

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1981

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) must be very touchy about this particular subject because the member had hardly gotten into the preamble to his speech. He had uttered about two sentences, Mr. Speaker, and had not gotten to his question. So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, with respect to the point of order, it was my understanding that the hon. member had asked a question and I think the question was to ask the Premier how the British Parliamentary system works. I assume that was the question. He asked that question in any event.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the question I would set up a time for the hon. member for LaPoile to come down to my office and we can discuss the British parliamentary system and what I think of it. I do not intend to consume all of Question Period answering that kind of question because I am sure other hon. members have very important questions to ask about jobs and the fishery and the forestry, and other important issues in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I would submit to the House, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. HANCOCK: The Premier is trying to get off the hook.

MR. NEARY: - that the Premier does not have the foggiest notion of how the British Parliamentary system of government works or he would have demanded, immediately he would have demanded the resignation of these two ministers. But the hon. gentleman just gave an answer that the ministers acted in the

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, for quite some time now, the hon. members of the Opposition have been decrying my government's tough stance on such constitutional issues as the fishery, hydro transmission and offshore ownership. How many times has it been said that our people do not want to hear of the Constitution, they want to hear of jobs, jobs in a Province with Canada's highest unemployment rate. Well, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the tremendous positive effect that success on the constitutional issues would have on our unemployment rate, my government is more than pleased with the progress we have been making in our all too quiet way.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the Newfoundland economy is among the most buoyant in the nation -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if not in North America as a whole.

When I was elected leader of my Party, and thus Premier, two years ago to the day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the unemployment rate in our Province was a staggering 17.1 per cent. Figures for February of this year show that our unemployment rate is now 12.7 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - a drop of 4.4 per cent in just

PREMIER PECKFORD: two short years. This has been caused, Mr. Speaker, by adherence to my government's policy of job creation for our people. The number of people employed last month was up 20,000 over the same month in 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: These figures hold true across the board, Mr. Speaker, with the steady increases in employment for men, for women and for young people in the 15 to 24 age bracket. For example, in 1980 employment for men enjoyed a 3.4 per cent increase, the youth figures had a 3.9 per cent increase and the women's employment underwent a staggering 10.2 per cent increase. That is performance, Mr. Speaker, performance from a government that some claim is not concerned with mundane things such as jobs and a decent standard of living for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: My government's policies are having their effect, Mr. Speaker, the figures speak for themselves. I call upon all hon. members to envision what constitutional success could bring us - thousands of new hydro, fishery and offshore jobs. Only give us the tools, Mr. Speaker, the levers and the wherewithal to manage our economy and Newfoundland and Labrador will show our fellow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - Canadians the stuff of which we are truly made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

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

MR. NEARY: That a boy, Nero, fiddling while Newfoundland burns.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that since there was nobody on that side who would congratulate the Premier for having achieved his second year as Leader of the Party -

MR. ROWE: he had to do it himself.

MR. STIRLING: - and some of us on this side are equally surprised that he attained his second year as Leader of the Party, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when the man has the gall, the absolute gall, to bring out this kind of a statistic as his anniversary present.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) turning over in his grave.

MR. STIRLING: And I suppose this is further evidence that he and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) do not agree because the minister, the last chance he got to speak, caused us to believe that all of this figures were nonsense. Mr colleague, who is not here today, when he questioned him, he said, 'Oh, you can do anything with figures'.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the thousands of people in that age group under twenty-four, those people who are unemployed today, the 7,000 people who are looking for jobs on the offshore, those 7,000 must be delighted to know today that there are no problems in Newfoundland, here on Fantasy Island, here on Fantasy Island with our Premier fantasizing with the great movements that have been made since he became Premier.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be dealing a little bit later with some of the problems of some of the people whom he will not sit down and talk to, some of the people who are suffering from this grandiose propaganda, newspaper release type of thing. And, Mr. Speaker, the real sad thing about it is that he probably actually believes it! He probably actually believes it. He can go through all of this Province, Mr. Speaker, to all the people who are unemployed and if he had the gall to read them these figures he would not be looking forward to many days of rabbit catching out in South Brook-or maybe a lot of days of rabbit catching in South Brook. Because, Mr. Speaker, one of the things he does not tell us-and I would challenge the Premier to do it-is to tell us where these jobs come from. Are they the seasonal plants that were opened for the over-fishing of the Northern cod stock for a month, all of those temporary jobs? Are they all of them LIP jobs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: Are they all the federal government's expenditures for LIP programmes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

MR. L. STIRLING: Are they the 90 per cent of the forestry agreement, the money that is spent on forestry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, how quickly the Premier forgets. In the Throne Speech he could only predict 1,800 jobs, all of these created by federal funds, and now suddenly 20,000 jobs have appeared out of the mist.

MR. TULK: Bluff!

MR. L. STIRLING: Propaganda, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Arising out of this statement which we just had from the Premier, and in view of the statement by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) that he cannot support this government's position on the handling of the NAPE strike—I take it by the fact that the member is sitting here that he has not resigned — has the minister indicated to the Premier that he will be resigning as Minister of Labour and Manpower?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: In view of the fact that the minister has not resigned, has the Premier decided to ask for his resignation?

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the ministers concerned acted in the context of bringing an end to the particular labour disputes under issue right now and an end to all labour disputes so that people can go back to work, and that it was in that context and not in the context of opposing government policy.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I find that answer to be very difficult to understand. Both ministers - as I understand it, and perhaps the Premier can explain to me how he thinks the British Parliamentary system of government operates - both of these ministers had a right and a duty, if they felt strongly on this matter, to express these matters around the Cabinet table.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order.

MR. HANCOCK:

Silly Willie is up. Silly Willie.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The point of order, I think, is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker. This is Question Period, the time for asking questions and I do not think that it is the time, nor is it really of great interest to hear -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- to hear the hon. gentleman make a speech as to his views of Cabinet collective responsibility or solidarity.

MR. HODDER:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: context that they were trying to get people back to work to settle these strikes. Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate on that? Because my understanding of how the Cabinet works is that these two ministers were free to debate and discuss these matters in private around the Cabinet table on the eighth floor, but instead of that they chose to go outside the Cabinet room and denounce government policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I have said on two previous occasions here today, in my view the ministers supported certain aspects of the present disputes that are under negotiation right now, and some not even under negotiation, in the context of wanting, sincerely wanting to see these strikes over and have not opposed government policy.

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

MR. STIRLING: Maybe the Premier does not realize that his ministers signed something that said, "We believe that something is wrong when the government, through you, refuses to appoint a mediator to help settle a dispute."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Do I take it from what the Premier has said that now that his Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is urging him to take some action, will he now agree to appoint the mediator that was requested by the union many, many weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to respond to a comment or a suggestion or a phrase taken out of any particular context that one of the ministers might have said over the weekend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Because of the serious nature of this attack on government policy by a minister who sat around the Cabinet table in secret, oath bound and voted in favour of this policy, and then went out a couple of days later and denounced government policy, would the Premier indicate to the House why he has not demanded the resignation of the two ministers who signed that petition denouncing government policy?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that both ministers acted in good faith and in the context of wanting to see all people who are presently in a labour dispute position back to work.

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 -

MR. MORGAN: Can you not find bigger issues than that?

MR. NEARY: That is the biggest issue in this Province today, showing the chaos in government.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should interject -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: - delightedly, because the last time this question of Cabinet solidarity - Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a very serious question. We seem to be now moving - the Cabinet has certain very specific protections, that of Cabinet secrecy, but a Cabinet minister has only two choices; he either lives with the Cabinet or he resigns. Now is the Premier saying that it is all right for Cabinet ministers to express any view, to take any position even against government policy?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will respond by simply saying that in its totality and in talking to the ministers I am satisfied that both ministers acted sincerely and genuinely in an effort to try to -

MR. NEARY: Cabinet solidarity.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - project an image, especially in the case of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), that he is sincere in wanting this dispute over, that the whole question of ways and means to solve the dispute are still a matter of discussion in Cabinet and at some point when Cabinet changes its present direction, if in fact it does change its direction, then we shall inform this hon. House.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: The Premier did not answer the question. The question is, is he now prepared, in view of this very drastic action taken by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn),

MR. STIRLING: the threat of resignation, has the threat of resignation caused the Premier to re-examine his position? Will he now make a commitment that he will appoint a mediator to settle this dispute?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition, and I did answer the question before, that if government changes its present position as it relates to the disputes in question it will inform this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: I will yield to my colleague, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the matter is -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: This matter is probably, Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious matters to arise in the operation of a Cabinet under our British parliamentary system. I would say in our whole history, and it is unprecedented. Now would the hon. Premier indicate to the House what aspects of the present disputes the ministers were objecting to when they stepped outside of Cabinet, when they stepped outside of their Cabinet oath and their Cabinet secrecy, when they stepped outside of that, what aspects of the present disputes were they opposing? They were opposing certain aspects of the present disputes so we were told, by the Premier. What aspects? Would the Premier care to tell us what they were?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry I was not in town over the weekend, but I noticed since I got back, in the papers, in the newspapers and on the electronic media that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had a fair amount to say. And given his previous questioning to me, which indicates that I am ignorant of the British parliamentary system and he is all knowledgeable in it, and that he was in St. John's this past weekend and has commented extensively on it, I would pose the question the other way.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that they would not understand on that side is common courtesy. On this side we do yield to each other and we do work together, something they would not understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments made by the Premier, do I assume that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) still speaks for this government on questions of labour? Would the Premier confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is a very broad question, Mr. Speaker, 'questions of labour.' The President of Treasury Board does have a role to play in "questions of labour," and a number of other ministers do from time to time when employees of their departments or whatever are involved in labour disputes, so that therefore one cannot make a response in a black and white situation to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition. There is a particular role. No doubt the Leader of the Opposition has read the act under which the minister operates and therefore knows full well, being the alternative Premier in this Province, just exactly what the role of the Minister of Labour and Manpower is, and hence I will not go through the song and

PREMIER PECKFORD: dance or the chapter and verse of that particular statute under which the minister operates. Suffice it to say now there are roles and responsibilities that the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) , the Minister of Labour and Manpower, performs which most honourable members know about, that the President of Treasury Board performs, and other ministers in this government, and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will continue to discharge the responsibilities that he has under that statute.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Leading out of that dissertation, can I ask the Premier a specific question since it has to do with his government, his Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn). When the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) charges publicly that the union is bribing the strikers, was he speaking on behalf of government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would have to get the full context of the statement that the Leader of the Opposition just mentioned. I would not be, you know, prepared to make a blanket response to that kind of question. Suffice it to say that many ministers from time to time make statements and if you take one part of that statement and try to make something out of it, no doubt it is very easy to do so.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if you do check and you check his statement carefully, and you find that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), speaking on behalf of labour for your government, has said that a union is bribing the strikers, what action will you take?

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 396

AH-4

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The question is a hypothetical question. The hon. Leader of the Opposition should know that hypothetical questions are not permitted to be asked. If he wishes to rephrase it, I will allow him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile yields to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Let me rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. If the Premier

MR. STIRLING: will take my word, the word of a member of this House, as I take his word - I heard the newscast and the minister did say that the union was bribing their strikers - would the Premier indicate what actions he will take if he finds that he can take my word for the fact that the minister said it?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I would have to rule that this is pretty well the same question the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked before. It is a hypothetical question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: - yields to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, has the Premier discussed this matter with the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn)?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: And did the Minister of Labour indicate to the Premier that he accused the union of bribing the strikers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with the Minister of Labour and Manpower all the events that have happened on the labour front. I discussed it with him the week before last, last week and again today, and will continue to do so as the labour scene in the Province continues to experience problems. We have discussed many things and everything that myself and the minister discuss is not necessarily information that I would be willing to disclose to this hon. House. Some of those conversations, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows, are confidential.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier if it is his government's policy, the government Cabinet position, does the Premier believe, is it his position, that the union has been bribing its strikers?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will not answer that question. I will only answer it in this way: I believe the union is doing what it believes is rightfully their responsibilities in a labour dispute situation, and I believe that the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the other members of the government are doing what they believe is right in discharging their responsibilities. I will not get into value judgements as to whether in fact a given union or a given group in a union or an executive of a union are engaged in that kind of thing. I do not believe for a moment that either government or the union would exercise themselves in that kind of way. This is a very difficult dispute that we are trying to deal with. We are doing our best to deal with it and we will continue to do so.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Premier correctly there a few moments ago in answer to a question, that he said he was out of town on the weekend and was not familiar with the facts of this particular case, and yet the hon. gentleman also told us in the same breath that he was not demanding the resignation of these two ministers who publicly denounced government policy? Is that the situation, the hon. gentleman only got back in town this morning, or was the hon. gentleman in his office this morning?

