

VOL. 3

NO. 51

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1981

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Council in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House about the discussions that were opened up today with the Premier of Alberta in connection with borrowings on the part of this Province? Could the hon. gentleman give us a few details?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I was not privy to the discussions but there were discussions between the Premier of this Province and the Premier of Alberta touching upon many subjects. I am not in a position to give the hon. member at this present time any report of that conversation having said, as I say, not being privy to the conversation. And in any event, Mr. Speaker, even when the Premier returns I do not know necessarily whether the conversations that took place between he and Premier Lougheed would be a matter that he would necessarily wish to reveal.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are so many urgent and pressing matters to be questioned in this House you would think that the hon. the Premier would be in his seat today. But could the hon. gentleman tell us whether the Premier of Alberta (Mr. Lougheed) agreed to give

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland a preferential interest rate, or if we borrow from the Heritage Fund, which is substantial now in Alberta, will we be paying the same rate of interest that we pay the chartered banks or any of the bonding houses? Will the interest rate be lower? Will it be better? Is there any enticement, any encouragement to borrow from the Heritage Fund or will we be paying whatever the going interest rate is?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the last borrowings that were entered into, borrowing arrangements between both provinces, resulted in Alberta giving a favoured rate to this Province, favoured in the sense that we were treated as a province with the highest debt rating. In other words, the province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, was prepared to treat us as equal to all Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Would that the federal government in Ottawa, the friends of the hon. gentlemen there opposite who they love and emulate from time to time, would treat us equal to all Canadians in other respects as well.

MR. HANCOCK: They give you too much now and you do not show any appreciation.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I did not hear Your Honour call 'admit strangers' but the hon. the Premier did walk in. And perhaps the hon. gentleman could bring us up to date now on negotiations with Mr. Lougheed in connection with borrowing for this Province? What kind of an interest

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2041

AH-3

MR. NEARY: rate are we talking about
and how much money are we talking about borrowing from the
Heritage Fund in Alberta in this fiscal year?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been borrowing from the Heritage Fund in Alberta for quite a number of years now and I think it is clear to all the members of this House and, I think, to the majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that if we can get a cheaper rate from the Province of Alberta than we can in the markets of the world, then the taxpayers in Newfoundland are better off, the Province is better off, the country is better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So we are very proud of the relationship we have developed with Alberta as it relates to borrowing and we will continue to borrow where we can save the people of this Province the most money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is Alberta. That is where we will borrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So that is where it is. How much we will borrow this year from the Heritage Fund, how much we will borrow in New York, how much we will borrow in Toronto, how much we will borrow in Europe is a matter that we will decide - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the government will decide from time to time as we look forward to what the windows are in the various marketplaces of the world to borrow money.

It is known, I guess, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as it is to most members opposite, that the amount of money we intend to borrow this year is a matter of record from the budget and where we borrow, when we borrow will be determined by the market forces in the various negotiations that we have

PREMIER PECKFORD: with our fiscal agents from the various markets in the world, one of which happens to be the Heritage Fund in Alberta.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, surely, if the Premier held preliminary discussions with the oil sheik from Western Canada this morning in connection with borrowing, surely they must have talked about an interest rate, they must have talked about the amount of money that we are going to borrow in this Province from the Heritage Fund in Alberta this year. Surely, the Premier is not trying to tell this House that they did not discuss the interest rate. And what I am asking the hon. gentleman, a specific question, can he tell us now what interest rate we are talking about when we are borrowing from Alberta this year? And how much did the Premier indicate to the Premier of Alberta this morning that we may need to borrow this year from the Heritage Fund? And did Mr. Lougheed agree to this preferential interest rate or did he agree to the amount that we need to borrow from Alberta this year? Surely, there must have been some agreement. Give us a few of the details.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: In due course, Mr. Speaker, the details will become known to the hon. the member for LaPoile. He has no worry about that. When the government intends to borrow, how much it intends to borrow from the Heritage Fund or wheresoever, we will inform the hon. the member for LaPoile. As the great financial adviser to the Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile will be the first to know when we are going to borrow in the financial

PREMIER PECKFORD: markets of the world. Let it be recorded, Mr. Speaker, that it was because of Newfoundland's initiatives last year that the Alberta Government changed its procedure in loaning money to provinces so that all provinces, regardless of what the rate was in New York or in Paris, would get Aaa rates. And that continues to this day, and it was this Province that initiated that great Canadian concept so that now we can get Aaa rates

PREMIER PECKFORD: in Alberta when we can only get Baal rates in London or in New York and that will save us millions of dollars over the next few years. When we are ready to borrow, how much we are going to borrow, the interest rates that are going to be charged will all become known to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that great financial advisor, that great whiz. We will let him know in due course, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, let me welcome the Premier back and let me ask him a question which is of great importance to the employers and the employees in this Province and that is, has the Premier, at this stage, asked for the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn)?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as in the case of borrowing money. when the government borrows money, we will inform the Opposition at that time how much we are going to borrow, where we are going to borrow. If I have certain remarks that I want to make in this hon. House about individual ministries or individuals who will now hold portfolios, I will make them in due course, Mr. Speaker. And I will inform the hon. member whenever that becomes operative -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if in fact it does become operative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I can understand, and maybe the Premier from Alberta is watching in the wings and

MR. STIRLING: our local addition has to show that he is a great and fearless man who answers to no one. I wonder could he now tell us whether or not it is government policy that enabled the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to say to the Labour Relations Board 'It seems to me to be tantamount to a denial of natural justice to deny a hearing in such a case?' Was the minister then speaking on behalf of the government?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let me first clarify some of the preamble that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned. He indicated that the Premier of this Province answers to no one. Well, I will have the hon. Leader of the Opposition know I do not answer to him. I answer to this House and to the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not answer to the Leader of the Opposition, I do not answer to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I answer to this institution, to this House and to the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is who I answer to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, government policy on labour relations is quite well known. We have one of the best records in Canada and I am proud that the minister who now holds that portfolio has been pursuing that with a great deal of diligence over the last number of weeks and months. We will continue to be fair to employers and to employees, we will continue to do the jobs we were elected to do and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to join us in being part of the great progressive and reform-minded legislation that we put forward over the last couple of years, that we will continue to put forward.

PREMIER PECKFORD: we do not have to take a back seat on labour relations in this Province to any former administration or to any existing political party who has advocated certain things in the realm of labour relations. We can stand on our record on that one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I realize the Premier may not have seen the letter of May 19, maybe when he gets up he can tell me whether or not he has seen the letter of May 19 or a copy of the letter of May 19, signed by Mr. G. C. Easton, Mr. C. W. White, Mr. F. W. Russell, Mr. G. Gillingham, Mr. W. Alcock, Mr. J. Walsh, Mr. R. Gosse, Mr. F. Bowdring who are all of the members of the Labour Relations Board appointed by this administration who said, "All members of the Board are unanimous in their alarm and concern, that you would deem it proper to suggest to the Board the manner in which it might deal with a matter properly before the Board and within its jurisdiction."

I ask the Premier if, in view of the great speech he just made a minute or so ago supporting the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), his colleague, now that he has heard of these people who unanimously expressed that opinion, has he seen the May 19 letter and has he changed his opinion as a result of that expression by the Labour Relations Board?

MR. WARREN: No, he is too arrogant.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I reiterate as I said a few minutes ago, that this government is proud of its record in labour relations, that we will continue to be fair as it relates to all elements of the labour community of the employer/employee community and that we are proud of our record and there many new reforms and progressive steps we have to take, which we will take with pride. And we will continue to do what we have done as elected officials in this House to make sure that is done.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, regardless -

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

MR. STIRLING: - regardless of the fact that the minister did something which unanimously was rejected by the members of the Labour Relations Board, and regardless of the complete irresponsible attitude now being taken by the Premier who refuses to deal with the specifics -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - apart altogether from that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - and in view of the fact that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has as his main responsibility to be deserving of and having the confidence of both management and labour, and in view of the fact that the Electrical Union, the Fishermen's Union, CUPE, the Newfoundland Construction, Trades and Labour Council, all of these people representing labour have individually, separately said that they have no confidence in the Minister of Labour and Manpower, would the Premier, forgetting the letter, and forgetting that they insulted the Labour Relations Board, but that now there is indication that labour has no confidence in the Minister of Labour and Manpower, does the Premier now

MR. STIRLING: intend to ask for the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and replace him with a man or woman who is more acceptable to labour or do you now decide that this whole government is taking an approach which is anti- labour in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

A good question. A good question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that was a pretty long question there, contained. It might take a long answer.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is trying to imply that this side of the House, for some strange reason only known to the Leader of the Opposition that this government here, is anti-labour. I mean, just let him look at our record over the last couple of years. We have been fair and reasonable with all the labour unions in this Province. We have tried to treat everybody fair and square.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we will continue to do that. We operate an open government. We operate a government that wants to hear from all sectors of the economy. We want to hear from the labour unions. We want to hear from the Employer Association. We have been fair and reasonable and we will continue to do that. And the Leader of the Opposition can try as hard as he likes to try to raint this government with some anti-labour bias. He will not succeed. He has not succeeded in the past, he will not succeed in the present and he will be a dismal failure in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the rules of this House do not force the Premier or a minister to have to answer a question. I am so pleased that he is so concerned about my welfare. However, the fact of the matter is that the labour movement have expressed to the Premier, specifically to the Premier that in this case they have no confidence. They have sent a telegram to him.

MR. L. STIRLING: I would ask the Premier if he has received these telegrams, these responses, these concerns from the labour organizations and what answer has he given them? If he is too arrogant to say to the House of Assembly or admit that there is a problem in this House of Assembly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Would he tell this House of Assembly what answer he has given to the members of the labour organizations who have asked for a very reasonable reply?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously if a number of groups in the Province have sent me representations I have received them unless the mail system or the telex system or whatever else has suddenly broken down. Obviously I have received them and will be responding to those organizations in due course as is normal with all representations that come to my office or come to me personally. Sure I will, yes! Absolutely I have received representations and I will be responding to them which is quite normal. As a matter of fact, responding fairly quickly too, Mr. Speaker. We respond quickly to representations that come to us. And we will put our position forward as to what I believe and answer the questions that the various groups have. That is normal and that will be done, Mr. Speaker. We receive representations every day on various issues and we will respond to them. Then after they are responded to, out of courtesy to the organization that has responded - they have to get the response first and then if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) wants me to table it in the House then well, then we will table it in the House. But out of courtesy to those organizations they must receive the response first before

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2045

DW - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: I tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) what the response is. I would be very discourteous to those organizations if suddenly I gave to the Leader of the Opposition, or members

PREMIER PECKFORD:

of the Opposition all of the responses before these unions and these organizations got the response.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But we respond all the time,

Mr. Speaker, and will continue to do so. I thank the hon.

Leader of the Opposition for urging me to ensure that I respond.

But I can assure him I will respond in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and present my views to those

organizations who have made representation to me as we have

done in the past and I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition

for urging me to make that kind of response.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Making a fool of yourself every time you open your mouth.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Premier

knows, interfering with the judicial system is probably one of

the most serious -

MR. HANCOCK: It is a real serious matter.

MR. NEARY: - most serious things that a minister

can do and in this case the Minister of Labour and Manpower

(Mr. Dinn) interfered with a decision of the Labour Relations

Board, or attempted to interfere. Now is the hon. Premier

saying that that now is government policy? Is the Premier

defending that kind of policy, interference with quasi judicial

and judicial processes in this Province? Is that what the

hon. gentleman is saying, he is going to dig in and he does not

MR. NEARY: care about the feelings of the unions in connection with this matter, that he is going to defend the Minister of Labour and Manpower no matter what price we have to pay for it? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, hon. members opposite are free to interpret what I say how they like. I will say what I am going to say. The press will interpret it, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) will interpret it, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will interpret it. And various members around here think a bit differently, or put a certain nuance, or a certain tone on what somebody says, and I am sorry that the member for LaPoile is having such great difficulty understanding what I have said but I think I have made it as clear as I can. I do not know what else I have to say to the hon. member for LaPoile but I have responded to the questions that the hon. members have asked and if he is having some difficulty understanding it well then that is his problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will try to put it in baby talk to see if the hon. gentleman will understand the question.

MR. HANCOCK: Write him a note. Write him a note.

MR. NEARY: The question that I am putting to the hon. gentleman, does his administration condone and defend interference with quasi judicial or the judicial process in this Province? Does the hon. gentleman defend that kind of action on

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2046

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

the part of his minister?

MR. HANCOCK:

Yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I said a few times already this afternoon, our policy is clear on how we deal in labour relations matters in this Province over the last couple of years. It is quite clear to

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the members of the Opposition, it is quite clear to the general public. We will continue to be reasonable and responsible in our dealings with all parts of the economy including the labour unions, including the Employer Association. That is the way we operate. We operate an open government, we want to hear all sides, we want to bring in reasonable and sensible legislation and laws governing that kind of activity (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all I am asking the hon. gentleman for is a simple yes or no answer and forget the rhetoric, because we all know how the trade union movement at this particular moment feels about the administration's philosophy and their policy.

