on television and he says - he tells an outright lie, an outright lie.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: And I can say it in the House, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! Yes, I would ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to withdraw that term which is unparliamentary. I would ask you to withdraw it.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am in your hands. I will withdraw, well, unqualified.

MR. NEARY: But you are not in Your Honour's hands.

MR. MORGAN: And I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I will say what I just said outside the House. In fact, I said it a few minutes on one of the tapes, on the electronic media, talking about the fact the Fishermen's Union will not meet with

MR. MORGAN: the provincial minister. Well, the Fishermen's Union and Fishermen's Committees have met with me, for example, five different times since the beginning of this calendar year. This afternoon at two-thirty we are sitting down in my office with the Fishermen's Union, full executive, a committee of the crab fishermen from around the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, a committee from the caplin fishermen from the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, the Fish Trades Association, and the independent companies, all in one big meeting this afternoon, sitting down to do what? - to try and resolve the problems created by the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is what they are. Problems where the crab fishermen are going to loose - already lost - last week every crab fisherman lost a herring licence. Every man had the right to fish for crab last week but then the federal minister came last week and took away their herring licence from them. Now they are talking about taking away their caplin licences from them.

So, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY:

What is the problem?

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you. The message says, 'One minute'.

So, Mr. Chairman, the situation is that these are the kinds of things we are doing in the Province together. We are all working together in Newfoundland, there is no question about that, the Fishermen's Union, the Fish Trades, the independents, the fishermen, the Fishermen's Committees working with government, this government here, to try to resolve local problems. But we cannot resolve them without the policies being changed in Ottawa and a whole change of attitude from Ottawa, which has to come one of these days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I believe the announcement of Dr. Paddon today being the new Lieutenant-Governor of the Province is a good indication - I do not think the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) really said it, but it does show that the federal government is concerned about the unity of Newfoundland and Labrador and it just shows another indication, Mr. Chairman, that there is more concern expressed by the Government of Canada about the unity of this Province than by the provincial government, itself.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) just spoke and he said, 'We are working together with the Fish Trades, the union.' You know, Mr. Chairman, that is the first time that I can recall the Minister of Fisheries saying, finally, that he is beginning to work together with the Fish Trades and the Fishermen's Union - at least finally, Mr. Chairman - and I hope that the Minister of Fisheries really saw the

MR. WARREN: light, that in order to do anything at all for the fisheries, we have to work together with the Fish Trades and the Fishermen's Union.

When asking for \$448 million in Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman, I say it is ridiculous to ask for so much at this time. It is only another eleven days, Mr. Chairman, according to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), before the Budget will be brought down. The Minister of Finance said we are not in any trouble until the 8th of the month, and from the 8th to the 14th is only six days, Mr. Chairman. And surely goodness, Mr. Chairman, we do not need \$448 million. I understand the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) is trying to mumble something over there. If this was money, Mr. Chairman, to pay the people who are on strike at the Workers' Compensation Board and the College of Trades and Technology, if that were the money to pay those two groups, Mr. Chairman, I would be the first to agree with it.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said there is no confrontation between the Nova Scotia Government and the Newfoundland Government pertaining to the fisheries. Well, Mr. Chairman, either the Minister of Fisheries misled the House today or the Minister of Fisheries for the Nova Scotia Government, on television the other evening, was misleading the people of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland when he did say there is definitely a turmoil between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia pertaining to the fisheries, Mr. Chairman.

Earlier today, Mr. Chairman, I presented a petition in this House signed by 294 people in the community of Nain.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) got up afterwards and said if the hon. member for the district was interested in finding jobs for those people, then they could afford to pay their hydro bills. Now, Mr. Chairman, what nonsense coming from a minister of the Crown! Mr. Chairman, we must realize that because of this government there are no jobs in this district. There are no jobs other than in fisheries and these people cannot do anything other than fish. And, Mr. Chairman, at this time in the year you cannot go out in boat, if the hon. member does not know, because all the coast is icebound.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) also spoke about the Leader of the Opposition on television. The Premier of the Province, Mr. Chairman - there must be something lacking, Mr. Chairman - it is the first time I can remember, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier of the Province refused to go on T.V. Now, in itself, Mr. Chairman, that must be a very important event in the life of this government and in the two years since June, 1979 up to the present day, the Premier has finally decided, 'Well, look, I am not going to go on