MR. NEARY: And should it not have been one of his first duties to send for these two ministers, to find out precisely what happened and demand their resignation? Or is the hon. gentleman just being flippant about this whole matter and not taking it seriously?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, every day in the last twenty or thirty days, I have been involved in the whole question of the labour situation in this Province and will continue to be until it has, shall I say, settled down. There are a number of groups now negotiating with government and with Treasury Board. There is a strike at the College of Trades and Technology, there is a strike at the Workers' Compensation, and we are monitoring that, and I am meeting with the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and with the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) and other ministers on it almost on a daily basis. It is not a very flippant matter as far as I am concerned; it is a very serious matter. We believe that we are being reasonable and fair in our proposals that we put before the membership of those two groups; 5,500 workers have already accepted the same package who are in like categories, that we have offered an average of 22 per cent increase over two years, 27 per cent and more over two years for the lowest paid workers, that this is consistent with the kind of treatment that governments which are wealthier than ours have offered their workers in other parts of Canada.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the question I put to the hon. gentleman did not have to do with the dispute. The question I put to the hon. gentleman involves another principle and that is of Cabinet secrecy and Cabinet solidarity.

March 17, 1981

Tape 397

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: What I asked the hon. gentleman
was - and let me be more precise - has he discussed this
matter of denunciation of government policies by two ministers
outside the Cabinet, publicly taken to the radio, television

MR. NEARY: take them to the radio, television and to the newspapers denouncing public policy, has he discussed that today or yesterday with these two ministers?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, my response in indicating that I was not flippant, obviously meant that I have had discussions with these ministers in the last several hours on this very important matter.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. gentleman - now, we are getting somewhere.

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

MR. NEARY: Now, we are getting somewhere. The hon. gentleman is either deliberately misleading the House, Mr. Speaker, or he is ignorant of the facts because -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not need to quote to Your Honour the authorities because it is obvious that anyone is not allowed to say that a person has misled the House, page 108 of Beauchesne, or deliberately misleading the House. there are two references here to that, or deliberately misled the House. There are about fifteen references to that. Also, Mr. Speaker, one is not allowed to say indirectly what one cannot say directly, and the hon. gentleman by any stretch of the imagination is imputing this and I submit, Your Honour, that before the Question Period continues that the hon. gentleman must retract that particular -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Just to save time, Mr. Speaker, whatever it is I said that offended the hon. gentleman, I take it back and I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I understand the hon. member for LaPoile withdraws.

MR. NEARY: This is too important -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - it is too important, Mr. Speaker, to be side-tracked by the hon. member for St. John's East (W. Marshall). The hon. Premier now has admitted, after telling the House and the people of this Province that he was not aware of the facts, that he did not have the facts at his fingertips; now he is admitting that he has discussed this matter with the two ministers, and no doubt in the process of discussing this matter with the two ministers, he got the facts. Now, would the hon. gentleman answer the question I asked him ten minutes ago, and that is what is it that these two ministers - what part of the government policy do these two ministers disagree with that they felt morally obligated to step outside the Cabinet and denounce government policy? What part of the policy is it they disagree with?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now I understand why the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is not the leader because the Leader of the Opposition asked a polite question at the beginning of the Question Period and I answered it and I indicated on two occasions that I had spoken to the ministers. So for the member for LaPoile to suddenly say that now he has achieved some measure of success -

MR. NEARY: No, you told me you were out of town. You were out of town.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ah, but I did say in answer twice, two answers to two questions that I had met and talked to the minister concerned and it was as a result of that that I was

PREMIER PECKFORD: able to categorically indicate that I was satisfied that the ministers were acting in the context in wanting to see an end to these disputes, just the same way as the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) does or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H. Newhook) or whatever. And therefore I repeat again what I said in answer to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, that obviously this being a very important matter that as Premier I would consult with and discuss with the ministers and other members this very important issue to ensure that government's position is clearly understood and that we go forward in a view of trying to settle them.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. gentleman correctly now? Is this what the hon. gentleman is saying, that any minister in the Cabinet who sits down around the cabinet table and discusses a matter in the privacy of the Cabinet and agrees to a government policy, that a day or two later he can step outside the Cabinet and denounce that policy? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I never said that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman then tell us what it is he is saying? Because these two ministers did

MR. NEARY: indeed denounce government policy after agreeing with it around the Cabinet table where they are under oath. Now what is it the hon. gentleman is saying?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have just said it for the last twenty minutes or so, but if the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) does not understand it, I am very sorry. I cannot help that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier now inform the House if all ministers of the Crown are now to understand that they too have the right to support government policy in private and then feel free to denounce that very policy in public without having to resign from the Cabinet, to feel free to do so?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier would be very upset if he knew that some of the information given to this House by the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) is not in agreement with the facts?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, once again I guess it is a hypothetical question and one would have to deal with it as I saw it, I am sure the President of the Treasury Board and every minister in this House tries to give the information factually and as true to form as it is supposed to be. Whether it is as extensive as one hon. member would like or the Leader of the

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 398

EL - 5

PREMIER PECKFORD: Opposition would like is another question. But it is the policy of this government to provide as much information to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Opposition as is humanly possible.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have done so regularly since this House opened, and since this government has been in office, and will continue to do so.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the facts - I have checked the rules of the House and I am not allowed to say that somebody misled the House, but in the last discussion on this matter the information given to this House was, "There have not been any negotiations between the two for the very reason that the union has indicated it wishes to break off negotiations and undertake strike action."

The answer from the union: "The union contends this statement is false." Would the Premier be interested in examining that any further?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, the problem is it is a difference of opinion over a set of negotiations. And I am very, very surprised to see that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) would automatically, in his first lead-in question on this subject, imply that the government was wrong and dishonest and the union was right and honest. One would think that the Leader of the Opposition would wait until he had both sides of the story and then make up his own mind. That is very, very surprising to me.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have and I have checked it out. As a matter of fact, one of the other things that the Premier has repeated today is this question of 5,700 employees.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Fifty-five hundred.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, 5,500 - 5,700 is what Mr. Collins said.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, he has got the refined -

MR. STIRLING: Well, which one is right?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition should refer to a member by his constituency or his portfolio.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The information that I have, Mr. Speaker, from the union is that we are talking, in total, 1,400 employees in the maintenance and operations services, and 2,900 employees in the general services, and it did not include the 800 people who were laid off by this government. So would the Premier now be prepared to accept that that part of the information, at least, is incorrect?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously, as all hon. members can know in this House, the Leader of the Opposition is nit picking. The situation is simply this: A substantial number of people in the public service, represented by the M.O.S. group, represented by the general service group, who are in similar, identical categories as those people who now work at the College of Trades and work at the Workers' Compensation, have

PREMIER PECKFORD: accepted a package that is now being rejected by the workers and their union at the College of Trades and the Workers' Compensation.

I understand from the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) that the figure that the Treasury Board have been using is 5,715. But that is not relevant, Mr. Speaker. What is relevant is that we believe -

MR. STIRLING: exaggerated by 3,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no.

MR. STIRLING: It is probably like the unemployment statistics.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, the Leader of the Opposition will have to prove those wrong. The onus is on him not on me - and Statistics Canada too, by the way.

MR. HODDER: Just the opposite. Just the opposite.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You will just have to go form your own Statistics Canada. The situation is that this government have offered an average increase to these workers of somewhere around 11 per cent in the first year - not 8 per cent - that for the lowest paid worker, they get the highest percentage increase, some of them up to 27 per cent over twenty-four months; an average over two years of 22 per cent for all workers. We believe that to be a fair and equitable package and we are willing to sit down and talk about it at any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this meeting that took place this morning between the Premier and the two ministers who denounced government policy in public. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the matter of the resignation of these two gentlemen was in any way, shape or form discussed? Did they offer to resign? Did the Premier ask for their resignations? Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate on that meeting that took place this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile is asking similar questions as have already been asked by the Leader of the Opposition. And I have indicated in response to the Leader of the Opposition that conversations of this sort, between the ministers and the Premier on matters that they have to discuss, are confidential and I do not intend to discuss them here today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary; Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we continue with this way of operating government in this Province we are going to have anarchy, nobody will believe a word that the minister says. Is not the hon. gentleman interested in clearing up this matter for the sake of the people of this Province and letting them know just exactly what happened between the Premier and these two ministers who felt obligated to go out publicly and denounce government policy? Is not the hon. gentleman

March 17, 1981, Tape 399, Page 5 -- apb

MR. NEARY: prepared to elaborate
and tell us whether they offered their resignations to
the hon. gentleman or has he demanded their resignations?

MR. S. NEARY:

Tell us what kind of an agreement they came to. Were they reprimanded? What happened at this meeting? I mean, Mr. Speaker, this is going to destroy confidence in the government.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I believe the hon. member has asked his question.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, what I think the people of Newfoundland are interested in is getting these disputes solved, not the conversation between the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I also think that the people of Newfoundland are interested in jobs and are interested in creating more jobs in this Province. Now that we have it down by 4.4 per cent in two years, let us hope that through diligent effort we can get it down another four or five per cent in the next two years. That is what the people of Newfoundland are interested in. They are not interested in talks and conversations between the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or anybody else. They are interested in action, they are interested in jobs and that is what this government intends to give them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 400

SD - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Under Standing Order 23, Mr.

Speaker, I move that the regular order of business of this House be suspended to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, that two ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), having given their support to a government policy in the privacy of Cabinet at an oath-bound meeting of Cabinet, a few days later denounced that very policy, creating an intolerable situation that would prohibit Cabinet from functioning in future unless these ministers resign voluntarily or are asked to resign by the Premier.

MR. L. THOMS:

Can we include the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in that?

MR. MARSHALL:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is an observation, because the hon. gentleman has risen again for the - you know, this is about the fourth time it has happened in the nine days the House has reconvened-for adjournment of the debate. Now the authorities are there on pages 91 and 92, paragraph 287, "'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought up early enough and public interest demands that discussion take place immediately."

Mr. Speaker, there is obviously no urgency of debate in this. There is also the fact that we have just consumed the Question Period of a half an hour

MR. MARSHALL: and the questions have been all upon this and there have been answers given. There is also the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Address in Reply is the next order of business to be called. So it is obvious that this is not a matter of urgency of debate.

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

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is quite right when he stressed, Mr. Speaker, that it is the urgency of debate that requires the House to suspend the regular order of business under Standing Order 23 to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

Now, I would submit to Your Honour that this matter is indeed urgent. It is the first time in British parliamentary history, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: - that a minister - not one, not two but a minister privately supported government policy and denounced that policy publicly on television and radio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the only other time it happened in British parliamentary history was in the great debate for free trade. And in that debate, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is in Beauchesne.

MR. NEARY: - Your Honour can always check Beauchesne - in that debate -

MR. SPEAKER: Can the hon. member give me the reference?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not have the reference with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down, you are wasting the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No, I am not wasting the time of the House. Mr. Speaker, if we allow this matter to stand on the public record it will create anarchy, it will undermine the confidence in the government -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. member should confine his remarks to the point of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am discussing the urgency of debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe you are debating more than you are discussing the urgency of debate. Could the hon. member confine his arguments to the point of order?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am trying to do Your Honour. I do not know if I am fumbling it or not. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, just to rivet the message home of the urgency of this matter, that it has never happened before in British parliamentary history. The only reference that I could find is in the great debate on free trade when the government of the day in Westminster in England allowed three ministers -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Again I believe the hon. member is debating the issue rather than the point of order, which is to allow this motion to be made. So there is a point of order that has been raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). I understand the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wishes to argue the point of order, and that is what I would ask him to contain his remarks to, not the issue which will be debated if this motion is allowed.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I could not think of any point that I could make that could make the matter more urgent than to point out to the House-and the hon. gentleman cannot deny the fact, Mr. Speaker - that this is the first time - and we are operating under the British parliamentary system in this Province, Mr. Speaker - it is the first time that this particular incident has happened where ministers have not been asked for their resignation. If nothing is done about it, Mr. Speaker, it will undermine the confidence of the people in their system, in the government. It will create chaos and anarchy, Mr. Speaker, and I submit, Your Honour, that I cannot think of another issue that is more important -

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Your Honour has given a ruling to the remarks made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in addressing this point of order. The only recourse when somebody uses a point of order to transgress the ruling of the Speaker is to rise on a point of privilege, which I now do.

My point of privilege is precisely this, that Your Honour has made a ruling to the remarks made by the hon. member for LaPoile. The hon. member for LaPoile, while ostensibly accepting Your Honour's ruling, has immediately gone back and continued on in exactly the same tenor as he did before, thereby ignoring Your Honour's ruling. Now if Your Honour's ruling is ignored in this House, it becomes a matter of privilege and the House cannot continue, Mr. Speaker, in a vein like this. Your Honour's ruling has to be observed by every single member in this House. And what the hon. member is doing now whether, advertently or not, is flagrantly violating the ruling of Your Honour and casting this House in the arena of disorder.