What I am asking the hon. gentleman is this - forget the past - I am asking the hon. gentleman to state whether or not he, himself, or his administration condones in any way, shape or form, interference in the judicial process in this Province by ministers? Yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will have to rule the question out of order. Beauchesne, paragraph 357 quite clearly says, a question "must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused." It is the same question.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Premier. The Premier knows again better than anybody

MR. FLIGHT: else the importance of having a Minister of Labour that has got the confidence of the labour movement. They have to respect his impartiality and his non-partisanship. Now, representatives of the major labour movements in this Province have indicated they have lost their confidence in the minister, they have indicated that they are not prepared to accept the minister any longer in that portfolio. What does the Premier say to them? Is he prepared to foist on them a minister who has lost their confidence and with whom, Mr. Speaker, they are not prepared to deal? We have passed through some very sensitive times this past few months in labour relations and we are going into more sensitive. What is the Premier's position? Does he intend to continue to foist on the labour movement a minister who has lost their confidence when they have come out publicly and said so?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question a hundred different ways in the last five or ten minutes. I can say to the hon. member, I can say to all members of this House that this government is responsible, responsive to what happens in the economy, that includes the labour union movement, that includes the Employer Association. We want to be fair and reasonable in all our dealings. We think we have been in all the things we have done and we will continue to do that, to act that way. And, you know, that is the story on it. We are a responsible, responsive administration to various lobby groups in the community who have legitimate concerns concerning basic substantive policy issues which deal with this Province. We will continue to be responsive as we go along down the road.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier has acknowledged that he has received representation from the labour movement and quite possibly from the management movement but certainly from the labour movement itself and the Premier has indicated that he will deal with it in time. Would the Premier indicate when he intends to give his answer to the labour movement bearing in mind that every day that goes by, the Premier and the administration lose credibility in the eyes of the labour movement in this Province? Can the Premier tell us when labour can expect an answer as to how he intends to deal with this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as representations come to me from time to time, obviously I respond as quickly as I can and I will do that in this case.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: I think this is a very good display. I can understand why there is no television allowed in the House or any radio in the House. It is a good display today to indicate how a question is avoided by this government and causes us to wonder what the real relationship is between Alberta -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is entering more into debate now than the purpose of the Question Period.

MR. HANCOCK: Oh, he is defender today is he?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am just making a comment on the fact that the Speaker will realize that the Premier has not answered the question and this kind of glossing over is probably indicative of the kind of information that has been

MR. STIRLING: given to the House before on a lot of other issues. So I would ask the Premier whether or not it was government policy when the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) accused the IBEW of, in effect, holding the innocent third party, the people of the Province up to ransom, does this reflect his government's attitude about unions?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Government's attitude towards the union movement, towards the employer associations, towards these things in general over the last two or three years have made abundantly clear legislation, abundantly clear Ministerial Statements, abundantly clear in the way we have approached the union movement, the federation of labour and all the rest of them in representations that they have made. As a matter of fact on many, many occasions representations that have been made by the labour movement have been taken and incorporated into legislation and in other areas have been taken and incorporated into other public policy so you know we have been reasonable and fair as it relates to that whole question, Mr. Speaker. As I say, we stand proud in the way we have tried to deal and to walk down the middle of the road as it relates to labour on one side and management on the other and we will continue to be responsible as we continue to look at new legislation and to deal with various labour groups and to deal with the Federation of Labour, deal with management groups in the next few months or the next few years. Our record is clean, our record is clear, our record is responsible and we will continue to act in the way that we have acted in the past, Mr. Speaker, of being responsible and being responsive to all groups in society who have a legitimate concern and want is expressed to government.

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

MR. WARREN: I wish to yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You wish to yield?

The hon. member for LaPoile on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier agree that the Labour Relations Board is in the category of a judicial or quasi judicial body? Would the hon. gentleman agree that the Labour Relations Board is as sensitive as the Public Utilities Board? And the hon. gentleman in this House has so often said that it would be improper and wrong for the government or any minister to interfere with the Public Utilities Board. Would the hon. gentleman say whether or not in his opinion the Labour Relations Board is in that category?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not want to get into a great dissertation upon the role of a quasi judicial body, of a judicial body. I find it passing strange that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would soon start asking for my opinion. Most times in this House when he gets up and rants and raves, Mr. Speaker, he is condemning the opinion that I give him, he is condemning the opinion that this administration is giving him, he has condemned the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Newhook) on what we have said. So I cannot see what value my opinion is to the member for LaPoile. The evidence is overwhelming against my opinion being accepted.

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

MR. NEARY: How childish and arrogant can you get.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we now have a very serious situation in this Province in which you had a minister interfere with a board. That board decided unanimously in their opinion it was interference and the Premier has now decided today to defend that minister in his action. Would the

MR. STIRLING: Premier please advise this House of Assembly whether or not he is saying to this Labour Relations Board that if you are not prepared to accept the interference from the minister then you will have no other choice but to resign?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, they continue to ask for my opinion on a whole range of issues. I would love to know, talking about the dismal performance of the administration or myself, personally, on responding to matters of concern, one would think that the Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I think I was quiet while
(inaudible) member for
St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) on that matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Time is up, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just let it be recorded that we stand on our record as it relates to quasi judicial and judicial bodies in this Province. We have heard from the Opposition on this issue, we would love to hear from them on offshore oil and gas, we would love to hear from them on the fishery, we would love to hear from them on the creation of jobs, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - we would love to hear from them on those things which are important to the average, ordinary Newfoundlander. Where is the Opposition when it comes to the ordinary Newfoundlander? I would like to hear them on some of the issues which are important to the ordinary Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2049

SD - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.
MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I presume -
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
MR. NEARY: Time to go back to Ottawa again.
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
MR. STIRLING: - that from the Premier's answer
he does not consider having a fair and equitable treatment for

MR. L. STIRLING: unions and employees and he does not expect that having a Labour Relations Board that is beyond political interference, he does not consider this important to the average Newfoundlander? Now do I understand the Premier correctly when he says that, in his opinion, having interference by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), is acceptable to his administration?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of things that are important to the ordinary Newfoundlander. I think roads are very important to the average Newfoundlander. I think water and sewer is very important to the average Newfoundlander.

AN HON. MEMBER: The fishery.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think the fishery is very important to the average, ordinary Newfoundlander. I am sure there are people in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Stirling) district - in Badger's Quay, in Valleyfield and in Pound Cove and in Hare Bay and in Gambo. I think there are a lot of people in the Leader of the Opposition's district - ordinary Newfoundlanders in Bonavista North who are very concerned about a whole range of issues which they have to deal with every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we are going to respond to that ordinary Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker. We will respond to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Landlord And Tenants Act, 1973".

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Notices of Motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I now table the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) some while back.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Answers to Questions?

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have approximately seventy-five questions on the Order Paper now and I have received about eight answers. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon ministers to answer questions, written questions that go on the Order Paper. Could Your Honour give us a ruling on it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are diligently trying, and have been over the last couple of weeks, to respond to every single question on the Order Paper and in due course the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and all the members of the Opposi-

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2050

DW - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: tion will have all the answers
they need on all those questions. We are really proud and
we are really working hard to really respond to the new
Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): There is obviously no point of order, no point of order. I think I have ruled many times many precedents for that one.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Heave it out of you, boy.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 620 residents, ordinary people of the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HANCOCK: If this keeps up I will have to ask to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Walter Carter.

MR. NEARY: Walter is running for us the next time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Walter is running for the Liberals the next time.

MR. HANCOCK: The Premier just said that roads were -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: I will wait until some other day, Mr. Speaker, because I only have five minutes to present the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct, and about thirty seconds have been used.

The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes should have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Premier admitted that some of the ordinary people of this Province are concerned about road conditions, but you would never say it by the roads programme that was tabled in this House yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: The prayer of the petition,
Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! This is presentation of petitions now, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: The prayer of the petition reads as follows, Mr. Speaker.

"We the undersigned, from Admiral's Beach through to North Harbour, petition the government, and the Minister of Highways, that their highest consideration be given towards the upgrading and paving of roads in the Mount Carmel through to Colinet and North Harbour area this coming year of 1981, and that a start be made in the early Spring."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the prayer of the petition. Now what are the people in this area looking for, Mr. Speaker, from this administration, this government, Mr. Speaker, that has been running the Province for the last ten or twelve years where we have seen very little or no new construction or paving?

The people in this area, Mr. Speaker, are very upset with the road conditions that they have to drive to work over, that their school children have to travel forty miles a day on to get to school, Mr. Speaker. With the attitude of this government, and the statements made earlier by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that they are upset and no wonder that I defeated the Premier himself in that by-election,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: I have no worries about anybody running against me in the next election. The Premier of this Province, when he was at his peak could not defeat me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see him send somebody out to try to defeat me the next time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Well said.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the people in this area are not looking for something that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: - so arrogant.

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

MR. HANCOCK: You will find out how arrogant I am the next time around, Mr. Speaker.

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

All hon. members are aware that the purpose for presenting a petition is to present concerns of a particular group of residents in a particular area. I suggest to the hon. member now, the comments that he is making really would give rise to debate and there should not be any debate on petitions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Now the Chair has in the past attempted to be fairly flexible and I will continue to do so unless it begins to get out of hand.

The hon. member for St. Mary's-
The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I tried here last year to have this road placed on a priority list so that Ottawa could get involved and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) at the time would not even consider, Mr. Speaker, placing those roads on a cost-

MR. HANCOCK: sharing programme with Ottawa.
So that goes to so how much this government is concerned,
Mr. Speaker, about - they have not got the money to do it
and they do not want to put this section of road on a priority
list to go to Ottawa looking for funding for it. It is
ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

The people in this area, Mr. Speaker,
are upset with their school children, like I said, being bused
forty miles a day back and forth to school. Mr. Speaker, there
is fish being trucked over those sections of road. Roads lead
to resources. We would have one of the largest tourist attractions
on this Island, Mr. Speaker, if it was fully developed, in the
Cape Shore bird sanctuary off Cape St. Mary's,

MR. HANCOCK: It could be the number one tourist attraction in this Province, barring none, if we had some paved roads. What has this government done about it? They have done nothing, Mr. Speaker, in the last ten years only sit on their fat rears and try to abuse the Opposition in this House. The people out in this area, particularly in North Harbour, Harricott are not looking for something out of the ordinary, Mr. Speaker. They are just looking for road conditions that are fit to drive over that should be in place in the 1980s the same as - I can see other members from St. John's driving over those roads every day, but they would not tolerate it, Mr. Speaker. The people out there have been patient, you are going to see a rebellion from that district before too long, and I will be the one who will organize it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: And we may end up with the Premier in one of those potholes, Mr. Speaker. There are lots of them out there we can shove him in and keep him there if we want to for a while.

But I would ask, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: The Premier is about as welcome out there, Mr. Speaker, as I am -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: are lower than potholes are 'Jim'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has one minute.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I urge the Premier to send somebody out, the Department of Highways got out of the crusher business some three years ago with the promise to the people of that area that they would be purchasing crushed stone

MR. HANCOCK: from private enterprise. We have seen no crushed stone purchased in that area, in that district, Mr. Speaker, in the last three years. And I do not know -

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister is not doing his job.

MR. HANCOCK: I do not know if - not doing his job - what can you do in this House, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HANCOCK: It is a wonder you do not blame it on Ottawa again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. HANCOCK: The member is doing his job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Well I cannot hear anything. I do not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have to be a little more quiet.

The hon. member has about thirty

seconds remaining.

The hon. member for St. Mary's-

The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. NEARY: Start over again, by leave!

MR. HANCOCK: I will start over again, Mr. Speaker. I hope Hansard picks it up. Mr. Speaker, this is going out in a householder I can assure you that.

But, Mr. Speaker, the people in that area requested some crushed stone and this government got out

MR. HANCOCK: of the crusher business some three and a half years ago and have purchased no crushed stone in that area, I doubt if they have purchased it any anywhere on the Island to look after the basic needs of the people. The roads there are not fit to drive over. There is a bridge on this section of dirt road which is not fit, it was built in 1926. They could not put a new top on it this year because the bridge itself could not warrant it, they were afraid the bridge would collapse if they put a new bridge up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I have to advise the hon. member that his time has expired. He has requested leave. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. HANCOCK: I am not finished.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members could take their seats and I will declare first of all whether or not the request for leave is granted.

Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand leave has not been granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition presented by the hon. member -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock).

MR. HANCOCK: The petition has not been laid on the table of the House yet. I wholeheartedly support the petition, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: - and I hope the Premier sees fit to do something about it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): If I may rule on the point of order. There was no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I assumed same, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the petition presented by the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock). I rise to support it for a number of very important reasons. One is that I know the hon. member's district very well, I know the hon. member very well. As a matter of fact, he knows me very well.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, talking about his great love for me and for this administration, I think it was a number of years ago that the hon. members actually wished to support me during the leadership campaign, so I know that his support is very strong and I accept it again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I accepted his support two years ago and I accept it today. And just let me say, Mr. Speaker, in support of this petition, that the hon. member's district is a very historic district in this Province and it has a very long history of fishing and independent people, so much so that the P.C. administration over the last seven or eight years spent \$18 million in St. Mary's - The Capes - \$18 million!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is there any other hon. member, Mr. Speaker, who can stand in his place here and say that \$18 million worth of provincial funds were spend in his or her district over the last seven or eight years?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, he cannot, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And as far as provincial funds, 100 per cent provincial funds - \$18 million. I challenge any hon. member to show me any other district in the Province which has received \$18 million of provincial funds in the last six or seven years. I would like to see the district and would like for them to detail to me the thing.

On the whole question of DREE, Mr. Speaker, that is a cop out. All the roads in Newfoundland cannot be done by DREE, number one; number two, on the ones that we have submitted they have not signed;

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: and number three, the ones that they have signed, it has been only 50 per cent.

So if the hon. the member really wants to support me he should come across the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: I rise to support the petition and I want to congratulate my - wait now, Mr. Premier, just stay for this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: What a chicken!