MR. WARREN:

to debate the fisheries.' Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say there has to be some problem, there has to be some problem when the Premier finally says, no. And only just last night, Mr. Chairman, only just last night the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would not go on television to debate with the President of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees. Mr. Chairman, there must be something wrong. This government is getting in trouble, Mr. Chairman. This government is getting in deep, deep trouble. And when you see the President of the Treasury Board and the Premier not grabbing TV time, there has to be something wrong, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this government is in complete chaos, is in complete chaos and here they are asking for \$448 million eleven days before the Budget is brought down. Mr. Chairman, I think it is utterly ridiculous to come in with such an outstanding amount. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, why do the different ministers not lay upon the table what they are going to use it for? Like, for example, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor)—what is the big necessity of \$8 million between now and the fourteenth of April, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Labrador

MR. WARREN:

What is the big essential of \$114 million for education for, Mr. Chairman? I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the President of the Treasury Board is so money happy today, so money happy last night, I wonder if there is any money in his budget for a Northern allowance for government employees in Labrador? Government employees in Labrador, Mr. Chairman, are receiving the lowest Northern allowance paid for any government with employees working in the North, right across Canada. They are receiving

MR. WARREN: the lowest Northern allowance of any people working in the North, from town councils, from any government right across Canada, Mr. Chairman. And this is the Government of Newfoundland which is supposedly concerned about the people and about its employees, Mr. Chairman.

I would say the same thing to this government, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier said to a news reporter on TV awhile ago when the news reporter made an insinuation that maybe there was something wrong with the statements from the former Minister of Transportation. The Premier looked at the lady reporter and said, "Shame, shame for you to think of such things. Shame." Now, Mr. Chairman, if we look back over that it was not shame after all, was it? We know that this government, Mr. Chairman, is leading a corrupt life. We know, that this government is definitely in chaos and it was not shame for the reporter to ask the Premier, and to ask questions to the Premier concerning members of his Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). There are concerns, there are concerns in my district about the licensing programme announced by the federal Department of Fisheries. I am concerned about it, Mr. Chairman. I have written to the minister on many, many occasions asking for clarification and asking for the licenses to go from part-time to full-time, which they justly deserve. However, Mr. Chairman, I also understand, there was a release awhile ago, that there will not be any changes in the licensing system for this year. So, Mr. Chairman, it is going to take a year before any changes are going to be made anyhow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we on this side are not in agreement with the government asking for such a substantial amount and asking for this Interim

MR. WARREN:

Supply bill to go through. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied along with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and other members in the House this morning, to make sure that that bill will not go through today. That bill will not go through, Mr. Chairman, because a request was made yesterday of the government and they have not given us any evidence at all that they are going to supply us with the information that we requested yesterday. Unless they supply us with the information, I cannot see why, Mr. Chairman, we should agree with this Interim Supply bill passing through today.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of days ago, just to show you how this government acts, and the Department of Social Services, a couple of days ago I had the opportunity to visit a lady in one of the communities in the Bellevue district. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, this government should be ashamed. A lady with four kids

MR. WARREN: from the ages of two years to eight years, living in a shack with just a little small room for a kitchen and a room for a bedroom. No bathroom, nothing else, that is it. Just a bedroom for four kids and herself and a little small kitchen and that is what she is living in and she has been told that they cannot find any place anywhere else in Newfoundland to put her. This is what the Department of Social Services is saying, 'We cannot find anyplace for her'.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a shame.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments to make in regard to statements by hon. members opposite. I do not really have too many because the remarks of members opposite have not been very precise. I would like to just deal with the one from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The member for LaPoile asked that, I believe, the log in regard to the government aircraft as it is used by the hon. the Premier, the information be supplied.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for LaPoile is clearly again just getting a red herring on the go here. He is suggesting by that that the hon. the Premier is doing something with the aircraft that he is not supposed to do.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is imputing motives, Mr. Chairman. I am no such thing. I want to say it just for the benefit - that is not my point of order. I did not say any such thing. There is no charges or accusations, it was a simple request for information. The hon. gentleman has assigned motives to my asking that question. This House

MR. NEARY: is entitled to ask for information, Mr. Chairman, and I would submit that you ask the minister to stop trying to parrot the President of the Council (W. Marshall), in being nasty and withdraw that statement because it is not true.