And I would respectfully submit, Your Honour, that the time has come to tell the hon. member for LaPoile to make his comments and bring them to an end. And if he persists, Mr. Speaker, if somebody persists in this House of trying to take the House on his own back

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
MR. MARSHALL: - and flagrantly disobey Your Honour's ruling, there is only one remedy; the hon. member knows that quite well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
If hon. members would restrain themselves, we may be able to eliminate this matter very quickly.

Does the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) wish to speak on the point of privilege?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that that was not a point of privilege, that was merely an excuse for the hon. gentleman to unleash his usual vicious attack on a member of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and dictate to Your Honour.
Because Your Honour knows that there is a procedure in this House that if I question the ruling of Your Honour - which I did not do, which the hon. gentleman accused me of doing - if I did that, Your Honour would have immediately brought me to order, would have pointed out the Standing rule of the House that I had violated, which I did not, and Your Honour knows that because Your Honour did not bring me to order. I would submit there is no point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it is merely a tactic used by the hon. gentleman to try again to muzzle the Opposition. Well, we have no intention of being muzzled by that hon. gentleman or anybody on the government

MR. NEARY: benches, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I thank hon. members on both sides for their submissions to the point of privilege. The Chair's role, of course, when a point of privilege is raised, is to determine whether or not there is a prima facie case. In this particular instance, of course, there is not a prima facie case, in my opinion.

If the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wishes to have a few final remarks on the original point of order, I will hear them; if not, I am prepared to make a ruling.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I thank Your Honour for Your Honour's courtesy - and really, I should not have to thank Your Honour because we have privileges in this House. In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to reiterate what I said in the beginning, that if this matter is not dealt with forthright, is not dealt with immediately - and obviously, the Premier does not intend to deal with it - it is going to destroy people's confidence in the system, it is going to undermine the integrity of the government, it is going to undermine the democratic process, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to make the Cabinet look like a crowd of fools.

MR. THOMS: Which is exactly what they are.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I have heard enough to the point of order.

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

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, one final submission.

MR. STIRLING: I think that in bringing up this Resolution under Section 23(a), there is no other provision anywhere in the normal debate that deals with it and what we have here is a situation which under the rules I could not deal with earlier, but we can now. And that is what we have in fact here is a very basic change and my colleague is quite right. If we allow this to go by without debate we are talking about an essential, basic change.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, is arguing -

MR. STIRLING: No, I am not arguing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: - why we should or should not have the debate. I do not believe that is the point. The point at issue is the motion that has been presented by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). So if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has some new argument - and the hon. Leader should be seated when the Chair is standing - if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has some new argument to present to the point of order that was

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

originally raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I would be prepared to hear it; if not, then I am quite prepared to make a decision on a motion that has been presented.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, I would like to read what is in fact a vote of non-confidence in the government.

"We, the undersigned, believe that the current disputes between the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the workers of the College of Trades and Technology -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

- and Workmen's Compensation -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

- should never have occurred."

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not understand the relevancy to the debate on the point of order with reading a petition or whatever. So if the hon. Leader has no other argument to present to the point of order, then the Chair is ready to rule.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) wish to make some argument to the point of order that has been raised?

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think if you will allow me to finish reading what was signed by the minister you will see how significant it is that this matter be debated.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, with all due deference to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), I do not

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): wish to engage in a debate or argument with him. The matters which he is now perhaps trying to explore on the floor of the Assembly would be the type of information that would be debated if indeed this motion was allowed. But this motion has not been allowed. The Chair has to decide whether or not it is going to allow this motion.

There has been a point of order raised saying that this motion should not be allowed, If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) wishes to argue some point to that point of order, then the Chair is prepared to listen to it. Otherwise I am going to have to soon be able to give a ruling and I will ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he wishes to continue.

MR. STIRLING: It may be a question of semantics, What I am attempting to do is on the point of order in which he said that it is not urgent for debate, I am trying to make the point that there is nowhere else in the agenda that we can debate what is in fact a vote of non-confidence in the government by a Cabinet Minister, which is a complete change of the rules of this House that we operate under. And that is the basis under which I would like to be able to continue to read. If the Speaker obviously rules that I cannot, then I cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I would have to rule that that type of information is not pertinent to the debate on the point of order at this particular time.

If there are no other submissions, the Chair now would like to make a ruling with respect to the motion moved by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and it is a matter, of course, that has become repetitive in the last couple of weeks, in view of the fact that it had not occurred in the first two sessions that I have been Speaker. I have now had a chance in the last couple of weeks to do some research and look up some information relating to motions made under Standing Order 23. In this particular instance I would rule that, as I have on the

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 403

NM - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): last couple of occasions,
that there is a possibility and an opportunity for members
to discuss and debate this particular matter because of the
fact that still on the Order Paper is the Address in Reply
which is, by tradition, a very wide-ranging debate and also

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): in Question Period members may be able to ask the same sort of questions pertaining to this particular information. So I would rule that while the matter may very well be of importance, that is not the Chair's role in this particular situation; the Chair's role is to determine whether or not there is urgency for debate and whether there is no other opportunity for that debate. I rule that there is; therefore, I cannot allow the motion at this particular time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1. Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1. Address in Reply. The last day I believe debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr.F.Rowe).
The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the twenty-five minutes that I have left I will confine my remarks to the revised high school programme that is to be implemented over the next three years, phased in over the next three years with the extension of Grade XII.

I do not expect, Sir, that I will have enough time to make all my points respecting the new revised high school programme, I hope to deal with that in later speeches, but, Sir, let it be said that we on this side agree with the concept of a revised high school programme, we think it is a good concept as long as it does two things; as long as it has a vertical extension to it, and what I mean by a vertical

MR. F.B. ROWE: extension in this particular case, is that it has an enriched programme. In other words, there are course offerings in that revised high school programme that will make the student more academically enriched than he would otherwise have been if the revised high school programme were not introduced.

Secondly, Sir, we feel there should be a horizontal extension which basically means that there should be a broadening of the curriculum so that students can take courses that are more broad than they are at the present time and, therefore, they will come out better suited to go into all parts of adult life after high school training.

Now, Sir, there is little reason to believe - the intent may be there - that we are going to get either a true vertical extension, or an enrichment of the high school programme, or truly a broadening or horizontal extension of the high school programme. There is very little reason to believe that we will get either.

Sir, these factors, along with the complete lack of readiness for the implementation of the revised high school programme, indicate that the introduction of the revised high school programme for, say, 1981, in September, is premature and it can only result in an educational disaster, Mr. Speaker, which will take years in order to rectify if it is brought in too soon, which we firmly believe is being done.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, this whole revised high school programme seems to be somewhat of a fait accompli by the government. There are still students and teachers and school boards who do not

March 17, 1981, Tape 404, Page 3 -- apb

MR. F.B. ROWE:

know what it is all
about, entirely, and they are ill-prepared for it.

MR. F. ROWE:

Now, Sir, there are many students and teachers and parents and educators, school board members, Denominational Educational members and many others who have grave reservations about the timing of the phasing of the revised high school programme.

More importantly, Sir, an awful lot of people are deeply concerned that in this Province, neither the Department of Education nor the DEC's nor the school boards are in a financial position to implement the revised high school programme in the way that they would like to see it implemented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just go back. We feel strongly that the concept of a revised high school programme is a good one, provided that we truly get a vertical academic extension to the revised high school programme, plus a horizontal broadening of the high school programme. If there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to get these two things, the government will be wise to postpone the implementation of the revised high school programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE:

It would be very, very wise, before irreputable damage is done to the school system and to the students in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can say fairly safely here from the research that I have done that the schools are definitely not ready for the revised high school programme at this minute. The schools are not ready, Mr. Speaker, and the teachers are not ready for the revised high school programme. And I will support this with facts and figures in a few minutes, Mr. Speaker. But the schools are not ready, Mr. Speaker, the teachers are not ready, the school boards themselves are not ready, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are.

MR. F. ROWE:

No, they are not.

MR. TULK:

Why are they saying they are not?

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, the DEC's are not ready, the students in the school system are not ready, the parents are not ready and, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has to use pretty good argumentation to impress upon members of this House that indeed the Department of Education is ready to bring a revised high school programme in over the next three years which will have the vertical and the horizontal extension of a high school programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the question of finances first. Mr. Speaker, if the minister will refer or hon. members will refer to last year's Budget Speech, page 30, Education, hon. members will see that the Budget for 1980/81 for operational grants for the schools was estimated to be \$27,300,000.

MR.F.ROWE: Now there might have been a revised estimate there. a revised dropped, Mr. Speaker, but the estimate was \$27 million for operational grants. For building and equipping schools, Mr. Speaker, \$22 million was estimated, and that dropped to \$14 million by the looks of it.

AN HON.MEMBER: Estimates?

MR.F.ROWE: Estimates, right, dropped to \$14 million. No, I am sorry, I am looking at the wrong revised estimates for 1979-1980, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure what the revised estimates were for 1980-1981, but the estimates were \$22,300,000 for operational grants, and \$22 million for building and equipping schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would look at just one school board documentation, the Avalon North Integrated School Board, will just look at one school board's list of building needs for last year, Your Honour will see that out of a total - one school board, the Avalon North Integrated School Board - one school board, which has approximately fifty schools, they had ten schools that were in atrocious and terrible need for new construction and renovations, totalling, Mr. Speaker, \$8,680,000 - one school board's capital needs, building needs, renovation needs of \$8,680,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will just take a general average there and multiply that by the other thirty five schools boards, you will see, Mr. Speaker, that you will have a staggering requirement of something around \$300 million for building and renovations of the schools in this Province.

And if the minister takes issue with that, I would recommend that the minister go out and visit every single high school and elementary and primary

MR. F. ROWE: school in this Province and see what the needs are out there. Mr. Speaker, some of these schools are not fit to be called schools.

MR. TULK: Right on, brother.

MR. F. ROWE: Not fit to be called schools. There are a number of schools - and I will be coming to this later-where the fire commissioner has threatened to close the schools, Mr. Speaker, threatened to close the schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have approximately \$300 million worth of needs for the existing school system, \$300 million worth of needs for building and renovations, yet last year there was only \$22 million in the Budget for such requirements. And I simply ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, how can we possibly talk about implementing, however desirable a revised high school programme is, how can we possibly talk about implementing such a high school programme when we do not have enough money to keep our present school system up to par?

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a real financial crisis, a real financial crisis in the schools of this Province, a very big financial crisis, Mr. Speaker. The Federation of School Board's brief to the minister for example, Mr. Speaker - and I will be quoting from this

MR. F. ROWE:

quite extensively - more than half of the forty-two Resolutions at their general annual meeting, Mr. Speaker, approved by delegates, dealt with some aspect of funding education in this Province. Sixteen of these Resolutions referred directly to the need for more dollars to adequately maintain present school board operations. "Other Resolutions, as one would expect, addressed the need for increased funding to improve programmes. The disproportionate number of Resolutions on financing at the annual general meeting of the Federation of School Boards reflected a disproportionate amount of time and the personal resources which must be spent on financial survival in the school districts we represent." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is from the Federation of School Boards.

Mr. Speaker, there are examples:

"Operating Grants. The request for increased support is based on the irrefutable fact that increases in operational grants to boards have not kept pace with costs. The end result has been diminishing funds for school programmes, insufficient dollars for preventative maintenance, hence deteriorating school plants; layoffs of non-professional staff and other forced constraints placed on school board operations." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is coming from the Federation of School Boards, it is not just a personal opinion of mine. These school boards, as documented by the Federation of School Boards, are in a financial crisis. Education in our Province is in a financial crisis. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members opposite do not believe that generalization, I will have to bring to their attention certain glaring problems related to particular school boards. If the hon. the minister looks at the Terra Nova Integrated School Board, for example, with respect to operating grants, she will see that from 1976 - 1977 to 1980 - 1981, the per cent cost of the grant went from 29 per cent to 38 per cent and is projected to go to 47 per cent in

MR. F. ROWE: 1983 - 1984. In other words, what they are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if cost increases for heat and light continue as predicted - and we have no reason to believe otherwise - and if operational grants are not increased substantially, the Terra Nova School Board could for the year 1983 - 1984 be forced to assign approximately half of its income from operational grants to heating and lighting in the schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know it is pretty necessary to heat and light schools, but the main function of schools basically is to teach educational programmes, to have programmes of instruction. And year after year, after year, the cost of heat and light and general maintenance, non-teaching areas, are eating into the expenditures in the teaching areas of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, the Bonavista-Trinity-Placentia integrated school board: operating grants have increased 27 per cent, but non-teaching salary costs have gone up 37 per cent. As was the case with heat and light costs for the other school board, the Bonavista-Trinity-Placentia board has had to assign an increasingly larger

MR. F. ROWE:

percentage of grant income to pay non-teaching salaries. Of significance also is the fact that in the period studied non-teaching salaries costs rose thirty-seven per cent while the operational grant income increased but twenty-seven per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the period from '78 to '80 with this same school board, the prime interest rates rose from 8.25 per cent to 18.25 per cent. The average monthly rate for the period was 12.35 per cent. On the average, interest fees were approximately fifty per cent higher than in 1978 - interest fees, Mr. Speaker, fifty percent higher than in '78.