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) for

MR. STIRLING: finally getting the Premier on his feet dealing with a roads programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what may have upset the Premier very much with my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), is that he recognized in him maybe the first person of the thousands of Newfoundlanders who supported the Premier, who no longer supports the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: The Premier had a rude awakening last weekend with a visit from a member from a council on the West Coast, and that person said in a meeting,

MR. STIRLING:

when the Premier said, 'Listen, I hear you are gone Liberal', and she said, 'Yes, I am a Director of the Humber East Liberal Association'. But he said, 'You supported me in the leadership' like he just said to my colleague', and she said, 'Yes, but I do not like what you are doing, Brian'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: And that represents the feelings of thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders who had great hope for this man who was going to stand up for Newfoundland, who ran on the -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - we are dealing with roads, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually we are dealing with a petition and somehow or other I think my greatest fears have now been realized, we are into a debate and not into discussion or comments on the petition. I would ask the hon. Leader to try to - I was flexible for a few seconds but -

MR. STIRLING: I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that you try very hard to be fair and I was responding in the kind that was set out by the temporary Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that St. Mary's - The Capes was represented by two PC Cabinet ministers and then under the leadership of the present Premier, in a by-election they threw them out, turned around 2,000 votes and put in a fighting Newfoundlander as their representative, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STIRLING: And the reason that they did it, Mr. Speaker, and it is happening all over this Province, the reason that they did it is that there are still 105 miles of

MR. STIRLING: dirt road in St. Mary's - The Capes, 105 miles of dirt road. And, Mr. Speaker, you can kid the people in this Province, you can kid the people in this House of Assembly-and you saw the kind of arrogance in which they are trying to bluff their way through with the Federation of Labour. And, Mr. Speaker, we are now getting the first spark from the other side that shows there is a concern -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - because the people on this side are fighting for their constituents -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - and we will get the roads, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3.
Concurrence motions on the report of the Social Services Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The last day the debate was adjourned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition who has one minute remaining. And we have approximately one hour remaining on this particular report.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in that one minute I would now invite the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) to get into another area that he considers and they on the other side consider very unimportant and that is dealing with the health of the children on Social Services. Would the minister now indicate, since they had a week to consult and the Premier is

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2054

SD - 3

MR. STIRLING: back from his jaunt with our banker from Alberta, would the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) now indicate that he is going to do away with this policy of cosmetic treatment only and that the

MR. L. STIRLING:

children of this blind person who is on welfare, who went to get dental treatment for his son and was told, 'As long as it is in the front teeth, we will give the dental treatment'. Would he now announce a change in that policy so that people can be treated with respect and dignity and if dental work is needed for the children of those on welfare, it will be provided to the full extent of the dentist's recommendation? I will now ask the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) if he will confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is hard to follow the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling). Yesterday evening, Mr. Speaker, we were a great bunch over here and I think he said something to the effect that I was very compassionate.

MR. L. STIRLING:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. HICKEY: Well, have your colleagues be quiet over there and you might hear it.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that it is difficult to follow the hon. gentleman. Yesterday evening he indicated how compassionate I was and today he has changed his mind. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to understand that change. But I will try to respond to the two issues that he raised.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. HICKEY: One, with regard to the issue of the dental problem, Mr. Speaker, that is a programme which is not in my department. And the hon. gentleman yesterday evening indicated or raised a question as to whether or not we, on this side as ministers, could make decisions or whether we were controlled so rigidly by the hon. the Premier we were not able to make decisions. I can inform the hon. gentleman and all other hon. members on that side that we are not under any rigid control by the hon. the Premier on a day to day basis. We are clearly understandable of our policy of the areas and programmes that we are responsible for. And there is not the kind of interference that the hon. gentleman perceives there to be in this administration. I can tell him that I share his concern as do all of us on this kind of a programme and my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), is presently considering this whole matter and hopefully very shortly there will be a statement made by him. My staff -

MR. W. CALLAN: (Inaudible).

MR. T. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman now newly elected will just be quiet then he will get his turn and then he can tell us all how he feels about this issue.

MR. HICKEY : Mr. Speaker, the involvement of my staff into the dental programme is only by way of certification as to the ability or inability to pay

It starts and ends there. That is the involvement of my field staff. The programme itself is a health programme and consequently I have no authority to change or -

MR. STIRLING: The decision will be made by government as to who pays for it.

MR. HICKEY: That is right. My staff certifies whether the family is able to pay or not.

MR. STIRLING: Is it the Department of Health's policy then that it is only front teeth?

MR. HICKEY: Pardon?

MR. STIRLING: It is the Department of Health's policy that it is only front teeth is that so?

MR. HICKEY: It is not the policy of my department. It is the health programme.

MR. STIRLING: The Health Department.

AN.HON.MEMBER: That is only cosmetic
(inaudible)

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the other issue raised by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with senior citizen's homes, I want to inform him, as my official informed him at that opening, that his interpretation of what that official said was not necessarily correct.

MR. STIRLING: Not necessarily.

MR. HICKEY: That is right. The hon. gentleman raised the issue with the official who made the statement and the official explained what he had said and what it meant and the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as having said, "Well, I interpret that a different way," so I will clear the air for him today. The policy with regards to expansion, further expansion and the construction

MR. HICKEY: of new senior citizens' homes in the Province is geared around providing services to people to the largest extent who need bed care or some level of nursing care. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that ambulatory people cannot be admitted, but the emphasis is on nursing care of one, two or three categories depending on how ill or to what degree the nursing care is required and the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, are twofold. One, the greatest need in the Province today is for people who require bed care, by far the greatest need is that. And government has to lead the way by developing a policy which responds to that need and so we have done it. The other reason for it, Mr. Speaker, is that it is very, very costly. In some instances it is an amount of close or approaching \$2000. a month to house someone in a senior citizens home when in fact that person could be housed for far less in another type of home such as a licensed boarding home or , as we prefer , Mr. Speaker, that person could stay in their own home and have homemaker services and a whole range of other types of services provided. So government's policy is to encourage people , senior citizens to stay in their own homes for as long as practical and possible and then when they require nursing care, by all means they should and will be able to find accommodations in those high cost institutions. It is a very positive and a very forward policy, Mr. Speaker, which is receiving the approval not only of senior citizens but of all the population throughout this Province. It is the obvious thing to do, to keep people in the environment in which they grew up and spent most of their lives as opposed to housing them in institutions very often far removed from their loved ones and their friends and relatives. It is a policy, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. HICKEY: this government is extremely proud of and is anxious to expand on and hopefully we will be able to do that in the coming year.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I raised the matter of the advertisement that was run by the public service, the Newfoundland and Labrador Public Service for a family planning consultant. And I passed a remark here in the House that the ad was tailor made to suit one individual and I promised the House that I would bring the ad today to the House of Assembly just to prove my point. Well here is the ad and the hon. member for

MR. NEARY: Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) should pay attention to this. Here is the ad, here is what the ad says: 'Family Planning, Education and Information Division, Department of Health, St. John's. Qualifications: Considerable experience in family planning including supervisory experience, Bachelor of Nursing degree supplemented by post-graduate education in family, maternal and child health at the Master's level or any equivalent combination of experience or training.' Tailor made - that was tailor made for one individual. The officials in the Department of Health wrote that advertisement to suit one individual. I believe the government got two applications and the one that they were looking at, the decision has been postponed, the one who was the administrator of the family planning group in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are people objecting to this appointment? People are objecting to this appointment because of the philosophy of that organization. Does that organization encourage teenagers to terminate their pregnancies? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, yes. Yes, they do. 'Terminate your pregnancies, have an abortion,' that is what they advocate, and the hon. gentleman knows. Mr. Speaker, I have all kinds of documentation here in front of me to back that up. Here is a form they sent out to people who may be interested in volunteering their services for this organization. 'I am interested in working with you in the birth control clinic. I understand this will be on a sessional basis, either morning, afternoon or evening. Payment will be by billing to MCP and a portion of this will be returned to Planned Parenthood for use of facilities. I will be able to fit diaphragms, insert IUDs, perform vasectomies,

MR. NEARY: prescribe OCs, refer patients for termination, refer for infertility workshops, give advice and help with related gynecological problems.

'Refer patients for termination,' that means refer patients for abortion. This was the questionnaire that was sent to the medical staff of the various hospitals in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, that is against the law. This outfit have been operating against the law. They have violated the Criminal Code of Canada. The Criminal Code of Canada states that abortions will only be performed after they have been cleared by the committees in the various hospitals.

MR. HOUSE: What are you quoting from there?

MR. NEARY: I am quoting from a questionnaire that was sent to medical people, nurses and doctors.

MR. HOUSE: From whom?

MR. NEARY: By the Planned Parenthood Association, that has been operating, by the way, Mr. Speaker, on federal grants completely independent of the Department of Health. The Department of Health are the first to say, 'We are interested in hygiene and standards,' as far as the denturists are concerned. Well, what about this Planned Parenthood Association that has been operating laboratories with no standards, no inspections by the minister's department, operating as if they were the Department of Health, operating on their own? What about that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of delving into this right now, but I can guarantee the minister this, that he had better establish his advisory committee before he starts hiring consultants and before he starts making policy and programmes for the schools of this Province. The hon. gentleman may find that

MR. NEARY: his consultant may be rejected by the school boards and by the various denominations in this Province and by the people of this Province. And his policies may be rejected, Mr. Speaker, by the people of this Province.

The hon. gentleman promised to appoint an advisory committee, and before he does it, here he is out advertising for consultants.

Mr. Speaker, I will have a little more to say about this matter later on.

There are a couple of other points that I want to raise now seeing the hon. gentleman is back in his seat.

I want to raise that matter of the doctor down in Placentia who is not permitted to visit his patients in the hospital in Placentia, Dr. Penney, who is one of the most overworked doctors, overworked physicians, in this Province, with a case load of seventy to one hundred patients per day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just listen, I talked to Dr. Penney on the 'phone this morning. He told me it is virtually impossible, physically impossible for him, with the case load that he has, with the population of that area, and with the turnover in medical staff down there, the doctors in the hospital, it is virtually impossible for him to punch in the time that is being forced on him by the Department of Health in that hospital in Placentia. He just cannot do it. And even if he did - he maybe could do it and he did it previously before he developed this case load that he has, but even at that when he did relieve in the hospital in Placentia, the Department of Health would not pay him for it, refused to pay him, refused to compensate him for his service.

MR. HOUSE: Nonsense.

MR. NEARY: That is an absolute fact, Mr. Speaker. The minister says nonsense. It is true and the minister had better check his facts, that Dr. Penney did not receive one penny while he was relieving, while he was doing his shifts at that hospital.

MR. HOUSE: False.

MR. NEARY: It is not false. It is true.
It is not nonsense.

MR. HOUSE: He got the same as everybody else.

MR. NEARY: He was not getting the same as everybody else, Mr. Speaker. He did not receive one cent when he was -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who stopped him?

MR. NEARY: Who stopped him? The Department of Health stopped him from visiting his patients in the hospital.

MR. HOUSE: He did not work (inaudible) hospital.

MR. NEARY: He is not allowed. He can put patients in the hospital. He had a case recently in which he wrote the Minister of Health (Mr. House) about one of his patients who had a stroke and he had to treat the man within his home. He could not put him in the hospital because the Department of Health would not allow him to go in to visit his patient.

DR. COLLINS: He would have gotten paid for it.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HOUSE: He would have gotten paid for it.

MR. NEARY: He would not have gotten - he did not want to get paid for that. All he wanted was the privilege, all he wanted was privileges. He wanted hospital visiting privileges.

DR. COLLINS: He could treat the patient at home and get paid for it.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: He could treat the patient at home and get paid for it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not the point.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, it is not. The hon. gentleman, I hope he has a better bedside manner than he has a grasp of the overall medical situation in this Province.

DR. COLLINS: You have no concept (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: We are not talking about MCP.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that that man needed hospitalization. But he could not admit him to hospital because he would not be allowed to visit his patient. The Department of Health would not allow him to visit his patients in the hospital.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) negligent, would you say the doctor was negligent?

MR. NEARY: I am saying the Department of Health is negligent, discriminating against the people in Placentia.

MR. WARREN: The Department of Health.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is an authority now on this particular subject.

DR. COLLINS: The Leader of the Opposition (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I have all the documentation here and I will read the letters in due course.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker. I will read the letter to, "Dr. H.R. Penney, Placentia. Dear Dr. Penney," and this is 1981, this is the 9th. of April 1981, "Dear Dr. Penney, We understand that you have removed your name from the duty rota of Placentia Cottage Hospital effective Thursday, April 16th., 1981.

"As you are aware, included in your hospital privileges is the requirement that you be available and share with the other physicians in the on call rota of the hospital. Your refusal to participate," because the man could not physically do it, he is working now seven days a week, eighteen hours a day, seeing 70 to 100 patients a day. "Your refusal to participate leaves us no alternative but to withdraw all your privileges at Placentia Hospital as of the aforementioned date."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: "We would also like to point out that it is not a temporary withdrawal -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sorry, the hon. member's time has expired.

June 2, 1981

... Tape No. 2058

NM - 4

MR. NEARY: Could I finish my paragraph, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): By leave?

MR. NEARY: No, well it will only take me
a second.

"We would also like to point out
that this

MR. NEARY:

is not a temporary withdrawal of privileges, but rather a permanent one."

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: How cruel can you get.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak at this time,

AN HON. MEMBER: I wonder what (inaudible) to the United States.

MR. HOUSE: - except I am going to respond to particularly the last item, and I wanted the opportunity to say something about this particular matter. We have in our cottage hospitals a system whereby either we have salaried doctors who man the hospital or we have doctors on fee for services who get privileges and for these privileges they agree to , of course, man the out-patients department and to man the hospitals in emergencies.

In the case of Placentia - I just want to point out the scenario of what did happen. We had four doctors there, one on salary and three fee for service and they took a night each on duty. Two of these doctors, the administrating doctor and one of the fee for service doctors left with virtually no notice and left us with two persons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. HOUSE: Well one had a job somewhere else, and another fellow moved to another area. Mr. Speaker, it is quite normal for people after two or three years to move on to other areas.

MR. CALLAN: Without notice?

MR. HOUSE: No, it is not normal for them to do it without notice. Dr. Roggeveen left after one month when he was supposed to give a three month notice, and the other person does not have an obligation, fee for service, but nevertheless, he did leave without notice. And it left two doctors there and

MR. HOUSE: one of them said, 'I cannot look after the hospital.' We immediately brought in two more people, we got two people some of them were locums from other areas and put in the hospital. But that is the letter that we wrote to Dr. Penney. When he could not meet his obligations, we could not give him his privileges. If we did that, Mr. Speaker, we would have chaos in our hospitals in the Province. We would have utter chaos.