DR. COLLINS: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt, I just withdraw any remarks that would cause dissension.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that would clarify it.
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I can assure members of this hon. committee that the Premier uses the government aircraft on government business, and solely on government business and precisely on government business. Now, if there was any question about that, I have absolutely no doubt that in his report the Auditor General would bring this point forward and as everyone knows, the Auditor General reports to this House. He does not report to government or to a department of government, he reports to this House and it is his duty to bring to the notice of this House any expenditure that the House has voted where it is inappropriately or incorrectly used.

Now, if the Auditor General is satisfied that the hon. the Premier is using the government aircraft in a correct manner, I do not see why the precise details, which are purely administrative details— and this government has thousands and thousands of administrative details. If we tabled, in this House all the administrative details of every department in this government, or every agency this government had to do with, this House could not perform its duties. So, I do not think there is any point in going into that any longer.

DR. COLLINS: Now, I would just like to - I am sorry the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (G. Warren) has left the House because he is labouring under a serious misapprehension. Possibly he is within earshot. I would like to just make sure he understands the process here. He is suggesting that we do not need an Interim Supply Bill because within a few days we are going to bring in the Budget. So he says why not wait for a few days, bring in the Budget and there you are? Now, if the hon. member for Torngat can guarantee that hon. members opposite will pass the Budget the day it is brought in or the day after, I think I will go to my colleagues and ask them that we do withdraw the Interim Supply Bill. The hon. member should understand that the government will not have authority to spend out of the main estimates until the main estimates are passed and we are anticipating that it is not likely to be until sometime in June so clearly we have to have interim supply to cover that period. Now, I hope the hon. member for Torngat Mountains is not under any misapprehensions on that, or any other member of this House.

The hon. member mentioned a number of departments, you know, why do they need this amount of money? Well, I can tell him. He mentioned the Department of Development. The Department of Development

DR. J. COLLINS: needs \$66,700 for the minister's office, various aspects of that; for general administration \$212,700 is required; for development services \$206,000 is required. This is for the interim period, the three month period. For economic research and analysis \$155,400 is required; for promotional services \$681,300; for a development organization the sum is - the total there, that includes grants to NORDCO and so on and so forth, comes to \$5,233,500; for special projects \$251,200, and so on. And similar items like that make up the total amount required for the Department of Development on interim supply of \$8,666,800.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) also wondered why government is not giving more for Northern allowance, and not giving further amounts for social assistance. Well, I can assure the hon. member for Torngat Mountains, that government is aware of the problems in both those areas as well as they are in other areas and other areas include salaries to public servants, and we are trying to spread around the available funds to us in a most equitable fashion possible.

Perhaps I could just make a brief mention in regard to the public service salaries as it relates to the two ongoing labour disputes, just a few points on that that hon. members may not be aware of.

Now firstly, on the public service labour scene totally, at the present time there are approximately 165 public servants on strike and the impression seems to be around that there is a tremendous amount of turmoil and unrest and that sort of thing in the public service. I think we should remember that there are 165 public service workers on strike. Already settled are 5,500 workers. And we still have to settle with 12,000 workers. So we are about halfway through the packet, halfway through the exercise and already we have a ninety-eight per cent settlement of the

DR. COLLINS: financial packets offered. Now that is a very good record. That does not suggest that there is a very, very bad labour scene at the present time. I hope it goes that way. I do not know if it will. Perhaps it will get sticky as time goes on, I do not know. But I certainly can say that up to this point in time the packet has been good, the scene has been good and I hope the small percentage of workers who are on strike will be able to settle in the near future.

There has also been comments about the level of payment for the lowest paid workers. I think that should be put in this context, or this is one context that might be helpful. I believe the minimum wage at the present time is \$3.45.

MR. DINN: As of the 1st. yes.