For the Exploits Valley Integrated school board, Mr. Speaker, total expenditures are up thirty-six per cent, grants only up twenty-four per cent. In the period from '76 to '78, the Exploits Valley Integrated School Board was required to supplement operations of the schools by \$1,117,000. Operational grants from government fell short by that amount. The board met the short-fall with income from local taxes from the sale of teachers residences, the latter a rather extreme measure to be forced to take to meet operational - imagine! Now they are selling off teacher's residences, Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the short-fall to operate their schools.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. ROWE:

Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's, Mr. Speaker; the grants increased from '76 to '80, the grants increased to twenty-five per cent, tax revenue to eighty-four per cent. -The expenditure in instructional programming, Mr. Speaker, up only seventeen per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the period when per pupil grants to the St. John's School Board increased by twenty-five

MR. F. ROWE: per cent, the tax revenue by eighty-four per cent, the amount spent on programmes increased by only seventeen per cent. The additional funds assigned to instructional programme budget did not keep pace with price increases in programme material and therefore represent a lessening amount of real dollars available for programmes.

Now, what, Mr. Speaker, are we supposed to be doing in the schools?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: We are supposed to be providing instructional programmes, but year after year after year the percentage costs for instructional programmes are going down-increasing for heat and light and everything else, non-teaching or non-instructional operating facilities-and we are thinking about bringing in a Grade XII, and a broadened high school programme and hopefully an enriched high school programme.

Mr. Speaker, the aim is to be commended, but I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a complete tragedy if this high school programme is implemented too soon, prematurely, and it will take years to rectify the damage that it has done to the school system and the students in this Province.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, you will note that total operational grants increased by only 18.3 per cent in the period 1976 to 1980, or 06.1 per cent average.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that this falls well short of the inflation rate applied to major expense items for school boards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this one. If we do not think things are too serious around the Province, the Fire Commissioner's orders: "In recent years the Fire Commissioner has identified serious deficiencies in school plants which could endanger the life and safety of school children and school board employees. He has issued orders that reflect that these deficiencies be corrected. To date this has required boards to spend hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars beyond normal maintenance budgets. There has been no provision in maintenance grants to assist boards in complying with the orders from the Fire Commissioner".

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are hundreds of thousands of dollars required to be spent by the school boards for the purpose of satisfying the Fire Commissioner, I ask the basic question - this is another reason why we have to ask ourselves a very basic question; can the Province, the DEC's, and the Department of Education, and the school boards afford to implement a truly broadened and extended academically enriched revised high school programme, plus the addition of Grade XII over the next three years? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the government nor anybody in this Province are really ready for it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the biggest crime of all is inequities from one school board to another. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: We are all aware that boards have varying abilities to raise extra revenues via local school tax, for example, or through school assessments. Mr. Speaker, in 1978-79, the range varied - hon. members will be horrified to hear this - from \$162.55 cents per pupil in Labrador West to \$8.62 per pupil in Bay St. George.

Mr. Speaker, in Labrador West the school board was able to raise through school assessments or taxation, on the average per pupil, \$162.55. In Bay St. George, that my friend from Port au Port would probably be more familiar with than I am, \$8.62. Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister going to get up in her seat - or stand on her feet, I am sorry - and suggest that the revised high school programme can be introduced into this Province equitably, fairly and sensibly when we have these kinds of inequalities, inequities, different standards of education right, sitting here, from Labrador West to Bay St. George? And I can use other examples.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Federation of School Boards' brief, itself,

AN HON. MEMBER: You have five minutes left.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Oh, good God! I have not even started, Mr. Speaker. Five minutes? I had twenty-five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Yes.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Is that twenty-five minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the hon. member started at 3:30 and he concludes at 4:15.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Five, ten, fifteen,
twenty, right! You are right on, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: I think the hon. member
(inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE:

What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Five.

MR. F. ROWE:

No, five minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough to have inequalities but does the hon. - just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, inadequate staffing, does the Speaker realize that there are inequities or inadequacies in certain school systems? For example, we have five separate schools and five all grade schools - this is one school board, Mr. Speaker - the high school section of most all grade schools are by Newfoundland standards, large high schools, yet we have the following inadequacies.

Listen, Mr. Speaker, we have five high schools which do not have Home Economics. We have only two high schools offering Industrial Arts. We have two high schools without guidance councillors. We have three high schools without Instrumental Music teachers. None of our high schools have an Art teacher. Now where is this, Mr. Speaker, out in the sticks somewhere? Mr. Speaker, this happens to be, and the minister knows full well, Sir, the board I am referring to, this is the St. John's Roman Catholic School Board. Five high schools that do not have Home Economics; two not offering Industrial Arts; two high schools without guidance councillors; three high schools without Instrumental Music teachers; none of the high schools have art teachers.

Inadequate physical facilities, Mr. Speaker. To summarize it here, they have not got a gymnasium in one school. They have a high school in St. John's without a gymnasium, Mr. Speaker, and they are trying to establish a library room in this school board. "Over the next few years we must devote all of our energies and resources to preparing for the physical needs of Grade XII. If over the next few years we must devote all

MR. F. ROWE: of our energies and resources to preparing for the physical needs of Grade XII, then these inadequacies referred to above will never be met."

Mr. Speaker, the same individual talks about the level of literacy in the schools. He also talks about classroom space. Mr. Speaker, a generalization here because I only have five minutes left.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. F. ROWE: This particular superintendent says, "I can see no way in which six of our ten schools with high school grades can provide the additional classrooms that an extra high school grade will require."

Listen to their unmet needs, Mr. Speaker. One school board - replacement of eighty portable classrooms are required. "St. Kevin's and St. Edward's on Bell Island have been condemned by the authorities as being unsafe. A new high school is needed in Mount Pearl area where our present two schools are badly overcrowded and where enrollment is increasing. St. Paul's School in East Meadows is overcrowded despite the six room addition which is now being added. Additional school facilities are needed in Kelligrews - Topsail area where the existing school, Holy Spirit, has over 1,000 students and is badly overcrowded."

Mr. Speaker, the practicality of bringing in a wider curriculum or wider courses - would hon. members opposite just give me a few minutes extra by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): By leave. It is agreed then?
Agreed.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not being particularly nasty today, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 410

NM - 3

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the practicality of a wider variety of courses are concerned in the schools, it might be noted that thirty-eight per cent of the Roman Catholic high schools in this area have enrollments of less than 200,

MR. F. ROWE:

and another 30 per cent have enrollments less than 300. Since Catholics tend to be more urbanized, the suspicion is that the situation regarding small high schools is worse for the non-Catholic school boards." I do not know if that is a correct assumption or not. But the question remains how does the department propose to vary course, course options, in these small high schools which represent the majority of these types of students in the Province?

These schools are hard put now to provide a basic course for their students. Indeed, it is the opinion of this particular superintendent "that many of our smaller high schools, in an effort to emulate the course offerings of our larger schools, even with their limited course offerings are spending too much of their resources and personnel on the top grades to the neglect of our junior grades and the problem becomes compounded."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you just go right down through the whole list. For example, how many students and parents really realize in this Province today that Grade XII is not senior matriculation? An awful lot of the students - I have asked the question - think that Grade XII is senior matriculation, I am not suggesting that Grade XII should be senior matriculation, but a lot of parents and a lot of students believe that Grade XII is senior matriculation. It is not, Mr. Speaker; they do not get credit for first year Memorial because of Grade XII. There may be, I will grant that there is a certain amount of vertical extension of the academics in the revised high school programme, of course there is, and there is a certain amount of broadening, you know, of the curriculum. But what I am trying to point out to hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is that the intent of the government may be one thing, the actual ability of the schools to do what the government intends

MR. F. ROWE: or the Department of Education intends, or what the school boards and the DEC's and the teachers intend and what the students and the parents wish, what that may be and what may happen will be two entirely different things. Because I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the schools, unless the minister has a great big bundle of money to pour into those particular estimates in her budget, the operating aspect of it and the capital aspect of it, are doomed to die on the vine to start off with, Mr. Speaker.

And there are certain misconceptions about it. I will point out the fact that this is not senior matriculation and there are a heck of a lot of students and parents out there who think it is senior matriculation. And it is not bringing us into tune with the rest of Canada either, Mr. Speaker, when certain people suggest that we have to have Grade XII because it is the termination of high school in every other province. I will finish on this, Mr. Speaker, although I have another couple of pages.

Certain people are given the impression, Mr. Speaker, that Grade XII appears to be the termination of all high school activities in Canada or in every other province and, in fact, in some cases it is a senior matriculation or the equivalent of first year university.

MR. F. ROWE: If one differentiates between Grade XII, which is clearly pre-university level, junior matriculation, Grade XII, which is clearly equivalent for first year university, that is, senior matriculation, then comparisons of the high school programmes of the various provinces of Canada will reveal the following, Mr. Speaker. This is Dr. Sullivan's little note here: "Newfoundland proposed Grade XII, junior matriculation; Nova Scotia, Grade XII, senior matriculation, first year university; New Brunswick, Grade XII, junior matriculation; Prince Edward Island, again junior matriculation. Now I point out then in Prince Edward Island, the situation in the Maritime provinces is complicated because, under certain circumstances, Grade XII from New Brunswick and P.E.I. is accepted as senior matriculation by Dalhousie University, Nova Scotia. Quebec, no Grade XII - Prince Edward Island, I am sorry, no Grade XII, junior matriculation; Ontario, Grade XII, junior matriculation; Grade XIII is the last year of high school; Manitoba, Grade XII, senior matriculation; Saskatchewan, Grade XII, senior matriculation; Alberta, Grade XII, senior matriculation.

Mr. Speaker, this is not even going close to bringing us into the standardization of they want opposite with the rest of the provinces of Canada. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest in closing - and I hope to continue on with this in other speeches in the House of Assembly because I think it is a very serious matter and I think that it should be looked at very seriously by all members of the House. And we are not against this. The concept is beautiful, I mean, this is what we wanted as teachers in high school and parents and students for years, during the times when I was actually teaching in the high schools.

MR. F. ROWE: But, Mr. Speaker, if you do not have the money to pay for it, if you do not have the teachers properly prepared for it, if you do not have the parents and the students really knowing what the aim of it all is and what they are in store for, whether it is senior matriculation or a junior matriculation; when we have DEC's and school boards going around, basically bankrupt at the present time, trying to keep the school system going as it is, when you do not have a true academic enrichment of the programme and when you do not have a true broadening of the revised high school programme, we are going to end up with an extra year tacked on to the high school programme without any tangible and realistic improvements in the enrichment component and in the broadening component, and that is what concerns me greatly. I would like to hear a few more statistics and a few answers from the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and from her colleagues opposite assuring us that these questions that we raise and others that we will raise in the future are not ones to be worried about. If that can be proven, that everything is being satisfactorily taken care of, the school boards are not going to have any difficulty financially, that they do have the classroom space, that we do have the facilities, that we do have the trained teachers, that the students know what the aims and objectives are and where there is direction is, we will whole-heartedly endorse the implementation of a revised high school programme.

But no way, Mr. Speaker, can we, on the basis of the evidence and answers that we have heard so far, can we possibly accept and allow the implementation of the high school programme the way it is being done. It is premature, it is going to be an utter disaster and I would think it would better to, for example, bring in a pilot project, test this high school programme out in certain schools on an experimental basis. This is traditionally what is done in the area of curriculum developing, development a course,

MR. F. ROWE: experiment with it, get results and conclusions from it, get recommendations, and then, once you work out the bugs, it can be implemented throughout the Province after it has been experimented with, just as they are doing with this crazy comic book. If you can do a pilot project on a comic book, Mr. Speaker, surely Heavens it is much more important to do pilot project in experimentation before implementation with a whole new revised high school programme affecting thousands of lives of our young children, the youth in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. THOMS: The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has a very extensive vocabulary. It extends only to rubbish. The only word in his vocabulary is rubbish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, having read and studied the Speech from the Throne -

MR. WARREN: You have dropped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. COLLINS: - it becomes quite obvious to me the government's four components which they list on the very first page, without the first one the other three really become useless, they will never be able to accomplish them. So, in the few minutes that I have today I would like to elaborate more on what I think we need in Newfoundland for an honest political system.