Dr. Penney is quite free now to reapply. We have told him that he can do that, we have told him to do that,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Permanent until he accepts his obligations.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is the situation.

We have been in the area - all we can do as a Department of Health in this kind of a situation is to take away the privileges. It is up to his own organization whether they apply any sanctions. They have been out, (inaudible) discussed the matter with him.

What I want to say right now is the fact that we think everything is under control in that particular hospital. We have three doctors there, two salaried doctors and Dr. Ron Murphy who is another one of these doctors who was fee for service, who had a heavy workload. He had to carry the total load when the other person withdrew his services and I thank him very highly for the tremendous effort that he has applied in the last month in keeping that hospital operating. As a matter of fact, I will now say that we have appointed him Acting Administrator until a full-time administrator is found.

MR. HANCOCK: Will he be getting paid for that?

MR. HOUSE: Yes, he will be getting paid for that.

MR. HANCOCK: Is there a conflict of interest between him getting paid and running a private practice besides?

MR. HOUSE: No none whatsoever, (Inaudible).
for administering the hospital they can run fee for service.
That is normal.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation
and we are now - he is only taking that on in the interim - we
are now trying to obtain the services of a full-time medical
director.

With respect to the other matter
raised by the hon. gentleman, it is a matter of his opinion,
of course, who should be appointed. There has been a recommendation.
There has been no appointment made as yet. The only thing
I would say is that in all matters - of course, in a lot of
matters pertaining to appointments, the Advisory Committee is
usually the Public Service Commission which advises on
appointments. It is not necessarily any other advisory group.

I just mention for the -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)
appoint an advisory committee.

MR. HOUSE: I wish to advise that an advisory
committee is an advisory committee usually on programmes.
For instance, when I was in Education we had an advisory committee
and the advisory committee would work on programmes and not
on appointments. The advisory committee on appointments is
another independent body, of course, known as the Public
Service Commission

MR. HOUSE:

which I think was one of these great pieces of legislation brought about by the PC government. So, Mr. Speaker, there has been no appointment made. There has been a recommendation made but there has been no appointment made.

And I just want to bring the record straight on the hospital in Placentia and that is mainly why I got up to speak because everything is under control. Dr. Penney - his name was mentioned by the hon. member because a letter was read - he can send -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: - no, of course, he does not, Mr. Speaker, nobody minds, The point is, we depend on people to run our hospitals. In Bonavista we have to have everybody taking their turn in the night on call. They may not be called in for ten nights but they have to take a turn. This doctor refused that and we just could not give him the privileges without the responsibilities. But I am very glad to say that everything is under control and that no person has been refused admittance to that hospital but, of course, they will have to get another doctor to do the treating in the hospital.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am very, very honoured to just say a few words about the Social Services Committee.

The Minister of Health (Mr. House) has sent out a letter to all the hospitals in this Province saying that they want a reduction of 4 per cent. The IGA itself and well as other hospitals - and the reason why the doctor down in Placentia is so overworked is because all the medical services in the Province are being asked to cut back and we are seeing an example of Dr. Penney being so overworked that now he is even being given charge of the acting -

MR. HOUSE: No, not Dr. Penney.

MR. HISCOCK: - so, Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is that with this 4 per cent reduction - and going back to Cabinet to ask for money, how are we going to get more money to maintain the standard of health in this Province or are we going to see a continual reduction and, if so, does that mean we are going to have extra billing with Medicare because we, as a Province, cannot afford it?

Now to get to a larger issue, I am rather concerned that our budget in the social sector is \$1,094,000,000 or 63 per cent of our budget and that includes Education, Social Services, Health, Municipal Affairs, Culture, Recreation and Youth, and Environment. The federal government now, Mr. Speaker, in the last few months the five year contract with the provinces on Social Services, they pay 50 per cent to the Department of Health, so much towards education - post-secondary education - so much for various other departments in social services, for example, the majority is paid for welfare and health. This is five years, it is now up for negotiation and the federal government says that it wants to get out of these certain areas, it also wants to get out of the 50/50 cost sharing basis, particularly after seeing so much going up in the last five years due to inflation, due to costs, due to labour, due to materials.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask this House now, do we as a government, have any team together to negotiate with the federal government? Have we started a negotiation on this? Because, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has made its way knows that they are going to ask the provinces to pay more for health services, they are going to ask the provinces more for the RCMP and one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is that the country as a whole cannot afford these ever increasing costs. They cannot afford

MR. HISCOCK: to pay them. It is \$14 billion that the national government is in debt and if it continues to go on and costs continue to rise, it is going to be even more. So therefore the federal government, in order to increase the national standards to welfare, to education and to health needs more money. And one of the ways, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to get more money is by putting a tax on Alberta oil and what do we get from Alberta. We get a reduction, Mr. Speaker, and we get the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) supporting this move, Mr. Speaker, so that the federal government can actually get the tax dollars and can maintain a system of Medicare, of social services and all these other broad

MR. HISCOCK: social issues. So I would ask the Minister of Health, have the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, who is also the Premier, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the Minister of Environment and Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews), and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) sat down - do they have a position paper ready to go the federal government saying, 'No, we cannot accept this'? And we, as a Province, are we going to continue to support Alberta because the federal government wants a greater share of the energy? They do not want the greater share of the tax on energy by way of Alberta oil, Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of having money in the kitty. They want to make sure that we will continue to have unemployment insurance in Canada, Canada pension plan, old age pensions, Medicare and consumer subsidization of oil. And if we do not, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: We as a nation, and the great Liberal Party of this nation which has brought in these reforms - we are now seeing that these great Liberal programmes are under attack by the provincial governments who say, 'No, we cannot afford to pay for them.' And yet, Mr. Speaker, when Ottawa says, 'We want to continue them,' what are we getting from the provinces? 'No, we cannot afford to pay for them.' And when Ottawa asks for an increase in taxes, 'Oh, Ottawa is being greedy.' So it wants to keep Medicare and it wants to keep unemployment insurance and Canada pension plan and various other groups.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know is this committee set up? Do the various ministers have a position and are these ministers - not only the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Premier - is this the stated

MR. HISCOCK: policy that we want the federal government to continue on a 50/50 cost sharing basis because we cannot afford it? And, on the other hand, the federal government says the reason why they have to up it to 55 per cent or 60 per cent or 70 per cent, which is, by the way, negotiable - Ottawa has not set a price, it is negotiable. I am asking, is this Province negotiating? And it is not. This government is continuing, Mr. Speaker, with outright confrontation and here we have now \$1,094,000,000 which is the largest cost in our budget, 63 per cent, and because of our stubbornness and because of our confrontation with Ottawa, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that come December when this programme runs out, Ottawa will again be forced into the position by confrontation of saying to the provinces, and particularly the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, 'This is the way it is going to be.' And you will hear the Premier, and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) getting on T.V. and condemning Ottawa for the increase when the Province cannot afford it.

So I would say now, we have over six months to have a position paper to say, 'We are going to negotiate. And these are the reasons why we cannot or we can have - and I would ask that we have this.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have it both ways.

We cannot have Ottawa doing everything for us and not allow Ottawa to have a greater tax base in the energy resource.

We are not fighting, Mr. Speaker, a foreign government, and the way you hear some of our provinces, particularly Alberta - Alberta can afford to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta even calls the tune, and so can maybe Saskatchewan and Ontario and British Columbia. But P.E.I. and Nova Scotia and Quebec and even now Ontario, are getting into the position

MR. HISCOCK: where they cannot maintain the national standard. And if we, the poor Province of Newfoundland, cannot maintain the standards of health and welfare - the Leader of the Opposition talked about the frontal teeth; if we do not get down and negotiate with Ottawa, I can say, Mr. Speaker, this Province will have no programme whatsoever for any teeth or any social programme whatsoever.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope to hear from the Minister of Health (Mr. House) to find out that we have a team of advisers and that the ministers are having daily meetings and are coming up with a programme so they can sit down face to face with the various ministers so they can negotiate a settlement.

Thank you.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to these particular questions.

MR. L. STIRLING: (Inaudible) to the dentists, are you going to respond to that?

MR. W. HOUSE: That is being very capably looked after.

The Department of Health - the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is talking about whether this government is negotiating with Ottawa on the programmes for Health or for all the social services.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we know that the last agreement, the Established Programme Financing was agreed on five years ago and it is terminating this year. The fact is there has been ongoing discussions between all the provincial governments and that is continuing now. Our Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) heads up the programmes from this Province, and, as I say, the Established Programme Financing. It does not only affect Newfoundland, it affects every Province across Canada. So that is ongoing continuously.

The fact is there have been grumblings from the federal government that the costs have gone out of hand, too high. And, of course, that is as a result - I am of the opinion - of poor management, the (inaudible) of money, setting the provinces up, giving this and then taking back and saying, 'We should', of course, 'pick up the void now that they have to get out of it'. We had a committee here a little while ago for a visit, a Standing Committee of the House of Commons that was discussing this and saying they had to cut back. One of things they had the gall to say was, 'Look, you know, we do not get enough presence in these programmes. In health', they said, 'the provincial government gets all the credit'.

MR. W. HOUSE: So I said to them and I think some other colleagues, 'There is no problem with us if you want a presence. Sure have a presence! We do not get any credit necessarily. There is nobody out praising us for Health or Education. You know, we get knocked for not doing certain things. So they can take the credit, all the credit they want.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that is under study continuously. I want to point out one thing to the hon. member, the whole commission report completed a report a little while ago stating that the Maritimes and Newfoundland, the Atlantic Provinces, are 15 per cent behind the rest of Canada in health care delivery, taking time and energy, as it were, to point out that Newfoundland and the Maritime Provinces are doing all they can. They are spending now more than they reasonably can be expected to be spending. And he suggested - his number two point in his report was that the federal government-through federal sources more money should be come into this reason to bring us on a health care par with the average in the rest of Canada. We have gone back and talked to them about this and, of course, when we met with the minister, she certainly appreciated the statements of the judge in his report. And, of course, she said he would take it back to Ottawa for them to act on.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Will there be an increase in Medicare?

MR. W. HOUSE: Well, that is the Established Programme Financing we were talking about. And we said that we should have more input into the rest so that we can come up to the rest of Canada.

So that is where it stands now. We do not know. If they cut back on this Province, if the E.P.F programmes are cut back, I do not think we can reasonably expect to maintain the quality we have.

MR. W. HOUSE: So Ottawa has lots of money to spend on some of the frivolous things so I think they should be putting it into things, of course, that count.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to Medicare and extra billing, this Province has not had extra billing. And, of course, at this point in time we are not expecting to have extra billing. There is nothing that this Budget this year does not call for extra billing. The only thing we have in that way is we have two doctors who have opted out and, of course, they can charge more than the going rate that they charge.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we have an increase in the Health budget this year of about thirteen per cent over last year's Health budget. The hospitals, we discussed budgets and we do this every year, discuss budgets for the hospitals, We have asked them to make certain adjustments and I am getting this report saying we will be discussing that. We are not anticipating any cutbacks in hospital services.

MR. HISCOCK: IGA says they have to.

MR. HOUSE: Well IGA has written. back to us and they are saying; Well this is what we can do! We have asked them to see what they can do and I will be discussing with all hospital boards in due course. With regard to the Placentia situation - I think that was the first part of your question. Placentia is not under a hospital board. It is operated by the department and there has been no cutback in the number of doctors. There are still four there and, of course, we are hoping to maintain four. As a matter of fact we are going to try and have three salaried doctors in that hospital rather than the three fee for service that existed before. So the other thing I want to point out for the hon. member's benefit is there is no such thing as a fifty/fifty sharing in this particular thing. The programmes for Health and Education - there is an amount of money that is allocated and it does not necessarily cover fifty per cent of the cost. So the cap allowance, what they call the cap allowance, for social assistance, that is a fifty/fifty but the established programmes are not, the established Financing Programme. And, of course, that is - I forget the figure now, it is designated in the budget.

MR. HISCOCK: Out of that billion dollars

MR. HISCOCK: in Social Services how much do we actually get from the federal government, \$1.5 billion?

MR. HOUSE: I do not know if that is the figure. I do not think it is a billion. The 1.4 billion that was referred to in some political statements includes everything practically, old age pension, unemployment insurance payments and everything.

MR. WARREN: In our own budget, there is \$1,094,000,000 - that is our own budget. How much of that comes from the federal government, \$400 million?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is here. About \$400 million I suppose. I think it is in there. It is 43 per cent or something.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks concerning the Department of Health and also the Department of Social Services. I heard on the radio this morning that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) said there were a number of tuberculosis cases reported each year in the Province. I just forget what number the minister said.

MR. HOUSE: I said roughly eighty per year.

MR. WARREN: Roughly eighty per year. I would be interested if the minister would lay upon the table of this House how many cases have been reported from the tiny community of Davis Inlet out of a population of roughly 250 people. Of this eighty odd tuberculosis cases I would venture to say -

MR. HOUSE: Sixty-seven last year by the way.

MR. WARREN: Okay, sixty-seven last year. I would venture to say that close to half of those

MR. WARREN: cases came from the tiny community of Davis Inlet.