DR. COLLINS: As of the 1st. of April the minimum wage is \$3.45. In the contract which has now ended the lowest worker at the Trades College got \$4.80 an hour, it works out to that. They are not paid on that basis. They are paid on salary basis but if you work it out on an hourly basis it comes out to that. Now, the minimum wage is \$3.45, under the old contract the lowest worker got \$4.80. Now, under the new contract that goes up to \$5.80. And that is the lowest paid worker there. That card that went around, that individual to whom that card is purported to relate, under the old contract that particular worker was getting \$5.48 an hour, it works out to \$5.48 an hour. Under the new arrangement he will get the equivalent of \$6.74 an hour. Now, remember at this point in time the minimum wage is \$3.45.

DR. COLLINS:

I thought that might be helpful to hon. members, to put this in context. The TV was another point that came up, I think that has been adequately dealt with really. I mean, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is really being a bit inconsistent. He said we should have all sorts of TV in here but, nevertheless, on one of the more important days in the House - I suppose the two most important days are the Throne Speech that sends out the general thrust of government policy, and the Budget Day Speech when that lays out how these policies are to be put into effect by applying funding to them, and on one of those most important days the hon. member says, no, I am not going to let TV in the House. Now that seems to me terribly inconsistent.

In terms of holding up the Interim Supply, I just forget who brought up that point, possibly the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) or possibly the hon. member for LaPoile. You know, I would regret that deeply. I would think that if interim supply is held up in such a way that the public servants in this Province are not paid on time, I think that would be most unfortunate but it would not be our responsibility, it would be the responsibility of the hon. members opposite.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. COLLINS: I would move, therefore, that the resolution be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall the resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I believe Your Honour anticipates -

the answer that was given at the outset of the hon. gentleman's remarks was absolutely incredible. I have never heard anything like it in this House of Assembly since I have been here in the last nineteen years. We asked the

MR. NEARY: government for information, we asked the minister for information about the government aircraft and what was the minister's answer? What was it? I will summarize it for you, here is what the hon. gentleman said, 'Take my word for it', he said, 'take my word for it, the Premier in all probability uses the government aircraft for government business, now take my word for that'. No information at all, just take his word for it. Well, as the hon. gentleman would say in his own profession, I would like a second opinion. I would like to see -

DR. COLLINS: The Auditor General's Report.

MR. NEARY: No, I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned that because I have right in front of me the Auditor General's Report. As a matter of fact, that is what prompted me to raise the matter in the first place and I thought a good place to start with the paragraphs put in the Auditor General's Report, the good place to start would be in the Premier's Office. Now what did the Auditor General say? Well, let us see what he said in his latest report and I will quote, section 43, page 26, item 43 in the Auditor General's Report. What does he say - 'Unsatisfactory administrative and accounting control over use of government air services', that is the heading. 'In previous reports, the Auditor General has commented on the serious lack of control by the Department of Transportation and Communications over the payment of public funds for air services. He concluded that action should be taken, without delay, to develop, document and implement systems and procedures to establish strict and satisfactory control over the use of government air services.'

MR. THOMS: Imagine that.

MR. NEARY: Now, the hon. minister just referred me to the Auditor General. Is he going to wait for another report? This has been in every report for the last

MR. S. NEARY: ten years only he is more serious this time. Just listen to some of the discrepancies that the Auditor General found: 'My 1979-80 audit disclosed that, in certain areas, the department has yet to completely rectify and identify weaknesses previously reported. During the year there continued to be difficulties with incomplete documents authorizing the use of air services; inaccurate and incomplete flight reports; instances where passengers on aircraft were not identified on flight reports;'-

MR. WINDSOR: They do not have to be.

MR. NEARY: They do have to be.

MR. WINDSOR: No, they do not.

MR. NEARY: Listen to this,

MR. WINDSOR: Says who?

MR. NEARY: 'purposes of trips not available; and necessary authorizing signatures not on some flight reports.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, did I hear the hon. gentleman refer me to the Auditor General? Well, I am quoting directly from the Auditor General's Report. 'As well,

MR. NEARY: there was evidence that the department was not undertaking a satisfactory scrutiny of invoices, flight reports, and other supporting documents before making payment to the various companies providing air services. The following cases highlight the deficiency: Information in two flight reports submitted by a company indicated that one pilot was flying two different aircraft at the same time. Flying hours were invoiced but not supported by flight reports.'