Mr. Speaker, I have been involved in politics for about two years now and have found it to be the

MR. COLLINS: most frustrating two years of my life, but also I must admit on occasion it has provided me with a great deal of satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment.

I have something to say here today which may upset a lot of people and maybe even offend a few. But before I do I would like to explain something of myself which may help this hon. House to understand why I must put truth and honesty foremost in all my dealings with people.

As a boy, I was brought up to be God-fearing and honest, with an idea that there was no substitution for hard work and that true happiness from life could only be obtained by being truthful and honest with all your dealings with your fellow men.

MR. NEARY: It is a wonder you are not struck down.

MR. COLLINS: I have been very fortunate in having been blessed with parents whose influence and dedication have left me with a sense of values that would make it impossible for me to make a decision which would cause me to lose the respect of my family and friends. I have been quite successful in private business and have obtained a position in life which would probably satisfy most men, but I soon found out that monetary gain or material possessions can in no way compensate me for the pleasure and true sense of accomplishment I feel in working on behalf of people a lot less fortunate than I.

At the age of thirty-three I found myself totally without a challenge to pursue which was giving me any great deal of satisfaction, and after many weeks of soul-searching and deep deliberation I decided that I must choose a field where I could dedicate my seemingly endless energy to a field of social consciousness. I narrowed my possibilities

MR. COLLINS: down to three chosen fields, namely medicine, religion and politics. I soon realized that the role of a politician, even though looked down upon by most people in our present day society, was truly a position where many of my dreams and ideas could be realized.

Mr. Speaker, the final prompting that I needed to enter politics was provided by a man who I have the greatest admiration for, a young, honest, energetic hard-working politician, namely our present Premier. Having watched the Premier for the last two years, I find it inconceivable that anyone could doubt his honesty and sincerity for Newfoundland and Labrador and its people. This young Newfoundlander is dedicating his talents and energies brought at great sacrifice to himself and his family. I have no doubt whatsoever that if he wished this very afternoon he could take up a position in private life which would pay him five fold which he could ever hope to earn as Premier of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched the Opposition try to defend their stand on the offshore resources and ownership, and I find it very difficult to understand how any Newfoundlander, let alone an elected member of this House of Assembly, can have any doubt as to who should control these resources. It is beyond my comprehension that we can consider anything else but total control of what is ours by traditional and historic rights.

Newfoundland and Labrador, I regret to say, has never had the leadership or the quality of elected representatives as we see in this House today. We cannot do much but look back since Confederation in wonderment as to how a province with such a small population and the abundance

MR. R. COLLINS: of natural resources finds itself in a position of such dire financial straits. I can only assume that the quality and calibre of our past elected members, especially our leaders, left an awful lot to be desired. I think in part this was largely due to the financial compensation offered to people to run for public office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. COLLINS: If there is one lesson, Mr. Speaker, which I have learned very early in life is that you get exactly what you pay for and you reap exactly what you sow. So if we do not want the next thirty years to be as totally mismanaged as the last thirty years, I think the people of Newfoundland and Labrador should realize that unless we start to pay our elected representatives what the position demands, the brightest and most intelligent Newfoundlanders will be lost to big business, which is something this Province can ill afford.

MR. THOMS: We should move him up in the federal (inaudible).

MR. R. COLLINS: We have seen, and paid very dearly, for what happens when we bring in sophisticated industrialists from Europe and the United States. For example, Dr. Valdmanis, O.L. Vardy, John C. Doyle and John Shaheen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to alter drastically the course of events in Newfoundland and Labrador which in the past have been based upon daydreams and pie in the sky schemes of dreamers who are totally out of touch with reality. If we stand together, united, the wealth created from our offshore resources will provide us with the finances necessary to develop our hydro potential,

MR. R. COLLINS: mineral and forest resources and, last but not least, the tremendous potential and future available in our fisheries. We have a duty, Mr. Speaker, to our forefathers and generations of young Newfoundlanders not yet born to see that Newfoundland and Labrador reaches its great potential and its people have the opportunity to earn a decent living without the necessity of having to move away from their homeland.

I would like to emphasize once again how important it is and how lucky we are to have a man with the qualities and energy of the present Premier to stand up and fight for Newfoundland and Labrador in this very crucial time in our history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. COLLINS: If ever there was a time for every Newfoundlander to stand up and be counted it is now. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my own personal position very clear because one might assume from what I have said that I am trying to improve my own personal political future. This, I assure you, is definitely not the case. Being a single parent and having a greater obligation to my two young children than I have for any political gain at this present time, make no mistake about it when the time comes that my obligations at home are fulfilled, my energies and talents will be put to the betterment of Newfoundland and Labrador and its people.

Mr. Speaker, I have read and studied very carefully the recent Speech from the Throne and it becomes quite obvious to me that Newfoundland's future depends totally on an honest and efficient political system which is the cornerstone of this present government's philosophy

MR.R.COLLINS: and is exemplified by the present Premier. Every Newfoundlander has the ultimate responsibility to cast his vote wisely for it is we the citizens of Newfoundland who must pay the price if we elect incapable and incompetent people to govern this Province.

AN HON.MEMBER: Right on.

MR.R.COLLINS: Having studied our trends in reasons for voting since 1949 and the people which we put into positions of responsibility through elected office, it is little wonder that we find ourselves in such an awful financial dilemma. We are contented to sit back and say the politicians did it, but then we must ask ourselves who gave the politicians the power to do so? So, Mr. Speaker, we have no one to blame but ourselves for the position we find ourselves in today. Newfoundlanders must start taking their politics and their vote a lot more seriously than they have in the past.

MR. R. COLLINS: If we continue to cast our vote, whether it be Liberal, P.C. or N.D.P., because of some long-standing traditional views that our fathers and grandfathers had, we have very little chance of good responsible government and will never be able to stand on our own feet. We have in this House today, Mr. Speaker, elected representatives elected on this premise. I have spoken to hundreds of people who have viewed the proceedings of this House and it is quite obvious to them and to me who these individuals are.

Questions put to ministers by some Opposition members lead me to believe that they do very little research and simply look for sensationalism and publicity.

The last provincial election, Mr. Speaker, saw for the first time the people of Newfoundland breaking with tradition and voting for a candidate because of his ability and not his political stripe.

It is because of this, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this hon. House today, on both sides, young, intelligent Newfoundlanders who will put their Province before any political or personal gains. This is truly paramount in the character of our present day Premier.

Mr. Speaker, it would be quite unfair of me to leave this hon. House and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador with the impression that all the good guys are on this side and all the bad on the other side, for they too have individuals for whom I have the greatest and highest respect, one of them being the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Hollett).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. COLLINS: This individual truly epitomizes the competency, honesty and common sense that is needed in an elected member of this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. COLLINS: In closing, I would like to thank this hon. House for the opportunity of speaking today, and I truly hope we can all work together to ensure that we can gain full control of our offshore resources.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That sounded to me, Mr. Speaker, like a farewell speech.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the debate presently before the House, first of all I would like to deal with some problems facing my own district of LaPoile. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my few remarks may be interpreted as a district speech, but if that is so, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, the history of transportation in Newfoundland has not been too well documented. Even though we are an Island, Mr. Speaker, and practically everything we do depends on transportation, very little attention, indeed, very little mention of transportation in Newfoundland has been made by writers and historians. We have never had a realistic transportation policy in this Province and as a consequence, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have paid a high price both in the cost of living and in jobs lost in this Province. Canadian National, Mr. Speaker, since Confederation, have been operating on a hit and miss policy in this Province and as a result, the employees of C.N. and the Province as a whole, have suffered drastically.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, in the main, Channel-Port aux Basques, the closest port of entry to the mainland of Canada, was the most important port before Confederation, but its importance and its development have really not kept stride with the things that are needed

MR. NEARY: in transportation in this Province.
Port aux Basques is ideally geographically located to be a major distribution centre, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that the Fathers of Confederation, the people who wrote the Terms of Union, included a special term in the terms of Confederation. They wrote a special term which included making it mandatory, compulsory for the Government of Canada to operate

MR. NEARY:

and maintain a ferry service across the Gulf between Newfoundland and Port aux Basques. And the Newfoundland Railway was handed over in trust to the Canadian government who in turn commissioned Canadian National to operate the Newfoundland Railway.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since that time, since Confederation, Newfoundland has seen a major boom, a major revolution in the construction of roads, bridges, airports and the like, and our traditional method of transporting goods and services in this Province has all be disappeared.

Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Railway, following the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland, was drastically affected by the appearance on our highways for the first time of tractor trailers bringing freight from the mainland down across the Gulf on the ferries over to the Island of Newfoundland and transported and dropped off at the backdoor of customers who ordered the freight. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, nobody seemed to pay very much attention to these innovations, these innovated measures that were being introduced into our transportation system, they have been going on now for over seventeen years and as a result, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves today in a very frightening predicament indeed. Lack of interest and neglect of transportation matters in this Province by the government and by the Canadian National Railway are now making Newfoundlanders and Labradorians pay a high price for their not keeping a close watch on the development of transportation in this Province. Not only has the absence of a realistic transportation system in Newfoundland given us the highest cost of living in Canada, but it has also taken its toll as far as employment on the Newfoundland Railway, the coastal boat service and the Gulf services is concerned. If a system, Mr. Speaker, of phasing in the changes, phasing in the new technology had been adopted fifteen or twenty years ago, and

MR. NEARY: Canadian National, which was given the responsibility of operating the Newfoundland Railway, the coastal boat services and the Gulf service between Port aux Basques and North Sydney, if they had carried out their mandate in the way that they should have done it, then we would not find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the predicament we are in in this Province today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: - where drastic changes are about to take place that will have serious implications upon certain communities and regions of this Province and have drastic affect on the future employment of workers with Canadian National.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that meetings have already taken place between Ministry of Transport officials, Terra Transport, CN Marine and Canadian National with the provincial government, and other meetings are scheduled to take place this week as far as I can learn, to discuss these changes that I will mention a little later on in my remarks. What is becoming obvious, Mr. Speaker, is that after seventeen years of sitting back and allowing freight to go to the private shipping companies in this Province and to the trucking industry, that CN is now going to do what they should have done in the beginning and that is to try to secure some of the container business that they lost by default to the private trucking industry and to the shipping companies in this Province.

The problem now, Mr. Speaker, is that Canadian National plans and Terra Transport plans and CN Marine plans are going to have a devastating affect

MR. NEARY:

on railway towns such as Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, over the years residents of Port aux Basques have been very tolerant and very patient indeed, and very co-operative, I might add, as they watch the new technology and the changes being implemented. Even though these changes and improvements, Mr. Speaker, were not in their best interest or did not offer them job security, the unions at Port aux Basques did not stand in the way of progress, always putting the interest of the Province first. And members will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this was a very noble gesture on their part, and we give them full marks for co-operating.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the process of their being good citizens of this Province, they have been stripped and robbed of services that should have remained in the gateway town of Port aux Basques. Mr. Speaker, the good people of Port aux Basques are to be congratulated and complimented for their live-and-let-live philosophy. But, Mr. Speaker, they were taken advantage of by Canadian National and by other regions of Newfoundland, especially St. John's and Corner Brook. No one can deny, Mr. Speaker, that even though millions of dollars of federal money have been spent upgrading and improving the port facilities at Channel, Port aux Basques that Canadian National over the last ten or fifteen years have been following a policy of downgrading Port aux Basques. Members, if they are not aware, should be aware of this downgrading, and stripping the community and taking services away from the people that rightly it belongs to, the community of Port aux Basques.

MR. NEARY: And we hear so much, Mr. Speaker, about the Terms of Confederation from the Premier of this Province, but one term he does not mention is the one that makes Port aux Basques the official port of entry to this Province. Mr. Speaker, practically every decision that has been made by CN over the last ten or fifteen years has robbed or stolen or taken something from Port aux Basques to put it in some other part of Newfoundland, or put it across the Gulf in Nova Scotia or in New Brunswick.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Canadian National are up to their old tricks again, and once more they are going to punish their employees for CN's lack of foresight and initiative and proper planning that could avoid the present layoff that is taking place of some 378 workers. And they have a sophisticated name for it now, Mr. Speaker; they do not call it a layoff; they say we are merely eliminating redundant positions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ah, ha!

MR. NEARY: Well, they can put whatever name they like on it, Mr. Speaker; as far as I am concerned they are still layoffs. In the transfer shed alone at Port aux Basques, when CN introduces its new container system in this Province, eighteen young men, who just built new homes in Port aux Basques, will be uprooted, will be displaced, will be laid off. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that transfer shed, by the way, which is about twice the length of two football fields put end to end, saw one of the most exciting innovations ever introduced in a transportation system in this Province, and I am referring to the truck to truck transfer that I will mention and elaborate on a little later on. And that transfer shed, Mr. Speaker, a part of that

MR. NEARY: transfer shed has only been in operating six months, and now it is about to become obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members may or may not be aware, it is the transfer shed and truck to truck at Port aux Basques that was the difference between life and death of the port of Port aux Basques for the last seventeen years or so. Truck to truck was an exciting innovation, Mr. Speaker. But containerization as is planned today, if it is not phased in over a period of years, could be frightening.