Now, I have said to the minister for over two years now that Davis Inlet is reaching a crisis. I say again today that Davis Inlet is reaching a crisis. And it is to the point that there has to be something done and it has to be done real fast. Because my sources tell me that roughly 85 per cent of the residents in Davis Inlet are either in contact with tuberculosis or are treated to prevent the tuberculosis there. Eighty-five per cent of them are sort of tied into this dreaded disease in Davis Inlet. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has taken Davis Inlet too lightly. Davis Inlet is taken too lightly by this government. There has to be a major rehabilitation programme carried out and it has to be carried out immediately in that

MR. WARREN: tiny community because if not, Mr. Speaker, it came to the point last year that the captains of the CN boats and the pilots of the aircraft had second thoughts about landing there because tuberculosis was so bad that the people on the boats were sometimes told, 'Look, there is tuberculosis in Davis Inlet so act accordingly,' sort of thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am begging this government to take whatever action is necessary to stop this disease from becoming more widespread and now it is beginning to spread out on the Labrador Coast, in other places there are signs of tuberculosis. Now, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge this government to look seriously at Davis Inlet. The reason, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is gaining magnitude, is increasing, if we go back to 1979, when the session opened in 1979 it was one of the first concerns I brought into this hon. House, that the government should look seriously at Davis Inlet. And the problem since 1979 has not gotten any better, it has gotten worse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why has this problem gotten worse? I can give you two or three answers. One of the answers is because of the living conditions, the houses that have been supplied by the government of the day are not fit. And, Mr. Speaker, the store that is operated by this government, that has fresh meats, fruits, and vegetables, is not fit to be open to the public, Mr. Speaker. This is another problem, fresh fruits and vegetables and fresh meats go into this store but this store should not be open to the public, Mr. Speaker, because all it is doing is bringing in disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who opened it?

MR. WARREN: The store belongs to this government, the Department of Rural, Agricultural, and Northern Development, They operate and own this store, and that store should not be opened at this present day , Mr. Speaker. And the people of Davis Inlet do not want it open but they need some alternative, and that opportunity is there. The government is spending so much money on a house for the Premier of this Province that they should be doing something to save the lives of those people on the Labrador Coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, last year this government collected \$53 million in the sale of alcoholic beverages and beer. Now they are planning to put out \$230,000 into a rehabilitation programme, \$87,700 in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, recently in one of the committees, my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) suggested that we cut out the sale of beer and alcoholic beverages to the Northern Coast. I do not necessarily agree with his statement, Mr. Speaker. However, I do not agree with what the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) said either. Do you know what the Minister of Social Services said?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: I will repeat what the Minister of Social Services said, He said, he answered, 'Not by turning off the taps. I suggest it would drive them stark raving mad and they will probably do the same thing cold sober.' That is what he said about the native people of Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: And that is published -

MR. WARREN: And that has gone right across Canada, and the Toronto Globe and Mail. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what an hon. minister of this Crown said

June 2, 1981

Tape 2064

PK - 3

MR. WARREN: about the native people living in
Labrador. 'I suggest that if we stop the beer and the liquor
going in there what they will do is go ahead and
kill anybody regardless!' Basically this is what the minister
is saying,

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, and I think that is the wrong approach, that is the kind of approach that this government is making towards Labrador. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) that is who said it, the Minister of Social Services who should be doing a rehabilitation programme not only for the people in Labrador but for the people all around this Island, Mr. Speaker. I agree there is too much drinking of beer and liquor all throughout this Province. And there should be a sensible and realistic rehabilitation programme carried out and this is what is wrong.

MR. FLIGHT: Read his answer again.

MR. WARREN: I will read his answer the second time what the minister said, yes, sure. By the way, the minister did not agree with my colleague's remarks about cutting off the liquor there and I do not agree with them either, I do not agree with my colleague's remarks either because I think there are other ways to do it instead of cutting off the social supply. Now here is what the minister said.

MR. HANCOCK: They will only get them drunk and they will go to sleep (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Okay, he agreed with the MHA on the magnitude of the problem, he agreed that the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said there is a problem. The department's budget for the Native Alcoholic Rehabilitation Programme is \$87,700 this year. But as for turning off the taps, I will repeat one more time, Mr. Speaker, in case some hon. members on the other side of the House did not really hear what is quoted in the Toronto Globe and Mail from coast to coast, about the native people, the Aboriginal people in Northern Labrador, my constituents and the people I am proud of, by the way. Hear is what he said, 'I suggest it would drive them stark raving mad and they will probably do the same thing cold sober'. Now, that is what the Minister

MR. WARREN: of Social Services said about Aboriginal people, Inuit and Indian people and other residents along the Northern Labrador coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Resign, resign, resign.

MR. FLIGHT: Speaking for the Peckford administration, that is what he said.

MR. WARREN: Today, Mr. Speaker, in The Daily News today, there was a call asking for the minister's resignation. There was a call asking for the minister's resignation today because of those unkindly remarks towards the people. Is that the way you are going to solve a problem? Is that the kind of way that this government plans to solve problems in this House?

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is better for him -- and not to do with the kind of alcoholic programme that he is doing in Northwest River. There is another kind of a programme we want to see administered. We want to see a programme that will involve

the people, not just go into an office and sit down and write reports. That is not the answer to the problem. The answer to the problem, Mr. Speaker, is getting in with the people, talking with the people and talking about the culture or anything else with the people but not just writing reports on hearsay. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should not only withdraw those remarks but he should send an apology letter to all the people on the Northern Labrador coast, right from Rigolet to Nain, those people that he has insulted. And it is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, when one should look at those kind of remarks coming out in national papers, concerning the voters of this Province. And I assure this Honourable House that when the next

MR. WARREN: election is called, when the next election is called, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am not going to have too much difficulty in getting re-elected. But I assure you this much, that the way that this government is carrying on-I will make sure that-there are other things in Labrador too that will come back to the Liberal fold. Naskaupi will come back to the Liberal fold, as Menihek will come back to the Liberal fold. And I know, Mr. Speaker, because this government's attitude towards Labrador is at the lowest ebb ever and I strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government will pay more attention to the social and health problems related to the people in Northern Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: What would the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) say about that line?

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes has about eight and one-half minutes at which time (inaudible)

MR. HANCOCK: I will only need to take half of it Mr. Speaker, but I want to get some answers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take it all.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back on this Placentia issue again and I want to get some answers from the minister if it is at all possible.

MR. NEARY: You will not get them.

MR. HANCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Penney never-

MR. NEARY: He does not know what goes on in this House.

MR. HANCOCK: - he never thought lightly of bringing this matter to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker. He had no alternative, he contacted -

MR. NEARY: Ignored, ignored.

MR. HANCOCK: - his member in Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who did not want to help him in any way then he contacted his federal member, Mr. Crosbie, who you cannot find

MR. HANCOCK: these days, you have to go to a function and pay forty dollars, but he is lucky to get forty dollars I guess to hear him speak, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought to me long before Dr. Penney brought it to me, as a doctor in Placentia Mr. Speaker. If I have patients who are dying not because they cannot get to see Dr. Penney but - I have two in particular who have c.a. and they are in hospital and were denied the right to see the doctor who had been treating them for that disease for some six or seven years, Mr. Speaker, the doctor of their choice, the doctor that they wanted to see and were denied, Mr. Speaker, by this government, this honest, open and downright government in power now, Mr. Speaker, denied the right to see their doctor by choice, Mr. Speaker. They could not get to see the doctor who was treating them for five or six years. That, Mr. Speaker, is a policy that should be done away with in this House this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It should be done away with. Dr. Penney did not withdraw his services lightly from that hospital. He is one of the best doctors in Placentia I would go as far as to say, from general comments that I have had from people in that immediate area. He is one of the most respected doctors there. Mr. Speaker, whether the government likes it or not whatever his political colour is, it does not bother me but he is one of the most respected doctors in the Placentia area, Mr. Speaker, and by two doctors resigning from private practice, Mr. Speaker, left him in an awkward position where -

MR. S. NEARY: The heaviest workload in Newfoundland.

MR. HANCOCK: - he has one of the heaviest workloads I would say, per capita, in any district in this Province, Mr. Speaker. The man is worked up to his eyeballs, he is at it day and night, Mr. Speaker. What do you think the man is? He cannot be on call twenty hours a day, he has to get some sleep, he cannot be in hospital all day looking

MR. HANCOCK:

after ten or twelve thousand patients at the same time. It is a policy that should be done away with and the minister should take the initiative and have the intestinal fortitude to do away with it immediately, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how many doctors in the city of St. John's, MD's are on call at hospitals, Mr. Speaker? I wonder how many? Why should the people in rural Newfoundland be discriminated against over and above the people in St. John's, Mr. Speaker? There are enough staff in the hospitals of St. John's to look after the faces that are admitted to that hospital, Mr. Speaker. Why should it be any different in Placentia? It should not be any different, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK:

It should not be any different, Mr. Speaker. People in this Province were created equally and they should be treated equally, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK:

There should be no discrimination whatsoever. If a patient in my district wants to visit the doctor, then that right should not be taken away from him Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

This is P.C. policy.

MR. HANCOCK:

This is not Liberal policy, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals would never bring in such a policy as this, Mr. Speaker. It would never be implemented, it would be done away with. The people out there would do away with it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK:

It was bad enough in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes that we lost our drug dispensary. Well that was burden enough on the people, Mr. Speaker. That was insult enough—

MR. HANCOCK:

- Mr. Speaker, that the people had to travel and get a taxi and which cost more to hire than the

MR. HANCOCK: So I would urge the minister, Mr. Speaker, to look into this matter and seriously see if he can have Dr. Penney - Dr. Penney would love to be on call in a hospital but he cannot be in two places at the one time, Mr. Speaker, he is only human. He is a human being who cannot be in two places at one time. He would love to be on call in the hospital, he told me, seven days a week if he had nothing else to do, and he feels that he should not be denied the right to visit his patients in hospital, Mr. Speaker. It is an insult to a man to tell him, an insult I might add to the patient, Mr. Speaker. I have had calls from patients who wanted to see Dr. Penney because they have known the man personally for three or four years and they wanted him to visit them in hospital but were denied the right, a policy implemented by this government, Mr. Speaker, and which can only be changed by this government, Mr. Speaker. So I would ask the minister to give this matter some serious consideration, some serious consideration and go down and straighten this matter out immediately so that Dr. Penney - and I have to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, because it does not seem to hitting home that a doctor cannot visit the patients or the patients cannot see their doctor by choice. The government is now taking away that right, Mr. Speaker. They are taking away the right of the patients and the doctors of this Province, Mr. Speaker. It happens all the time. It will only happen in a government that we have in power now, Mr. Speaker, It would never happen in any civilized country because they would revolt against such measures. They would not put up with it, they would not tolerate it.

MR. NEARY: They will defeat the member the next time as a result of that policy.

MR. HANCOCK: If I was the member from Placentia, I would be very concerned over this matter - but Dr. Penney - I might tell the minister that the member is a lot more popular in Placentia than the member is right now. He is a lot more popular in Placentia than the member is right now.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: He is a well established man. He has built a reputation in Placentia barring none, Mr. Speaker. He is more popular in Placentia than the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: I do not know if he is going to run for us in Placentia because I think we have our candidate in place out there. There will be no more two or three candidates running and getting a Tory elected because of Liberal stupidity, that will not happen any more, I can assure the hon. member. But he may run somewhere, Mr. Speaker, because he denounces the policy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: set forward by this government, Mr. Speaker. It is doing away with a democratic right. It was a right that was fought for in World Wars I and II, Mr. Speaker, that the Province could have -

MR. NEARY: Right on! Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: - and it is now in jeopardy of being taken away from us. It is something that should not be taken away from any doctor, I do not care if he is in a Tory riding, a Liberal riding or an NDP riding, if there were one in the Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: They think they are white niggers down there.

MR. HANCOCK: It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, to have to travel to Placentia from my district, and my district is serviced by the cottage hospital in Placentia, but when you drive over twenty or thirty miles of dirt road to get to a doctor and then realize when you are admitted to hospital that you cannot have the right to see your doctor -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HANCOCK: - and this government only laughs, it is a big joke. It is a big joke that a patient cannot get to see his doctor by choice. It is a big joke, Mr. Speaker. It is one of the jokes that is going to defeat this government the next time around, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK:

It is not the big issues that are going to win elections, it is the little issues. It is the potholes and the roads they have to drive over, Mr. Speaker, that this government is not doing anything about, not taking the initiative to look after the needs of the people who elect them. I will be awfully surprised, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have to appoint an Opposition the next time around. You can mark it down, you can get as cocky and as confident as you like, Mr. Speaker, but there is such a thing as getting over cocky and over confident, and I am very much afraid that is happening - not only to the Premier, I mean, he has always been a little bit cocky by nature. But the rest of the members are getting into the same trend, the same thought. Because we have too many Tory members, a lot of seats outside the overpass, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: There is more to Newfoundland than urban Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. There is a rural part of this Province, Mr. Speaker. It has been Liberal for years. But they decided they were going to give the Premier a chance. They have given you a chance and I am very optimistic that they will make the right decision the next time around, Mr. Speaker, and not only vote Liberal, vote for principles, Mr. Speaker, vote for rights that have been taken away from them. They want to see justice in that part of this Province,

So I would urge the minister to give this matter some serious consideration, some serious thought. It is not a joking matter, Mr. Speaker. It is something that affects several people in that area. It affects people in my district, in Placentia and, I think, there are some cases even from Whitbourne. That is how popular the doctor is, he has got patients that visit him from Whitbourne.

MR. PATTERSON: St. Mary's is going to get thrown in with Placentia in the next election.

MR. HANCOCK: You would like to have it thrown in with Placentia because you may have a chance of winning it then. But it will not happen the next time around.

MR. NEARY: You would not take Kelly's Island now this time let alone Placentia.

MR. HANCOCK: You would not take it. You have not got the intestinal fortitude to take forty-five miles of dirt road and put it in your district.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member has one minute.

MR. HANCOCK: Merasheen Island is the only place you would win the next time. But, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HANCOCK: we will see what happens when the next election is called.

But I am afraid it is little problems like this, Mr. Speaker, that mean so much to the ordinary Newfoundlanders. Once again it goes back to rights that are being taken away, rights that are being denied by - who else, Mr. Speaker? - but this poor, honest, open and down to earth government that we see in power now, Mr. Speaker. These are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are taking away the rights of the people, not the Opposition. It was bad enough to take away the drug dispensary - now Mr. Speaker, the Premier is not aware that people have to travel over forty miles of dirt road to pick up drugs, that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) closed down two years ago.

MR. HANCOCK: It is not bad enough that they have to travel to Placentia to pick up drugs but now they have to go and they cannot even see their own doctor by choice - Mr. Speaker, by choice cannot see their own doctor. That is hard to believe, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Shocking!