I am not going to read it all, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to read it all, I am just going to revert back now again to what the hon. gentleman said in his answering the questions that I put to him. Here you have a government asking for \$500 million, a half a billion dollars in interim supply and we put one, one simple question, the rest of it, the hon. gentleman can ignore. About the television and so forth, he can ignore that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are worried about one thing, one?

MR. NEARY: Yes, one question, And here is the question. Let me repeat the question and then let me repeat the minister's answer. What we asked for was this, we asked for the number of times the Premier's Office requisitioned the use of the government aircraft. Is that unreasonable? I ask hon. members, in all fairness, is that unreasonable? I ask the minister if it is unreasonable. Or is the House entitled to this information? Now, the number of times the aircraft was requested, the number of passengers carried on the aircraft and the names of the passengers. Is that unreasonable? We are spending public money, taxpayers' funds, taxpayers' money on the use of that aircraft. The taxpayers are entitled to know how many times it has been used by the Premier and the ministers, the number of passengers who travel on the aircraft and the purpose of the visit, the purpose of the trip.

MR. STAGG: What about trips to St. Pierre?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about them?

MR. STAGG: In 1969.

MR. NEARY: Yes, in 1969, what about it?

Now, I am not going to get sidetracked off with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) -

MR. WINDSOR: (Inaudible) should be interesting, tell us.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I could tell you all about it.

And that was brought up in this House before and the hon. gentleman who brought it up is no longer with us, he got tossed out on his ear and he had to withdraw it.

So, I am not going to be sidetracked by the yahoos down there in the corner into their scummy little interjections, their rotten, scummy little interjections.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Calm down.

MR. NEARY: Let me come back now, Mr. Chairman, let me come back -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If there was anything wrong, the hon. gentleman has recourse as well as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who lowered his low-level nastiness in this House again yesterday. If the hon. gentleman sees anything wrong he knows what he can do, just the same as I know what I can do. And if the Premier talks about innuendo and slander and personal low-level attacks in this House, he should talk to the hon. gentleman - through his innuendo yesterday that is not going to work, it is not going to fly. There is nobody in this House, nobody, and I do not care which side of the House he sits on, who has a certificate of cleanliness like the hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now, that is right. I have my certificate. I have my certificate. Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt);

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, if there had been anything wrong with the member for LaPoile (S.Neary) they have had eight years. If there had been anything wrong -

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible)

MR. NEARY:

Was there anything wrong? No, there was nothing wrong.

Because who, who above anybody else in this House would this crowd love to stick the knife into? Who above anyone else, Mr. Chairman? Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come back to the Minister of Finance (Dr.Collins) and ask the Minister of Finance again in all fairness to the people of this Province, let the minister produce the information that the Opposition is asking for in connection with that aircraft. And what are the questions? I hope the press will take note of the questions and the answers. They are listening, do not worry, they are listening. How many times did the Premier's Office request the use of the government aircraft? Well, if I could only get the hon. gentleman's attention. How many times? How many times did the Premier's Office request the use of the government aircraft, the names of the passengers that travelled on the aircraft and the purpose of the trip and the cost? Now, are we going to get that information?

AN HON. MEMBER:

And how much toilet paper was used on it?

MR. NEARY:

How much booze was used on it? And how many in-laws and relatives travelled on it?

MR. NEARY: That is why we cannot get the list, and the hon. gentleman has the gall to stand up and make a statement in this House that the government aircraft is used by the Premier at all times for government business. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have evidence to the contrary.

MR. MORGAN: Lay it on the table. Table it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well, I am not making any charges or any accusations -

MR. MORGAN: No!

MR. NEARY: - nor innuendoes at this point in time, all I am asking for is information that this House is entitled to have and the hon. gentleman is refusing to give it to us. And until we get that information, Mr. Chairman, there will be no interim supply as far as I am concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I gather then that despite what was indicated yesterday by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) to the effect that interim supply would go through today, that we are not going to get interim supply. I gather that is the position. The questions that are asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) are questions that he asks, he gets the answers to them; he is not satisfied with them so is determined that interim supply is not going to go through. So if that is the case, if we are not going to have any vote on it today, it is just as well to rise the Committee.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) says we will not get interim supply today, Mr. Chairman, so I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have directed him to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 6, 1981 at 3:00 p.m.