MR. NEARY: The transfer shed and all its employees could be a thing of the past.

Mr. Speaker, we are not trying to stop progress, but what we are concerned about is the continuation of CN's hit-and-miss policy, CN's hit-and-miss philosophy. They dream up an idea, they get a brainwave and then without putting too much thought behind it they go full-speed ahead, no matter what the consequences are to the people and the economy of the area concerned. Up to now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bandeen and his little army of high paid cronies up in a skyscraper up in Montreal, have gotten away with their silly concepts, they have gotten away with treating the Newfoundland Railway as an unwanted godchild.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the end of our patience with Mr. Bandeen and we do not intend to tolerate any more of his monkey business. If CN is going into containers in a big way in this Province, then it must be done in an orderly, humane fashion. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it must not be done in a way that will disrupt the economy of a whole area of this Province through massive layoffs.

Containerization, Mr. Speaker, must be phased in over a period of a number of years. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, will cost money. What I am really saying, and this is the understanding that those of us who heard about the containers, the understanding that we were given, that two systems would be operated in Port aux Basques, truck to truck and containers. Side by side the two systems would be operated. But now we are being told that when containerization reaches its peak, a year or two from now, that it will mean massive layoffs around this Province. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, should the provincial

MR. NEARY: government kowtow to Mr. Bandeen's wishes to put the Newfoundland Railway on a user-pay basis? That railway, Mr. Speaker, was entrusted to CN not as a paying proposition, it was put there to serve the people of this Province and Mr. Bandeen, sitting up in his skyscraper in Montreal, has been treating the railway in this Province, treating Newfoundland as an unwanted godchild.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am really saying is that in order to avoid a major disaster in this Province the truck to truck and containers must go side by side until a way is found to eliminate any possibility whatsoever of cruel and callous treatment of railway towns in this Province, or of the railway employees.

In addition to these measures that I have outlined, Mr. Speaker, we are also demanding that all services and purchases for CN boats such as food, laundry and drycleaning and all other ship supplies, be brought back to this Province. The operations of the ferries that was given to us as a right under the Terms of Confederation should have its head office in this Province and not in Halifax or in New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, the stampede across the Gulf started about seventeen or eighteen years ago when CN in its cute way managed to get the reservation office moved from Port aux Basques across the Gulf, and ever since, Mr. Speaker, they have been chipping away at the services that were provided in this Province, especially in Port aux Basques, and sending them to New Brunswick and to Nova Scotia.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said earlier, we realize it is impossible to fight progress, but, Mr. Speaker, we must let the

MR. NEARY: message go out to CN
that we have no intention of tolerating or putting up
with the plans that are outlined in a working paper that
I happened to come across, a confidential document,
presently being considered by the Ministry of Transport
in Ottawa, and to be the topic of discussion at meetings
to be held with the Premier of this Province either today
or tomorrow or the next day.

MR. NEARY: We have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of sitting back and letting CN in one fell swoop -

AN HON. MEMBER: Monopolizers.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Monopolizers.

MR. NEARY: Do what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Monopolizers.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not talking about monopoly. C.N. could be a good thing if it were handled right. But what they are trying to do now is they are trying to make up for lost time. What they are going to do now is implement a programme of change that should be phased in, and the phase-in should have started seventeen or eighteen years ago. Now they want to do it overnight. And it is drastically going to affect a number of districts in this Province, including that of the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), Mr. Speaker, because of the Burgeo road which has a bearing upon the coastal boat service.

I have this document in front of me that is devastating and disastrous to this Province', Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: Table it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will table it if I want to.

MR. BARRY: Do you see any

difference between what you are proposing here for CN as it relates to hiring and purchasing goods and services in Newfoundland, and (inaudible) any difference from what we are saying in the offshore?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who represents a big industry in this Province asks me a question, and I will answer the hon. gentleman by saying this to him, that if he has any influence over Mr. Crosbie, the first thing he would do is advise Mr. Crosbie to break that monopoly that was set up recently when a merger took place between the

MR. NEARY: shipping companies in this Province who do not, Mr. Speaker, even buy their fuel in St. John's or in Newfoundland, they go over to the mainland and get their fuel aboard these ships. Ask Mr. John Crosbie, the great saviour of Newfoundland, who is now obviously pushing the merger of the shipping companies so that Crosbie's can get in on the subsidy.

MR. BARRY: You have not answered the question. Do you see any difference between this situation and offshore?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how can you consider C.N.'s plans as progress if they unnecessarily disrupt whole communities and the lives of thousands of Newfoundlanders and their families in the process? What needs to be done, Mr. Speaker, is for containerization to be phased in, subsidies to the private shipping companies abolished. I am all for C.N. getting back the business from the private trucking industry and getting back the business from that monopoly that was just created by the merger of these shipping companies, but I am not in favour of C.N. getting back the business at the expense of their employees and the people of this Province.

And if this government, Mr. Speaker, who will be meeting with C.N. today or tomorrow, can persuade C.N. to use a little more common sense in these matters, then I am sure that the people in the communities to be affected and the employees of C.N. would appreciate it very much. Nobody should be hurt, Mr. Speaker, as a result of these changes and these innovations.

On the other hand, if C.N. and the provincial government go ahead with their plans post haste, as apparently they plan on doing according to this schedule that I have in front of me, where it would appear that the coastal boat service by 1982 will all but be abolished in this Province - and if hon. members want the names of the ports of call that are being considered, that are now linked by road - "The ports proposed for deletion in 1981' - just listen to this - 'are those with a minimum amount of freight and each with a good road access."

March 17, 1981

Tape 419

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:

The following ports are intended
for deletion of the coastal freight service in 1981:

"Baie Verte, Bay Roberts, Beaumont, Brigus, Burlington, Carbonear,
Catalina, Conche, Cook's Harbour, Cottle's Cove, Englee,
Fleur de Lys, Griquet, Harbour Grace, Harry's Harbour, King's
Point, LaScie, Leading Tickles, Little Bay Islands, Lushes Bight,
Main Brook, Ming's Bight, Nippers Harbour, Pacquet, Petty Harbour,
Port Anson, Quirpon, Raleigh, Roddickton, Seal Cove, Seldom,
Ship Cove,

MR. NEARY: Snooks Arm, Sop's Arm, Springdale, Triton, Twillingate, Valleyfield, Westport and Woodstock." And they are even going to wipe out the special fishermen's rates that we used - Mr. Speaker, in order that I may have a few more minutes, I wonder, Sir, if I could move an amendment so that I can get another half hour to carry on, and there are a few other things I want to talk about.

The amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker, would be by deleting all the words after the word "that" and replacing them with the following:

'The House regrets that Her Majesty's ministers have neither developed nor implemented policies and programmes adequate to meet the needs and fulfill the aspirations of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Is that amendment seconded?

MR. NEARY: If I need a seconder it is seconded by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B.Rowe), but I do not think you need a seconder.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) member for?

MR. NEARY: From St. Mary's - The Capes, my old buddy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
We have an amendment proposed. We will adjourn for five minutes while I study it.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The amendment as proposed is in order and the speaker has sixty minutes.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to burden the House with all the problems of the district of LaPoile and the other towns and communities and districts that will be hit hard by the changes that CN are proposing, but I feel that I should briefly run through some of the proposed changes by CN so that hon. members will be aware of how they are going to affect their own districts.

For instance, by 1982, I am told, the ferry service between Argentia and North Sydney will be discontinued. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that it will cost \$12 million to subsidize that ferry service and this will be the last year, next year it will be dropped. I do not know if the hon. gentleman is aware of that. Perhaps I could invite the hon. gentleman to have a few words on that particular matter. And there are going to be, as I said, drastic changes in the coastal boat service, according to this confidential paper that I have come across from my usual sources of information.

The fishermen's special rates to Labrador are going to be changed, there is going to be a reduction of the South coast Winter supplementary passenger service. The changes proposed - this is just headed 'North Passengers' - it is proposed to continue the policy of eliminating passenger calls to ports with road access. "In furtherance of this, passenger calls to Triton, Little Bay Islands, Englee and North West River will be deleted by 1982. Little Bay Islands is adequately served by a daily local ferry service."

MR. NEARY: "And by 1982 the Northern Peninsula road will be fully paved", according to this document, and so the freight service to St. Anthony from Lewisporte and St. John's will be retained only for a freight call to St. Anthony.

And South freight:

It is proposed to delete the present service from North Sydney to South coast ports as well as the freight service from Argentia. "Service to the following ports will be deleted as part of these changes". And just listen to this, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

MR. HANCOCK: And do not forget Fortune - Hermitage, too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I know, Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). Bay L'Argent will be dropped, Burin, Fortune, Grand Bank, Lawn, Little Bay East, Marystown, Monkstown, Paradise, Petit Forte, St. Lawrence, St. Jacques, St. Pierre and South East Bight. Now, the only one on that list that I do not mind seeing being dropped from the coastal boat service, is St. Pierre. Can members imagine? I can hardly, believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian taxpayers, that the taxpayers

MR. NEARY: of this great country have been for the last several years subsidizing a ferry service between Fortune and St. Pierre. Thank God, now, they are getting sense enough to drop it. No wonder we cannot get money for the essential things in this Province.

Placentia Bay Port; 'A special local service will be introduced for both passengers and freight to serve the isolated ports East of the Burin Peninsula. The ports supplied by this service will be South East Bight, Petit Forte and Paradise. The service will operate from a nearby port which is connected to the paved highway leading to the Burin Peninsula.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you add the changes that are proposed in this document to the implementation of containerization in this Province, if you add it up what does it all mean, Mr. Speaker? What does it mean? Well, it can only mean one thing, it can only mean massive layoffs of CN employees, Terra Transport, CN Marine and Canadian National and the disruption of the economy of a number of railway towns in this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I implore and I beseech the Provincial government not to go along, Mr. Speaker, when they sit down around the table with the Ministry of Transport officials—and they have already held discussions with Terra Transport, we know that from a question I asked the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett), in the House one day, if the government was going to support CN's proposed containerization plan and he assured me that they were. They have already decided that Corte blanche no strings attached.

And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, what I am imploring the government to do is to dig in.

MR. S. NEARY: I am not fighting progress, the people of Port aux Basques are not objecting to progress, but what they want is the pace slowed down, they do not want these plans to be implemented overnight. Seventeen, eighteen years ago CN should have laid down a programme and a plan for phasing in all these things. Now they are trying to make up for lost time and they are asking their employees and the coastal communities and the railway towns in this Province to pay the price. And, Mr. Speaker, I will just wind up my few remarks on this particular part of my address by again asking -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) and sit down.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from St. John's North obviously does not realize the serious consequences of the topic that is under discussion at the moment.

MR. HANCOCK: They do not care. They do not realize, and they do not care.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that these plans should go ahead. I do not think the Ministry of Transport, the government of Canada, Canadian National and the provincial government should allow those plans to be implemented without due regard to the people who live in our coastal communities, who live in the remote parts of this Province, without due regard to the people who are employed with CN and their families, and the people who reside in these railway towns. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, what we should be doing in this Province, instead of rubber stamping these proposed changes and these plans, what we should be doing is demanding that the terms of Confederation as far as Port aux Basques is concerned, as far as the operation of the

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 421

RA - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Newfoundland Railway is concerned, and as far as the operation of the Gulf service is concerned, we should be demanding that all the services and all the things that have been robbed from this Province and sent across the Gulf to Halifax, Nova Scotia and to Moncton, New Brunswick, be returned to us. It is criminal, Mr. Speaker, what has happened and, as I said, it all started with moving the reservation office. When CN saw they could get away with that

MR. S. NEARY:

they traded off that for something else, when they saw they could get away with it then the stampede started across the Gulf. And as a result today there is not one major decision making procedural body of CN located in this Province and if you want to make a reservation on the Gulf you call a Zenith number and do it through Nova Scotia. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If they want to buy food, they buy it in Nova Scotia. There was a gentleman out in Port aux Basques a few years ago who established a laundry and a dry-cleaning plant at tremendous expense hoping that he would be able to get some business from Canadian National but no, Mr. Speaker, no, they had their buddies and their friends over in Nova Scotia and that is where all the food is bought and that is where all the drycleaning is done, over in Nova Scotia. And I wrote CN the other day, Mr. Speaker - I am trying to find the letter I had back, I have it here on my desk somewhere - to find out the number of Newfoundlanders employed on the Gulf ferry service and on the coastal boat service in this Province, the number of Newfoundlanders and the number of non-Newfoundlanders. And my hon. friend asked me a question a moment ago about the offshore hiring practices, Well, here is something that obviously has been neglected somewhere along the line.