MR. HANCOCK: I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker.
I thank the House for this opportunity to bring out these points and I hope the minister takes them seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The time has expired for the concurrence debate on the report of the Social Services Estimates Committee. Is it the pleasure of the House that the report of the Committee be concurred in? Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay'. I declare the motion carried.

Next order?

MR. MARSHALL: Resource Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
We are still on Order 3, the concurrence debate on the Resource Committee Estimates and we will be discussing Heads, the Department of Mines and Energy, Fisheries, Development, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and Forest Resources and Lands.

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

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In moving the concurrence to the estimates for these departments of government, I would like to first of all commend the ministers and the officials of their respective staffs who attended the deliberations of

MR. BARRETT: the Committee in reviewing these estimates for the current budgetary period.

This Committee spent some twenty hours reviewing the heads to which it was referred, being Department of Development, Mines and Energy, Fisheries, Forest Resources and Lands, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

The Committee, I think, as a whole were quite diligent in the review of these estimates and it is certainly indicative of the success in being able to do an in-depth study of the various expenditures of the departments.

It is interesting to note also, Mr. Speaker, that at each session that this Committee met, there was attendance by members of this House of Assembly who were not regular members of that Committee.

MR. BARRETT:

I think that it is quite significant and quite important to get the views and observations expressed by other interested persons other than those assigned to the specific committee. This sector of the departments of government accounts for approximately 18 per cent of the total expenditures of government. The Department of Development expends some \$38.2 million of public funds; the Department of Mines and Energy, some \$55.9 million; the Department of Fisheries, \$28.6 million; the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, \$32.7 million; the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, \$32.1 million. These departments of government employ some 969 people in various positions providing noble service to government and to the people at large of this Province. The services these people give, I think, are most commendable and it is interesting as well to note that the salary paid for this work amounts to some \$27.5 million annually. This averages some \$28,000 per person. This is quite remarkable that an average of this can be attained and certainly suggests that the public sector is being well recognized for their endeavours and paid accordingly.

In reviewing some of the issues that came out of our deliberations - and I would probably like to skim very quickly through the various departments and starting with the Department of Development - it is interesting to note that in the development organizations supported by this department, a great deal of money is expended in research and development areas. Some \$2 million is funded to NORDCO to help in its ocean research and development programs. Some \$6.2 million to the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, this is development organizations -

MR. BARRETT: Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation under construction are expending some \$7 million of public funds this year. In special projects, the Labrador shipping probe into Lake Melville is being funded to the extent of \$800,000. This should provide a great benefit -

MR. WARREN: Federal government money.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: - to the economic future of this part of the Province. It is significant to note in this year's estimates that there has been no budgetary allocation for any deficit envisaged by the Marystown Shipyard. This would certainly suggest that the management initiatives that have been taken by government to correct the situation and improve the situation at that yard and the determination of the people who work there amounted to virtually eliminating an operating deficit from this facility.

In the tourism facilities it is interesting to note that some \$2.3 million has been allocated for new construction. The Department of Mines and Energy, a significant part of this department is the amount of expenditure in mineral development. Some \$3 million has been allocated in this particular part of the department for the coming year.

The Renewal Energy Demonstration Programme in co-operation with the federal government, is going to cost some \$4 million for this current year. Under the Department of Mines and Energy, jurisdiction and supervision extends to the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation. Some \$35 million of public funds are expended in this department for this particular operation.

The Lower Churchill Development Corporation, there will be a further expenditure of \$5.1 million

June 2, 1981

Tape 2072

PK - 2

MR. BARRETT: in this department. The Department of Mines and Energy also controls and operates the Office of the Petroleum Directorate, which has a significant input into the offshore management and control of our resource. The Department of Fisheries

MR. BARRETT: is again notably concerned with fish facilities and services. Marine facility operations, \$4.4 million; fishing gear supplements, \$300,000; construction, acquisition, fixed assets, fish handling facilities, Inshore Fishing Development programme, special assistance to community projects and the like account for another \$6 million. Under Fisheries Technology, special services include fishing vessel experimental programmes, agriculture, inshore fishery enhancement programmes, research and development, product market development programmes, some \$2 million of public expenditure; construction of experimental fishing vessels, \$1 million; fishery loans and assistance, a continuing programme by this government, is exemplified by a further \$7 million into this programme in large and small fishing boat programmes and reconstruction and Fisheries Loan Board operations.

Forest Resources and Lands:

Of paramount importance, of course, is this year's spray programme. Insect control, \$2.5 million; forestry protection, the air services related to the Forest Fire Control programme, in excess of \$4 million; access to the forests of this Province, a further \$3.6 million.

Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development: Community project grants, \$1.25 million; regional government associations operating grants, \$1 million; research and development for business developments, \$1 million; Rural Development Authority loans and farm development loans, \$1.8 million; production marketing, attention to the hog production facilities, laboratory facilities, \$1 million -

MR. HISCOCK: Federal government.

MR. BARRETT: - in which the federal government participates. It participates, no question.

AN HON. MEMBER: 90/10.

MR. BARRETT: No question. No, Sir, not 90/10. Look at your figures again. Why do you not look at it again.

Concern for the native associations in Labrador, \$3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the highlights of some of the matters discussed by this Committee in its review of the spending estimates for this department.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the concurrence of these estimates be tabled.

Thank you very much.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With regard to the various resource departments, we have seen this government now for the past ten years get up in this House and in each speech and Budget Speech and Throne Speech give the great advancement that the past administration and this present administration have made in resources.

We have not seen one industry, Mr. Speaker, of resources, located in this Province in this ten year term. We have seen a total disruption, corruption and total abuse of power by way of the Fisheries Loan Board, Mr. Speaker. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, all of the community pastures done away with and given over to private enterprise, and those that could not be taken over by private enterprise, left and were completely abandoned. We did,

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, at one time in this Province have a Rural Agricultural Development Program. We did have a way whereby we at least had our kitchen gardens. We had ways of supplementing our income in the rural areas, but now, Mr. Speaker, what do we have? We see the hog producers going under because this government has no support system. We see a reduction in our broilers and various other things for farm use and yet, Mr. Speaker, here we get out of Rural Development \$13 million that is in the department, \$8.5 million or more is from the Federal Government. With regard to the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, the only thing we have seen with this government, and particularly with the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is total confrontation. I am amazed that when Mr. Clark was the Prime Minister and we had the two Cabinet ministers in Ottawa - with all the resource development that this government was going to put in the Five Year Plan, of the nine months not one cent came into this Province from the Federal Government. And yet we have the President of the Privy Council who gets up and says, 'Ottawa' -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) says that Ottawa is withholding money through DREE and that. Yet during the fish and chip days, what did we get, Mr. Speaker? Not one, not one iota, not one cent, and we had two. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen just this week \$33 million with regard to modernization of the mill; we have seen \$50-something million with the C-CORE at the university; we have seen almost \$47 million with the Coastal Labrador DREE Agreement; we have seen the Forestry Agreement, another \$50-something million. Almost \$200 million, Mr. Speaker, within this year alone and yet nobody - this government says that Ottawa is punishing. The

MR. HISCOCK: only one that is punishing are the people over there with their own mentality, their own negativity and their own attitude towards the way things are. They see everything in black and they basically -

MR. WHITE: Blue.

MR. HISCOCK: - try to - or blue, black and blue - Mr. Speaker, and because of that we, as a Province, are suffering. But the greatest crime that was ever perpetrated on the people of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Perpetrated.

MR. MORGAN: Perpetuated.

MR. HISCOCK: - perpetuated or perpetrated -

AN HON. MEMBER: Perpetrated.

MR. HISCOCK: - or whatever - Mr. Speaker, is with regard to the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls. We have seen, and I have said it again with regard to social policies, this government has a cosmetic approach, a Band-Aid approach. We have nothing, Mr. Speaker, with regard to social policies or social conscience. But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to resources, we even have less. We nationalized the Upper Churchill, the water rights, for one reason -

MR. NEARY: We did not, no, we did not.

MR. HISCOCK: - the Province, meaning the government - to bring in and expect the Lower Churchill to start. Since then, Mr. Speaker, it was \$1.5 billion, now it is up to \$7.5 billion, which is ridiculous and almost out of the reach of us as a Province and, of course, we have to depend on the Federal Government. But what have they done in the meantime? They have expanded to Holyrood; they did Hinds Lake,

MR. HISCOCK:

they did the Upper Salmon and now Cat Arm. All that area, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, all that wilderness land is now destroyed forever. And instead, Mr. Speaker, if we as a Province had gone ahead in resource development, developing the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls, then we would have had a permanent supply now and a surplus and we would have our (inaudible), our aluminum plant in Goose Bay. But no, Mr. Speaker, we do not have it and we will not have it as long as this government is in power, Mr. Speaker. And I cannot understand also why our people, through the political way of life here, had fallen for the trap back in 1975 when we had the two explosions on both sides of the Straits. And as soon as the election was over, bang, the air comes out of the balloon and nothing. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, we do not have more roads in our Province paved. This is why we do not have more health clinics and hospitals and schools and trade schools and an expansion of our university. It is because of the misuse of funds, the building up of this debt, Mr. Speaker, by this totally incompetent government. And I say, Mr. Speaker, totally incompetent government. They do have one or two ministers over there who do know their work but the majority of them, Mr. Speaker, they do not. And I dare say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to resources, Fisheries - the past Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) got the people in this Province so psyched up about the fisheries that everybody got into it. And we also got them psyched up with regard to the superport in Harbour Grace. Now where is the superport in Harbour Grace, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WHITE:

Where is the member?

Where is the member?

MR. HISCOCK:

And where is the member is right. And where is the Premier? Now out there buying up land and having option to buy land so he can have now not a superport but so he can have a petro-chemical industry in that part of our Province.

But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the forestry, what have we seen? A total abandonment of its responsibility. When it was election year, just after election, did they spray? No they did not spray, Mr. Speaker. And why did they not spray? Because of public opinion at that time and they just had the success at the polls. And yet, Mr. Speaker, with regard to cutting the wood and the infested forests, what have we done? Again we relied entirely on Ottawa. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, with regard to resource development, with regard to social services in this Province, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a policy in this Province and we will no longer have a policy in this Province. Because one of the things - and I am a little bit surprised to be able to quote him - is the past President of the university Mr. Morgan, of all the negative things that were said about Mr. Smallwood in the various years with regard to Mr. Smallwood talking about his broad, social conscience point of view,

MR. HISCOCK:

his overriding point of view of the needs of the people through education, through health, through social services, through industry, through industrial safety. And, Mr. Speaker, I said before this government got in by way of saying that the country is going in debt, by way of various other points. And what are we seeing? They got in, they were in there under so much surprise, Mr. Speaker, They had no plans once they got in there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - and Mr. Speaker, they still have no plans and it is still a Band-Aid approach. And until the people of this Province wake up and get rid of this government, we, as a Province, are going to suffer dearly, we suffered for the past ten years dearly, and I hope that our people, and I would love to have an election tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, to find out how this country and this Province, in particular, are being run by this negative attitude that this Province is having and particularly-not only negative, but no development whatsoever and then turn around and say to the national government, 'The reason why we do not have the Lower Churchill or our Northern cod, our resource, or our forest, or our fish, or our minerals, the reason why we do not have it because Ottawa will not give us any more money.' It is absolutely, I say this, Mr. Speaker, we have a government that does not even know the word 'co-operation', only confrontation.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to hear the member from the other side get up and speak about the problems facing this Province in terms of resource development, he managed to speak for ten minutes or so without mentioning one of the impediments that is in the way of this Province, whichever government might be in power, whether it be this government, Mr. Speaker, as we can expect to see the case for many, many years to come, or whether it were members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who were in power.

Is the member opposite serious in saying that this Province should not have the right to transmit electricity through Quebec? Is that what the member who was standing up, the member who was supposed to speak for the people of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, not one reference, not a single referenee in his speech to the greatest impediment

MR. BARRY:

to resource development in Labrador, the fact that this Province is not treated equally with other provinces in the movement of electricity, the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the federal counterparts of the party to which the member belongs do not have the political courage to bring in amendments to the National Energy Board Act to see that the people of Labrador and the other people of this Province can have their hydro-electric resources developed in a way that will benefit to the maximum the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed - and there will be further debate on this tomorrow afternoon and I am looking forward to it - that we have a Private Member's motion here supported presumably by the members on that side of the House from Labrador that we should construct Muskrat Falls immediately. And I believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) supports that concept.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Lower Churchill.

MR. BARRY:

Correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do

members opposite realize what they are saying when they commit themselves to Muskrat Falls? When they permit the federal government to get off the hook with respect to Gull Island, they are committing themselves to a power development which will see no power for Labrador, Mr. Speaker, which will see 600 megawatts developed for use on the Island to meet the domestic and commercial and present industrial needs of the Province, the bulk of which is on the Island, Mr. Speaker, and leave no power for development in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, it is this government - and the people of Labrador know this - it is this government which has fought for the rights of people in Labrador as well as the rights of people on the Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: It is this government, Mr. Speaker, who continues to say to the federal government of this nation, "No", Mr. Speaker, "it is short-sighted to build Muskrat Falls for twice in excess of \$3 billion when we could have Gull Island built", Mr. Speaker, "when we could have power available not just to meet our present needs but to provide a potential for industrial development in Labrador as well as on the Island". No, Mr. Speaker, the same short-sighted approach to a hydro electric development that we saw when that crowd was in office before, when the leaders of their government of the day were able to say in recent days, 'We did not look at the power contract. We had nothing to do with the power contract. We let the private sector, the private corporation make that power contract.' It is the same philosophy -

MR. STIRLING: You know the difference.
You know the difference.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - it is the same philosophy that members opposite are continuing to spew out in this House, Mr. Speaker. And they will never

MR. BARRY:

be elected the government of this Province. We will see three more leadership races, we will see three more changes of leaders on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, if that is the philosophy that the Leader of the Opposition is going to continue to espouse. He had better look to his back, Mr. Speaker, because there are enough shrewd members opposite. There are enough members opposite with that rat-like cunning that will tell them when the people of this Province will not stand for the political diatribe that they go on with, will not stand for the shortsighted development policies that would see us leap, leap, Mr. Speaker, at the first offer of anything that we get from the Federal Government. They would snap at it like trout snapping at May flies, Mr. Speaker. You have seen this little black flies about this time of the year, Mr. Speaker, float off on the surface of the pond and you see the way the trout leap up after them. Well we have, Mr. Speaker, nineteen or twenty trout on the other side of the House, that every time there is a little May fly of an offer from the Federal Government, however shortsighted it might be, to accept it, to go for it, they jump, they leap. They are after it, Mr. Speaker, like the trout after the May fly. Well, Mr. Speaker, Muskrat Falls - it may be, Mr. Speaker, that this government, this Province will be forced to develop Muskrat Falls because it cannot get the co-operation of the Federal Government for the better project, which is Gull Island, but this government is not going to leap after the May fly of Muskrat when we have a chance to get the big fish of Gull Island, Mr. Speaker. When we go trouting, Mr. Speaker, when we go trouting we do not look for those fish that are under the limit, which members opposite have a tendency to do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - Mr. Speaker, if their fishing policy, their trouting policy, is the same as their resource development policy, I would say that the game wardens of this Province should look very carefully at the trouting baskets of members opposite whenever they stroll back from the ponds. Because, Mr. Speaker, they would never throw back a two-inch, a three-inch, a four-inch trout. No, Mr. Speaker, they would say, 'Let us get it while we can', however shortsighted that decision might be. And, Mr. Speaker, while they are hauling in the two-inch and three-inch and four-inch fish, the big one is getting away. Well, Mr. Speaker, this government when it goes fishing for a hydro-electric project -

MR. MORGAN: We go for the big ones.

MR. BARRY: - we go for the big one, we go for the best one, we go for the one that will

MR. BARRY:

bring the most benefit for the people of this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) big one.

What would you call Cat Arm?

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Cat Arm is a big monster, is it?

MR. BARRY: Members opposite - I understand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - there is the occasional member opposite, Mr. Speaker, it has been said, who has not been adversed with jigging the occasional fish. Shame, shame, shame! But, Mr. Speaker, they seem to have lost their technique when it comes to politics, their jigging technique is being lost and they do not know how to apply the jigging technique to political development policy.

No, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to jump, in the context of the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) statement yesterday that he would not dare blaspheme against the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, any fight at all for a proper development policy members opposite look on as blasphemy against the federal government.

MR. POWER: Now look -
If you read the Bible too long.

MR. BARRY: - we are all Newfoundlanders, we have a few ideas together, combined in this House of Assembly about what we would like to see developed for the benefit of our people. Now surely heavens members opposite can show a little intestinal fortitude, can be courageous enough to put aside their partisan politics for a while, can be courageous enough to get on their feet and point out when the Prime Minister of Canada is not treating this Province fairly. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit with all sincerity that

MR. BARRY: this Province is not being treated fairly with respect to the transmission of energy within Canada. There is no other conclusion, that conclusion is inescapable, we are not being treated fairly.

MR. POWER: By the Liberals,

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, Gull Island could be underway within months after the federal government takes the appropriate action to see that the transmission of electricity across Quebec is permissible without our being forced to sell our energy to the Province of Quebec in a take it or leave it position. Gull Island can commence, Mr. Speaker, when we have the transmission of electricity possible across Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been indications from time to time that the federal government has been looking seriously at responding in a positive fashion to the very reasonable requests we have made, that the National Energy Board be amended. My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that here again, they are going to be forced, there is

MR. BARRY:

no question, ultimately they are going to be forced to treat this Province fairly. My fear is that what they come up with is going to be fair more in form than in substance, that they are going to stop-and instead of doing the two things that we have asked, that they authorize the National Energy Board to deal with the wheeling of electricity as well as the power corridor, we suspect that they are just going to amend the National Energy Board Act with respect to a power corridor but stay back from the amendment which would permit the wheeling of electricity and it is the wheeling right that will be most important to this Province, that will permit short term sales of surplus energy, Mr. Speaker. And I ask for the support of all members of this House to urge the federal government to amend the National Energy Board Act to permit not just a power corridor but also the wheeling of energy throughout any transmission system that has the capacity within Canada to hold it.

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

MR. BENNETT: That is the advantage, Mr. Speaker, of sitting closer to the Speaker. Thank you, anyway. The hon. the Minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of interest if I might just for a moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: The member opposite has pointed out that members opposite tend to go after what are called, in the vernacular, either pricklies or in Brigus they used to be called bantacles, which are the little things about that size as opposed to the real trout.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

Order, please!

The hon. member for

St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, all of the political rhetoric that we have just heard, undoubtedly the minister has got a lot of knowledge of course about hydro development. Likewise he would have a lot of knowledge about negotiations. And I would like for the minister, in the not too distant future, to table the correspondence between this government and Quebec with regard to what has actually -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The negotiations.

MR. BENNETT:

Yes, the negotiations have been ongoing between Quebec and this government. So that we can take a look at it and then we shall, I shall decide myself then if what this government has done in its efforts, indeed if they have put such efforts forward to negotiate. I can decide for myself then who is right and who is wrong. But at the moment, Mr. Speaker, I am in the dark with regard to knowing how much effort this government has put forward. What I hear in the news, the news release is the only thing that I hear except when the minister stands in the House of Assembly and tells us. And we are not hearing the other side of the story. We are hearing the minister's side of the story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BENNETT:

The minister will not convince me, he shall never live long enough to convince me that we are not a part of Canadian unity. He will not convince me that we can survive with one government, cannot convince me that we have not got two governments that take an interest in this Province and in Canadian people generally. And I am a Canadian.

MR. HOLLETT: I am proud of you.

MR. BENNETT: - and I am proud to be a Canadian, like I am proud to be a Newfoundlander, but, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian by choice. I was not born a Canadian and I have seen fantastic development in this Province brought about, primarily, by being a part of Canada. When Churchill Falls was implemented, when that was brought about, the price structure for the generated electricity then, was in line with that day's values, but the present administration wastes more time talking about something that they cannot change. They waste enough words in debate, Mr. Speaker, that if they took the bull by the horns and went out and rolled up their sleeves and developed and stopped flogging any error, be it their own error or somebody else's error, if they stopped wasting people's time in talking about catching little trout - I am surprised at the minister - one of these days I shall ask exactly how much it costs per minute to listen to such foolish, political rhetoric as I am hearing sometimes in the House of Assembly, how much it is costing of the taxpayers' dollars per minute to run this House of Assembly and drag it on into the Summer months when, indeed, we should all be getting out of the House of Assembly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: - we should be getting out of the House of Assembly and saving money for the taxpayer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: Every time that I stand up to speak, I shall not fail to remind -

MR. THOMS: It never fails.

MR. BENNETT: - I shall not fail to remind this hon. House of Assembly of the exorbitant, the unbearable provincial debt that we have incurred since we have had this Tory administration. When we start looking at the resource sector in our budget and our estimates here, Mr. Speaker, we should realize - I would like all hon. gentlemen to realize that it looks like there is only 18 per cent of the total budget that is set out for the resource sector. To me I feel that is a very small amount of money allocated for the resource sector when there is so much that needs to be developed to generate jobs, create employment so people in this Province can be employed, gainfully employed, so they in turn can return cash to the Treasury of the Province and help develop, be self-sufficient taxpayers instead of being a burden. It seems to me that this government wants to keep these people, who are presently dependent on government, totally committed and forever committed to a welfare state. When the minister speaks of going after the big things like Muskrat Falls,

MR. BENNETT: I wish the minister, and all the ministers, indeed, of this hon. House of Assembly would think more in terms of the human resource and the resource that we can develop with the human resource that we have at our disposal, such as the timber and the land that is at this moment being denied people the right to develop.

In my district I have a man who is aspiring to do farming. He has, I would think, probably invested anywhere from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and he is being rejected - he is being refused a loan of, I believe, in the order of \$10,000. And he does not owe any money. Mr. Speaker, this farmer wants to develop the land, and he is down there carrying limestone in a five gallon bucket because he cannot borrow \$10,000 from this government's Rural Development scheme or any other scheme.

MR. NEARY: Shame! Shame!

MR. BENNETT: He is down there trying to develop that land by carrying twenty-five tons of limestone in a five gallon pail and spreading it on his land. He is keeping fourteen cows and he has to mow all his hay by hand. He has no mechanization and he cannot borrow money from this government or through the system that is set out to assist in development. And he is not asking for a donation, a grant, he is asking for assistance in the form of a loan that has been set down and paid mainly by federal funding, and still that money is not available for that man.

That man has a family who want to work and develop the land and they are not given the opportunity to do so simply because of the lack of interest in this government. They are so interested in Churchill Falls, they are interested in the big game like Hibernia.

I spoke this morning with a fish plant operator who employs 1,200 people in his fish plant

MR. BENNETT: and I could not help but suggest, 'Well, that is worth the Hibernia.' There are only 600 or 700 people employed, I understand, in offshore Hibernia. And still, one fish plant alone, Mr. Speaker, employs 1,200 plant workers. And, Mr. Minister of Fisheries, after that, comes the fishermen and after that comes the resource sector and building boats, cutting timber to build boats. The transportation of the various - all the various equipment needed to

MR. BENNETT:

supply these boats.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) in your budget, 'Jim'.

MR. BENNETT:

The necessary equipment generally, and it all creates employment.

We have, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, such mismanagement that it is atrocious, and still, our provincial debt has escalated beyond any recovery unless we can have some great Santa Claus come about in a very, very short while. Hibernia shall not be able to take us out of this -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. THOMS:

Go back to sleep.

MR. BENNETT:

Hibernia shall not be able to take us away from the provincial debt, Mr. Speaker, unless we develop the resource that we have at our disposal other than or including development of Hibernia oil.

If we continue to wait, Mr. Speaker, until we can have revenues from offshore, and if we continue to keep our people from having land to develop, having timber to cut, and having fish to catch and process, if we can keep our people from all these avenues of resource and we emphasize only offshore oil, then I am very much afraid, Sir, we shall always have the heaviest provincial obligation in debt of any province across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made a few brief remarks about the Mahoney Report, the Mahoney Commission Report, and every time I speak in the House of Assembly I would like to remind the hon. gentlemen of this House that they should all read it, they should go back over it, I have been reminded by some hon. gentlemen that former administrations may not have been straightforward as the

MR. BENNETT: general public would like to have had them.

But, Mr. Speaker, this government brought in a bill, an Act to make it illegal to commit such crimes as have been committed as are displayed in this Mahoney Report, and indeed since 1974 it is a crime to commit some of the offences that have come out in this Mahoney Report. And not only is it a crime in principle, Mr. Speaker, it is a crime to the people of Newfoundland to rob them of the money that has gone down the drain, the taxpayers money, denying the people the right and the possibility of being able to develop our resources because of the lack of money this government now find themselves in. They do not have the money to develop and they have let half of it be squandered and wasted through corruption, mismanagement, and many other forms of giving away the peoples tax dollars. And like I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, some hon. gentlemen on the other side suggested that they may not be liked by this side of the House or indeed probably not even by the people in the Province generally, but they have made it possible themselves to put their hands legally in my pockets and take out my tax money and waste it,

MR. BENNETT: and I would like to see them now, I would like to see them, Mr. Speaker, think more seriously of the people that they represent.

Thank you.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there could have only been one person standing, I guess.

Mr. Speaker, it is the first chance I have had to speak in the concurrence debates. I would like to say just a couple of comments on the committee system. There has been one revealing fact, anyway, about the committee system. I have discovered that the chairmen of the committees had very little, if any, confidence in their ministers to appear before the committees and to be able to answer questions that were directed to them, in the main by the members of the Opposition. The one big problem that we had in our committee, as I see it, was that there was no definition of the function of the chairman. Whenever the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), for example, got into or appeared, as she did most of the time, to get into any little bit of trouble at all, then the chairman of our committee -

MR. NEARY: He bailed her out.

MR. THOMS: - was using his prerogative as chairman -

MR. NEARY: To protect her.

MR. THOMS: - to protect her, to jump in, to bail her out, and, consequently -

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

MR. THOMS: - consequently, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member from St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I believe the hon. gentleman is referring to me and he is just being incorrect.

MR. THOMS: Well, I can be more (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: As usual he is mired in misinformation, wallowing in error and absolutely incorrect and what he is saying is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion.

The hon. member from Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, this was one of the big problems that I found in our committee, except there was one occasion, Mr. Speaker, one occasion and that was when the chairman of our committee tried to - and the chairman was the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) but I thought everybody knew who I was talking about so I did not want to sound redundant, I thought everybody knew I was talking about the member for St. John's North - there was one exception, one exception to the ministers who appeared to our committee, and that was the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) who, when the chairman interjected, when he interjected - thought that it was his responsibility as chairman of the committee to protect the minister - jumped in - the Minister of Justice very neatly, very niftily, as the Minister of Justice can do, put him in his place and said, 'Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, but I can handle myself before this committee. I do not need help from the chairman, the member from St. John's North', but I do not have the time -

MR. CARTER: Rubbish, rubbish.

MR. THOMS: - go back and read Hansard when it is printed and you will find that half the time the chairman is

MR. THOMS:

interjecting, using his prerogative as Chairman and interjecting and using up time of the Committee, not asking questions, Mr. Speaker, he was not asking questions. What he was doing was interjecting and making statements and putting words or thought he was putting words into the mouths of the minister who came before our Committees.

MR. NEARY:

He does that down at

Public Accounts too but he does not get away with it.