The letter I received was from Mr. G. J. James, Director of Industrial Relations. 'Dear Mr. Neary: Your letter of February 13th. to Captain W. P. Embleton concerning breakdown of employees on coastal and Gulf vessels has been referred to me for reply.

I am not certain as to the differentiations which you intend with the terms Newfoundlanders and non-Newfoundlanders. The only record we maintain is that of current residence or mailing address. On this basis recent sample reveals a total of 1,641 employees actually working

MR. NEARY: on the Gulf and coastal vessels in the Newfoundland services - 1,641 - of this number 1,219 are shown as residing in Newfoundland.' In other words, over 400 employees who work on the Gulf, who work on the coastal boats, over 400 of these employees reside outside of Newfoundland, mainly in Nova Scotia.

Now some of them, Mr. Speaker, granted some of them may be Newfoundlanders who for one reason or another moved their families over to North Sydney because it was just a convenient to move them there as to move to Port aux Basques, I do not know, I do not know what the answer is, but I know that is a pretty high number. That is a pretty high number, Mr. Speaker, and I also know this, by the way, it is something that we are going to have to watch, that some of these employees, these 400 or more who work on the Gulf service, non-Newfoundlanders, and who work on the coastal boats, got their jobs through intervention by the federal member in Cape Breton, something that we will have to watch. We all go to bat for our own, Mr. Speaker, but we have to watch it. Some of these jobs where you have non-Newfoundlanders employed -

AN HON. MEMBER: Brian Tobin not doing his job?

MR. NEARY: No, Tobin does not represent that area and the other fellow has only been there a few months so give him a chance. This has been happening over the years, they have been chipping away and taking away and stealing away and robbing us -

AN HON. MEMBER: They will control the works.

MR. NEARY: They will control it. The hon. gentleman is right and that is why I am making this kind of a speech, most unusual for me to make this kind of a speech, but I am making a pitch to all members of this House, on both sides of the House, to get up on their high horses and not allow CN to con the Ministry of Transport and the provincial government into approving their plans

MR. NEARY: so swiftly, slow down the process. Nobody should be hurt, Mr. Speaker, everybody should benefit. Newfoundland should gain from progress, from new innovation, from new technology but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, if we do not take a greater interest in this matter that it is going to turn out, instead of being a blessing for Newfoundland, instead of lowering the cost of living in this Province, instead of giving the CN employees job security, it might turn out to be a disaster for the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another matter of the Throne Speech itself. I want to ask Your Honour's advice on this. I really do not know how to handle this particular situation. I notice by the Throne Speech, Your Honour, that the Lieutenant Governor, when he read the Throne Speech, used the term 'my government' 142 times, 'my government'. Now it seems to me, if my memory serves me correctly, that the Premier of this Province for the last two years, two years to this very day, has been going on television and radio and in the newspaper referring to the government as my government. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you can advise me who is right and who is wrong. Is it Her Majesty's government or is it Mr. Peckford's government? Is it Her Majesty's administration of the Peckford government or is it the Peckford administration of Her Majesty's government? Could Your Honour advise me on that? Or will the Premier of this Province compromise and say, well, Her Majesty's government 50 per cent of the time and 50 per cent of the time refer to it as his government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Our government.

MR. NEARY: One hundred and forty-two times. Now, either the Lieutenant-Governor is right or he is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking the Chair for some guidance on this. I do not know how Your Honour can give me the counselling that I need, but I am confused and baffled, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to know once and for all whose

MR. NEARY: government we are talking about. Is it the Peckford government or is it the Queen's government? Is the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power), a Minister of the Crown in the Peckford administration, or he is a Minister of the Crown in the Queen's administration?

MR. POWER: A good minister in a good administration.

MR. NEARY: I see. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was one significant aspect of the Throne Speech that I noticed. The other thing that I noticed about it, Mr. Speaker, was how it lacked initiative, how it lacked foresight, how it lacked originality.

MR. TULK: I thought you were going to give him his resignation.

MR. NEARY: No, I am coming to the resignations. I still have plenty of time, do not worry. Mr. Speaker, it turned out to be a great disappointment to the people of this Province. And is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province are beginning to question, are beginning to ask questions about this administration, about the Peckford administration? Is it, Mr. Speaker, any wonder, for instance, why a group of prominent Tories in the city of Corner Brook, in the Western part of this Province, are organizing a big meeting to dispatch their concerns to the Premier of this Province about his behavior, about the way that he has been handling the affairs of this Province, a meeting headed by a very prominent P.C. in the Western part of this Province, a very prominent P.C., a man who was a candidate at one time for the Tory Party now heading up a great movement in Western Newfoundland to register their complaints and protests to the Premier for the way that he has been handling or mishandling the affairs of this Province?

And, Mr. Speaker, I draw hon. members' attention to a letter in today's newspaper signed by Mr. E.L. White, another prominent P.C. in the Western Part of this Province,

MR. NEARY: a letter to the editor headed, "Put Him Out Of His Misery." I would draw hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you read that one for us?

MR. NEARY: I do not have my glasses, I cannot see it.

MR. WARREN: Just read that one. Read that to them.

MR. NEARY: Let me see your glasses there.

Mr. Speaker, The Ottawa Citizen carried a headline "Peckford's Mouth Rides Again."

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. NEARY: That is fine providing one does not put too much faith in the jockey, something most gamblers are at times famous for. The Premier, only a few weeks ago, said that Newfoundlanders would be given preference to jobs created in Newfoundland. When the Premier was in Corner Brook during the Winter Carnival celebrations, workers from Ontario and the Province of Quebec were arriving in Corner Brook to take jobs from local, qualified tradesmen who were not permitted to work on the Valley Mall.

MR. WARREN: What?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true! That is true!

MR. NEARY: The Premier said that small business is well looked after.

MR. HODDER: . That is what is happening.

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the Premier heard of the multi-national oil rip-offs that is making big news across this nation. Can 'Mr. Peckford' tell how small businesses were driven into bankruptcy by the takeover of this Province? And I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker. He says, "I know what the Premier is doing to his own image, that does not concern me too much." - but listen to this - it is what he is doing to the image of the

MR. NEARY: Progressive Conservative Party in Newfoundland that is hurting."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: "Something must be done to move that man out before it is too late, something a lot of people in the party should be planning, if they are not already doing so."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And as I said, Mr. Speaker, plans are well underway in the Western part of this Province to accommodate Mr. White.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was read at a time when we never had so much discontent, when people of Newfoundland were so discouraged and downhearted and upset and disillusioned. Never, never before have we seen a Throne Speech read at a time when there has been so much chaos in this Province, in this Island home of ours, and on the mainland part of the Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. NEARY: -and not one reference to record unemployment, the high cost of living, increasing vandalism and crime. For the first time in Newfoundland people have to lock their doors when they go out. There was a time when we used to boast about the fact, in this Province, that you could walk out and leave your door open, nobody would bother your house. Now we have fellows going around with ski masks on, sawed off shot guns -

MR. HODDER: Call girls.

MR. NEARY: Yes that is right. My hon. friend said, we have the call girls. In the second last edition of What Is Happening In Newfoundland two massage parlours

MR. NEARY: were advertised.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: Cannot afford them.

MR. NEARY: I do not know what the Minister of Health (Mr. House) - what standards the Minister of Health has laid down for these massage parlours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are today -

MR. HANCOCK: To carry around vaccination shots for them.

MR. NEARY: - I would say, we are rapidly establishing a reputation that is equivalent only in Chicago.

MR. HOLLETT: They are in Toronto buying strip joints (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And just to demonstrate further, Mr. Speaker, the people's discontent for this government and how arrogant they have become, and the contempt they have for the people of this Province, let me read a letter that I had the other day just to prove the point again -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is nonsense.

MR. NEARY: This is not nonsense. The letter I just read is signed by a Mr. White. The group out in Corner Brook, my hon. friend is familiar with them, he knows that movement is underway. But listen to this letter, just to show the contempt and the arrogance that this government has developed for the people of this Province listen,

MR. HANCOCK: Do I get a tip for this, or what?

MR. NEARY: "Mr. Steve Neary, March 4," which is only a week or so ago, Mr. Speaker, "For some time now, Sir, we the Fishermen's Committee of Englee have been trying

MR. NEARY: to arrange a meeting with the Minister of Fisheries. We have been trying to have him come to Englee. Also we have contacted our member very often about "-

MR. WARREN: Who is the minister?

MR. NEARY: Hold on now - "also we have contacted our member very often about this, Sir, and it does not seem to do any good. Mr. Rideout does not seem interested, and since he turned PC it has gotten worse for us down here, and there is no place for us to turn. Would you please bring this to the minister's attention. We want a meeting with him here at Englee not at Plum Point. I wish I could talk to you, Sir, face to face. I would tell you a lot more that we have to put up with down in this part of the Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who signed it?

MR. NEARY: It is signed by a Mr. Winston Andrews, Mr. Winston Andrews, Englee, and I will table the letter, Mr. Speaker. I will table it so the hon. gentleman can get his hands on it.

Mr. Speaker, this is typical. This is typical of the kind of complaint that we are getting about this government that in a very short time has become arrogant, in a very short time has shown more contempt for the people of this Province than any of its predecessors. And, Mr. Speaker, their latest example of arrogance and contempt for the people is their handling of the strike over here at the College of Trades and Technology and at the Workers' Compensation Board. We all know their record in that regard, but, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this, that when I was told today by workers from the Workers' Compensation Board who are out walking the picket line, when I was told some of the stories of the goings-on down in that building of recent days, why, Mr. Speaker, it would make your hair stand on end! Only a couple of nights ago, Mr. Speaker, just to show you how arrogant they are, they have the scabs and the strike breakers in there paying them \$275.00 a shift, providing them with free transportation, having them picked up over here in front of the Holiday Inn by the scabs and strike breakers and transported through the picket lines by Shannahan's Security and by some of the other people who are involved in transportation in this city, transported through the picket lines where they almost knock - there have almost been a couple of major accidents over there, little girls out trying to fight for their rights, being rammed by these strike breakers and scabs driving through the picket lines, and provided with free transportation and free food. They are fed free of charge down there and, in addition, Mr. Speaker, they get around \$275.00 a shift.

MR. NEARY: Can hon. members just stop for a moment and see how penny-wise and pound-foolish this government really is? Here they are offering a miserable 8 per cent to the striking workers and the statement the Premier made today, Mr. Speaker, was a misleading statement. Either the hon. gentleman deliberately did it or he was not in possession of the facts, he did it out of ignorance, did it out of ignorance. Mr. Speaker, it is not 11 per cent, it is not 23 per cent or 24 per cent, it is 8 per cent, 8 per cent. That is what they are being offered. How much over and above that is the government paying out in foolishness, is the government paying out in food, free transportation and high rates of pay to the scabs and the strike breakers? Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this Province have we seen a government that has been so involved in strike breaking -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Hold on, take it easy, will you -

MR. NEARY: - so involved in strike breaking as the government we see seated in front of us today - strike breakers! The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is anti-labour. He is encouraging strike breaking. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what really got my goat today, what really set the devil in me today, was when I was told by people who walked the picket lines day in and day out for the last twelve, fourteen, sixteen weeks - I believe it was Friday or Saturday night - while they are out in the rain and the cold walking the picket line, fighting for their rights, fighting for things they are entitled to, what is going on inside of that building. What is going on inside, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will tell members what is going on inside, a big party -

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. NEARY: A big booze party, a big booze party going on inside.

MR. MORGAN: Where?

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 425

GS - 3

MR. NEARY:

Down at the Workers' Compensation building. It went on until 9:30 at night. There is a rule in the

MR. NEARY:

Workers' Compensation Building, Mr. Speaker, that if you do have a party, if you get permission to have a party, it has to be finished by 7:00 P.M., but this crowd staggered out at 9:30 P.M. and thumbed their noses at the strikers, at the people who were walking the picket line. And this is condoned by this administration.

MR. HANCOCK:

That is our open and honest government.

MR. NEARY:

That is open and honest government. That is a government of integrity, a government that will lash out to their buddies \$200 and \$300 a shift and give them free food. And I do not know who paid for the booze. I do not know whether the twenty or thirty employees inside the building bought the booze themselves for their party and provided the disco music themselves, I do not know whether they did that or not, but I think it is incumbent upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to find out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

It is not a bit funny, Mr. Speaker. How would Your Honour feel down walking the picket line like these young men and young women, fighting for a decent wage for themselves and their families, to be looking in and seeing a big booze party going on inside the building and people staggering out of the building at 9:30 at night. Who paid for that party?

MR. MORGAN:

Playing politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY:

Ah, playing politics!