MR. THOMS:

To me, Mr. Speaker, it

appeared that the Chairman of our Committee had very little confidence, very little faith and thought that the ministers who were appearing before our Committee, were incompetents. And, Mr. Speaker, in some cases I do agree with him. Some of the ministers who did appear before our Committee were incompetent, are incompetent and will continue to be incompetent.

MR. HODDER:

By the way, 'Les', do you notice

that the ministers who are supposed to be here responding to this Committee now are not in their seats?

MR. THOMS:

The Minister of Fisheries

is here. Of the five Heads, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Goudie) are here. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) were here because one of the reasons why I wanted to have a few words, was to ask the minister a question, a question in connection with the offshore resources of this Province.

The Prime Minister of Canada, as I understand it - and I could be wrong - the Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of Canada has stated very clearly that Newfoundland will receive 100 per cent of the revenues as if that resource was on land, which means that we will get 100 per cent of 45 per cent. And I can understand that. This administration was asking for 40 per cent and the Prime

MR. THOMS:

Minister of Canada has offered 43 per cent. So we gained three points there.

Now, there is also the question of the development, management and control. And the Prime Minister of Canada - maybe some other minister would like to get on his feet and answer the question for me seeing the Premier is not here, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is not here, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is not here, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not here, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is not here, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is not here, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is not here. There are no ministers in the second line. There is one out of - what? - seventeen or eighteen members of the Cabinet and here we are

MR. THOMS: discussing the concurrence. There are one, two, three, four, and I suppose in all fairness I will count the Minister of Rural Development who is standing in the wings. There are five out of seventeen or eighteen in the House listening to these debates. And no wonder I asked the question why we are open. People talk to me about the public of this Province not caring whether the House suddenly is open or closed, when we can only get five of the eighteen ministers here in the concurrence debates.

But anyway, the Government of Canada has offered us the same deal as Alberta has got, which I understand will mean something like \$100 million or \$100 billion or some figure like that to the people and the Government of Alberta. He has also said that there would be a joint development, a management of that resource. Now, Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, has accepted this offer, that they will get 100 per cent of the revenues and there will be joint management, joint development, joint control over the offshore oil and gas.

What I would like to know, and I believe the people of this Province have a right to know, is what this administration's position is on this matter. Does this administration accept this proposition in principle? Now, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the fact that there are negotiations, that there will have to be negotiations, that the joint agreement between the Province and Ottawa will have to be negotiated and agreed upon, but surely, we should know from this administration whether or not they accept in principle the idea of 100 per cent of the revenues plus joint development. That is what I would like to know and I have a feeling the people of this Province would like to know that. And, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have the two billion or

June 2, 1981

Tape 2086

EC - 2

MR. THOMS: three billion barrels of oil
off the coast of this Province and as long as we have
a confrontation between this Province

MR. THOMS:

and Ottawa in connection with that resource, it is not the Premier of this Province who is suffering, literally suffering. He may suffer at the next election because of it but not at this moment. But it is the people throughout this Province, it is the people in the Lawn, Lamaline, Taylor's Bay area who have to suffer, that particular stretch of road that I have been talking about. It is the people in Grand Bank who need so desperately a new bridge. It is the people in Lawn who need so desperately a new bridge. It is the people who need some sort of a shelter, a housing shelter in this Province, people who cannot afford to buy houses.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Your time is up.

MR. THOMS:

The Speaker will tell me when my time is up. These are the people who are suffering because of our lack of action in this regard. These are the people who are suffering. And I think it is criminal if we continue to let those people suffer. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get - maybe if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is not around, maybe somebody else would like to speak on behalf of the administration and give me an answer to the question that I ask about whether or not we accept in principle the Prime Minister's position.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just

want to cultivate -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. gentleman care to have the floor? I will yield to the hon. gentleman if he wants to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) copy of something.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to cultivate the topic raised by my colleague, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms). I was going to talk about rural development but it is getting kind of late in the day and the things that I have to say about the Rural Development Authority and the loans and the grants that were made to the Development Associations and so forth, I will save that for tomorrow and instead I will talk about the offshore situation that my hon. colleague raised.

But I want to tell the hon. member for Rural and Northern Labrador Development (Mr. Goudie), who is within the precincts of the Chamber, that he had better table the list of rural development loans that I have been asking for for the last several years especially the list for this year.

MR. MORGAN: It is public knowledge.

MR. NEARY: It is not public knowledge, the list has not been published.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) Peckford Administration to make everything public.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) fisheries loans (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, they tabled - no, no.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this the only thing they have tabled so far

MR. NEARY: is a list alright, but all it shows is what the loans were made for. It does not show the list of those who were recipients of the loans.

Am I correct in that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand the list of individual loans that were made totalling \$2 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the amount of the loans made in the 1979 - 1980 fiscal year, which is the year we are talking about, amounted to \$2,317,255.40. I have given the minister ample opportunity, I have put a question on the Order Paper, I have asked questions during the Oral Question period, and I am going to give the minister another chance to table the list of individual loans made, the industry type, the amount of the loan and the name and address of the recipient. And if the hon. the minister does not - I am quite prepared to hold this list back. If the hon. gentleman does not provide the list to the House - which we are entitled to have - if he does not provide the list for the people of this Province; it is taxpayer money. The hon. gentleman is duty bound to table the list. If he does not table it I will table the list tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. I will table the list tomorrow, and in case the hon. gentleman thinks that I am bluffing, here is the list. I will also table an accompanying list showing the grants of the Development associations.

MR. CARTER: Table it now so you (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I will not table it now.

I am going to give the minister an opportunity again to

MR. NEARY: table it because it is the minister's duty and obligation to table that list.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Here it is. I will table it tomorrow if the hon. gentleman does not table it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Okay? Fair enough.

And the CDA project grants, I will table that. And I will table it, Mr. Speaker, and I will show members of this House how much it cost the fund - that little publication called The Rounder. In 1978 - 1979, just as one example, it cost \$207,371 to fund The Rounder. Does Your Honour remember all the bellyaching we used to hear in this House about the Newfoundland Bulletin and where all the government referred to it, government members and the Opposition at the time? Your Honour will recall. The Newfoundland Bulletin, they used to call it the Newfoundland Bull, etc., etc. Well, here we have a publication that has been so pro government and has spent so much time playing up ministers and government policy, Mr. Speaker, that you could only classify it as a propaganda piece for the government - not doing the job it was supposed to do for the Rural Development Association. It is merely a little piece of government propaganda. Well,

MR. NEARY: back in 1978-1979 that cost \$207,371. No wonder they are ashamed to table these grants and loans in this House. That is only one example. I will give the House the other examples tomorrow. But I give the hon. gentleman fair warning, that if he does not table the list that this House is entitled to have and the information that the taxpayers of this Province are entitled to have, I will table it tomorrow. I had to get it via the backdoor I could not get it via the front door.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And my usual reliable sources of information, Mr. Speaker, will see to it that the documentation and the information is placed upon the table of this House. And I will elaborate on some of the loans and grants tomorrow, but today I want to deal with the offshore question that was raised by my hon. friend, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

And I want to say this at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday I was so pleasantly surprised in this House that you could hardly believe, I could hardly restrain my enthusiasm, I heard the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) state a policy in this House yesterday that the government are now entering into negotiations with the Government of Canada on the offshore question. And what the hon. gentleman said, he was articulating government policy, and here is what he said, and I am summarizing the hon. gentleman's words, the Minister of Mines and Energy, He said that the government now in these negotiations, they would prefer to have a negotiated settlement, that they are trying to get the best deal they can for Newfoundland. They are trying to get the best deal they can that will provide the Newfoundland

MR. NEARY: Treasury with the most revenue. That is what the hon. gentleman said. That is point number one.

And point number two was, that he saw no reason why the offshore could not be carried on as a joint development, joint management was the word the hon. gentleman used.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the government's position, if they consider Mr. Trudeau has weakened his position when he was here for the Cornish hen, if they think that Mr. Trudeau has changed his position, that he has weakened his position, that they can now sit down and bargain in good faith, that Mr. Trudeau is caved in, and this is the policy now of this government, these two points that I mentioned, that is what they are primarily interested in, then, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate, and this may come as a bit of a shocker now at ten minutes to six, eleven minutes to six and when nobody in the galleries, especially over my shoulder is listening, at least I hope they are not, because I would not want to be quoted on this, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the administration, I want to congratulate the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) for their approach, their new approach in this matter, and if they have beaten Mr. Trudeau to his knees, I would say God bless him, I congratulate him for it and I

MR. NEARY:

congratulate him now for being prepared to sit down with the Government of Canada, with the Prime Minister of this country to talk about joint management of the offshore resource -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I am sorry the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that because, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to harden the position on the other side. I do not want them to dig in anymore. I do not want them to start playing politics with this again so I call, I beg the hon. Leader of the Opposition to refrain from saying that is a policy that we have been articulating in this House for the past two or three years. Would the hon. Leader please, please, for the sake of Newfoundland, for the sake of getting a settlement on this offshore question, for the sake of getting it developed for Newfoundland, could the hon. Leader please never, never, never say that again because all that does is upset them and send them off -

MR. STIRLING: I thank them for their new position.

MR. NEARY: Exactly, that is the whole idea. It is psychological warfare now. So what we have to do -

MR. STIRLING: So we will then support this position of theirs.

MR. NEARY: Of course, we are going to support their position. We are persuaded - the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) yesterday persuaded me - as I said a few moments ago, I could hardly hold back my enthusiasm -

MR. TULK: Among tears of gratitude.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate him, the Minister of Mines and Energy, for this policy.

MR. NEARY: I hope, Mr. Speaker, they are sincere. I hope now they will not go off and hang their hat on one point. I hope they will not say to Mr. Trudeau and the Government of Canada, "Well, yes, we agree with all your points except you are not treating us the same as Alberta, that you are only giving us 100 per cent of 44 per cent until we become a 'have' province." Because, Mr. Speaker, if negotiations break off on that issue, then I am afraid the government will not be able to sell that to the people in an election. The people will not buy that. As a matter of fact, the people will just buy the opposite of that. The people will say, 'Well, okay, if that is the only point, Mr. Premier, and you come to us for a mandate on that particular point, you will lose the election'. So, Mr. Speaker, the government have won. The administration have won the battle. They have made Mr. Trudeau knuckle under and they are now prepared to sit down because he has caved in and negotiate and talk about joint management of the resource and to try to get the best deal they can for Newfoundland. And for that I commend them and I congratulate them, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, carrying on with the comments made by my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), if it is necessary for this to become the original thought of the government, their idea-now the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not smile.

MR. STIRLING: - no, the member for LaPoile may already be too late. It is unfortunate,

MR. STIRLING: he may be too late. Because the idea came from the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

MR. NEARY: Yesterday.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, but that may not be acceptable to the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. STIRLING: That may not be acceptable to the Premier because -

MR. NEARY: I assume he was speaking for the government.

MR. STIRLING: No, no. He is not always because there are times when he is allowed to speak and the other times -

So, Mr. Speaker, if we can settle that between the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Premier, then it really was not our idea and it really was not the Mines and Energy idea and it certainly was not an idea that was brought forward from 1973 or 1974. If some way the Minister of Mines and Energy can convince the Premier that it was his idea - that is what he was looking for all along, that it really was his idea. And what was his idea? Well, 100 per cent of the resources as if they were onshore and joint management with substantial control. And we saw today in this House how the Premier does not like to have anybody else think of anything, have an idea. Maybe on the offshore - maybe it is possible for him to go back before the university; maybe when he went back during his leadership when he was trying to run a campaign to become Premier of this Province - Leader of the P.C. Party and automatically then he became Premier of the Province - when he said that he was going to set up a royal commission to look into the whole development of the Lower Churchill, he was going to

MR. STIRLING: try as hard as he could to persuade his colleagues. Well, we have not seen that royal commission. And just so my colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), is not overly disappointed, maybe we will forget the position that it has always been the position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was Joe Smallwood's position, we will forget that. Maybe the member for LaPoile will take that back from Joe Smallwood. We will forget that it was always Frank Moores' position. We will take that back; forget that it was Brian Peckford's position - no, we cannot forget that. In keeping with what the member for LaPoile said, we have to convince the Premier that this was his original thought, it never came from the previous administration. It was never thought of that the only way to develop the offshore was a joint management position.

And now, Mr. Speaker, if we can accept that position, then maybe we have to forget the outburst of the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) yesterday. I am sure he will be lectured for it. Because the new look, as really set

MR. STIRLING: out by the man who is running Newfoundland - I hope nobody will let the Premier know that anyone in Newfoundland is suspicious that the banker came down to take a look at his assets, the banker from Alberta came down to take a look at his assets. And he stood up today at a meeting of the Chartered Accounts Association and said that he certainly supported Newfoundland's position on ownership because he feels that Premiers should go around Canada and get to understand each other's positions. He had a tour of the fish plant today so he now understands everything there is about fishing and he is hoping that the Premier is going to go up and visit a farm so he will know all there is to know about agriculture.

And what they are going to develop in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is the new concept, the new concept of Canada, the concept in which Alberta is the bank and all the provinces come in and see Alberta and say, 'Please, Sir, how much can we have this year'. And the Premier stands up and is very proud of the fact that Alberta will give us a preferred rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody knows in this Province that there is no such thing as a free lunch. There is no such thing as a province giving money out at below the going rate. Now it may be some embarrassment for the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to recognize that this Province does not have the credit rating after ten years of the Tory rule, they just do not have the credit rating to do it on their own. So they have to say to Alberta, 'Please, Alberta, will you give us some more money at the increased rates?'. Now they really object to having to talk to Ottawa about anything but they are not at all concerned about Alberta having the clutches. Alberta has more of an interest in Newfoundland now than any of the other loaners -

June 2, 1981

Tape No. 2092

IB-2

AN HON. MEMBER:

Call it six o'clock.

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, okay, all it

six o'clock. Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

It is agreed to call it

six o'clock. The hon. Leader of the Opposition adjourns the debate.

The hon. President

of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move

the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. and the House do now adjourn.

On motion the House

at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 p.m.