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you this.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The whale has surfaced again.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, again, it just goes to show the arrogance and the contempt that this government

MR. NEARY: have for the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, no wonder I can stand here today and name at least fourteen seats, if not more, that this party will lose in the next election.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can name them and I can give reasons why these twelve or fourteen seats will be lost by the Tories in the next election.

MR. MORGAN: Thoms and Neary.

MR. NEARY: If they want me to, I will name them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will start up on that end with Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Down in the wonderful district of Baie Verte they do not believe in a traitor, they do not believe in a turncoat. And that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, will bite the dirt in the next election. Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), gone, Mr. Speaker. Stephenville is gone. St. George's (Mr. Dawe) is gone. Two in Humber district, two in Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I can name them - the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), finished, gone; and, Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to say this, but I am looking across at the other victim of the political process, and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House), the Minister of Health, finished, wiped out. Could not even take a stand. He could not even take a stand on whether or not they should keep Deer Lake airport open - the major community, the biggest community in his district, and he straddles the fence - could not take a stand, and in that regard, Mr. Speaker, before it is 6:00 P.M., I want to say this, that I see no reason -

MR. NEARY: I represent a West Coast district -
I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why two airports cannot be
maintained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I will tell Your Honour why
I say that.

MR. MORGAN: The feds do not believe that, do
they?

MR. NEARY: Oh, the federal government does.

MR. MORGAN: No. No, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, they do.

But I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that I have nothing -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I have nothing but high respect
and high regard for Mr. Steele and Eastern Provincial Airways.
After all, we were the government, I was in the government
that created Eastern Provincial Airways, so why should I not
love it? Why should I not have a high regard for it? Why
should I not love E.P.A., Mr. Speaker, a Newfoundland airline?
And I can understand, Mr. Speaker, from a business point of
view, why they have to pull out of one airport, because you
have two airports that are so close together. So I think the
solution to it, Mr. Speaker, is for the Ministry of Transport,
the Government of Canada, to give E.P.A.

MR. NEARY:

a subsidy that will enable them to operate in both airports, keep both airports open. That is the only solution that I can see. Mr. Steele, EPA, has a very valid point, the Government of Canada has a very valid point. They say if EPA would continue into Deer Lake and Air Canada flying into Stephenville, both airports could be maintained. But Mr. Steele says, "No, we have to use Stephenville". The only answer to it is a few paltry dollars. \$200,000 or \$300,000 could cure the problem, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$500,000.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care if it is \$500,000. Look of all the jobs, all the employment. Look at what would happen to the economy of Deer Lake if EPA pulls out. Now, I got down to the Humber Valley and I got sidetracked off on that issue. Gander, unfortunately for my hon. friend, the hon. member is a gone goose.

MR. HANCOCK: She is not going to run, boy.

MR. NEARY: Gander - well, whether she runs or whether she does not run, Gander is coming back to the Liberal Party.

Naskaupi: You may as well write it off now, it is gone. Menihek is gone. Port de Grave, I mean, I should not have to, after the performance we saw in this House today, I believe the maiden speech of the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins), Well, I think we understand why that one is gone. Fortune Bay, finished, coming back to the Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never left it really.

MR. NEARY: Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, a traditional Liberal stronghold that the hon. gentleman fluked his way into, fluked in, finished, the hon. gentleman is finished.

MR. MORGAN: What a dream world you gentlemen are in. What a dream world.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, listen to this. I have not mentioned one district in the city of St. John's. They can have all them. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Here are three more possibilities according to the pollsters. What are the three more possibilities? Harbour Grace, a very great possibility because of the way the government blundered and goofed the superport. Trinity North - Mr. Speaker, the other day I had to laugh, I thought it was the most humorous and funny thing that I ever heard in my life, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), the Minister of Transportation -

MR. MORGAN: No, no, no. Trinity North you mean, not Bonavista North.

MR. NEARY: Trinity North I am talking about.

MR. MORGAN: You had the Leader of the Opposition in Trinity North.

MR. NEARY: Is that what it is now? Well, the district my hon. friend the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) represents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Trinity North.

MR. NEARY: Trinity North, that is what I said. Well, he had some complaints from his constituents and the complaints had to do with an unfortunate tragedy that took place in his district, a man was missing and presumed drowned. And if it was not so serious, I mean, I could have laughed. But in the meantime, the hon. gentleman had a few complaints from his constituents that the RCMP and Search and Rescue had not implemented to their satisfaction a search for this man who was missing and presumed drowned. And so down comes the media from the press gallery on Friday to interview the minister and says, "Mr. Minister, would you care to tell us why you are getting involved in this?". And he said, "Yes, I have had complaints from my district, and I have had several phone calls from my district, including one from the man who is missing". Mr. Speaker, a man who is as stunned as that,

MR. NEARY: you can understand why he signed the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And you can understand why his career in politics is coming to a close.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other possibility, of course, is Bonavista South. I hear rumblings, Mr. Speaker, rumblings from Bonavista South and the hon. gentleman -

MR. MORGAN: Come on down next election.

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman now, as brave as he appears to be in this House at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is in serious trouble in Bonavista South.

Now you notice, Your Honour, I left out all the St. John's seats. I would hope -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not forget Exploits.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Exploits.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Exploits is gone.

MR. HANCOCK: Grand Falls could go back too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, there are fourteen districts that will be sending Liberals back to this House after the next election and three possibilities. Now, Mr. Speaker, why will they be sending Liberals back? Well, they will be sending Liberals back because of some of the reasons that I gave a few moments ago, because of the arrogance of this government, because of the contempt that this government has for the people of this Province and because of the mishandling of the affairs of this Province. We have had a Premier in the two years, Mr. Speaker, who could not think of anything else but oil. When he went down to Mockey Night last year he even dressed up as a Arab, he is so obsessed with oil, cannot think of anything else but oil. And there has been bellyaching about offshore ownership, offshore jurisdiction and offshore management and now, Mr. Speaker, he has himself completely boxed in a corner by the oil companies and by the Government of Canada in his mishandling of-the lack of negotiations with the oil companies and with the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am told by my usual reliable sources in Ottawa that there have been no negotiations, there has been no liaison between this Province and the federal Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. LaLonde) for months, Mr. Speaker, no liaison, no conversation, no communication, no liaison between this Province and the federal Minister of Mines and Energy for months. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY: Ah,

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman says, 'Ah', well, let me say something to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: - I will show you, Mr. Speaker, their policy on the offshore.

MR. L. BARRY: The officials were down last week.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the hon. gentleman, I asked the hon. gentleman the other day, it was sort of off the cuff, I said to the hon. gentleman, "do you know that the Premier is meeting with the Mobil Oil officials and all the oil companies that have dealings with Hibernia today, after the House rises?" And he said, 'No, that is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, he said, 'The Premier does not tell me anything. That is not true', he said, 'you are pulling my leg'. I said, I am not pulling your leg and lo and behold I went -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) pulled your leg.

MR. NEARY: - out of the building at 1:45 after hearing all these jets zooming into St. John's Airport - four or five private jets - and here they all are standing out there with their big black overcoats and their pinstripe suits and their big briefcases -

MR. HANCOCK: Was the minister there?

MR. NEARY: - headed for the Premier's office to hold a discussion with the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: In private.

MR. NEARY: - a private discussion because the Premier of this Province had sent them a ultimatum.

Now, it is alright for the Premier, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: I will come to that. It is alright for the Premier to call an impromptu news conference, it is alright for the Premier to call an off-the-cuff press conference to say nothing, to try to con the media of this Province as he has been doing for the last couple of years, and they lap it up and they take the copy and just put it out verbatim and do not ask any questions about it, well, that is fine, getting the good press, it is alright to do it with them, Mr. Speaker, but when you do it with the oil companies that is a different matter, and I guarantee you they will only do it once.

The hon. Premier, apparently, up in his comfortable little nest up in Mount Scio place, up in Nagles Hill, leaped out of the shower, called up his executive assistant and said, "Quick, get the oil companies down here tomorrow. I want a meeting." Did not say what the meeting was about -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was in the bathtub, was he?

MR. NEARY: - so on, gets the executive assistant, he gets back into the shower -

AN HON. MEMBER: Get him the soap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and calls up all the officials of the oil companies and said, "The Premier wants you in this Province tomorrow for a meeting at 1:00." Down they come, Mr. Speaker, they go into their meeting and they say, 'Yes, Mr. Premier, are you going to make a deal? Can we go into production? Can we get this thing started? Can we start doing things in Newfoundland? Can we bring back the stuff we moved over to Halifax?' No, none of that, just sat down to have a little friendly chat. They still do not know to this moment why they were given an ultimatum to come to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the hon. Minister of

MR. NEARY:

Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) can tell us. If I did not have -

MR. STIRLING:

(Inaudible) he would not go

to lunch with him. He would not go to lunch.

MR. NEARY:

He would not go to lunch with

him, the Minister of Energy. If I did not have far more important things -

MR. BARRY:

I was invited.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, the hon. gentleman was

invited but declined the invitation, and I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that in due course you are going to see an eruption in that Cabinet, led by the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

And I have to say this, I have

to say this. In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, that looking over the benches on the opposite side -

MR. BARRY:

Solidarity in Poland has nothing on this Cabinet.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. BARRY:

Solidarity in Poland has nothing on

this Cabinet.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, we saw Friday an example

of Cabinet solidarity in this Province but in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, if I had the opportunity, if I was given a chance to pick a man from the other side to join the Liberal ranks, I have to say that it would be the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

I believe that that is a

compliment.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, it is compliment. The

door is always -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, the door is always open for the hon. gentleman. I notice in the last year or two he has been criticized so often, contradicted in public by the Premier. He has been silenced. He has been told he is not to deal with this one, he cannot deal with that one, he cannot talk to Ottawa. The Premier wants to do this himself. He cannot invite the oil company officials in here. He will not even attend their meetings, will not have dinner with them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that true?

MR. NEARY: That is true. And so, Mr. Speaker, this meeting that took place on Friday, Mr. Dorry Little, the President of Mobil Oil, says he does not know why this ultimatum went out, why they were summoned to Newfoundland. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, while our Premier is making a silly ass of himself and a fool of himself, Mobil Oil -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark, "silly ass".

MR. NEARY: Well, I retract it. If it is not parliamentary I take it back, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member withdraws?

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Anything to keep peace and harmony in the House.

But while our Premier is making a silly fool of himself, is on the brink of a nervous breakdown over all this, who reminds me, Mr. Speaker - the hon. Premier reminds me today of the first job I had when I went to work with DOSCO, I was a nipper. And do hon. members know what a nipper is? A nipper is a fellow who runs messages

MR. NEARY: and brings water to the bosses. Well, that Premier reminds me of a nipper. He is out of his league. He is out of his depth. He does not know how to handle the situation. He does not know how to handle his job. It is too much for him. It is too much for him, Mr. Speaker. The man is such a bundle of nerves that I am expecting any day at all now, any day at all, to hear that he has taken up - Mr. Speaker, any day at all I am expecting to hear that the Premier has taken up residence in another beautiful building where he will have much more room, in a big brick building located opposite Bowring Park, and he will have lots of room to run around and play with his little gadgets.

Mr. Speaker, while all this silly nonsense is going on, Mobil Oil will go up to the federal Minister of Energy and they will say, "Mr. Minister, we are about ready to present our production plans", and the minister says, "That is fine. Give us your production plans, and when we get them and we look them over, if they are satisfactory and meet our regulations, we will approve them." Then Mobil Oil will go out on the Grand Banks and they will set up this platform - not a concrete platform, I forget what they call it now. The hon. minister could tell me.

MR. BARRY: A production platform.

MR. NEARY: A production platform. They will set it up, a platform that can be moved out of the way when icebergs come along, and the oil will be loaded at the wellhead, there will be no pipeline in to shore, the oil will be loaded at the well-head, carried down to Maine, fed into the pipeline, fed into the oil refineries in Eastern Canada and the United States, and that is all we will know

MR. NEARY: about it here, Mr. Speaker. That is all we will know about it. Right now the Government of Canada, the Energy Committee of the House of Commons are meeting on this piece of legislation, the Canada Lands Act, which gives the Government of Canada ownership of the offshore resources in Eastern Canada.

MR. MORGAN: That is what you guys want.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we want. What we want, Mr. Speaker, what we want is this: we want action. We do not want a Premier who says we are going to sit on this resource until hell freezes over. We want action, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows, everybody, even a kindergarten student in this Province knows that the only way these matters

MR. S. NEARY: can be resolved is through a deal, you make a deal. Everybody knows that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) your friends know.

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, my friends in Ottawa know, that is why they are making a deal. But no deal in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) deals in (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: The oil ship is going to pass us by. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months the relations between this Province and the Government of Canada, the Minister of Energy, relations have hardened not softened. They have hardened and Ottawa is going full speed ahead with the oil companies as if they owned the oil.

MR. BARRY: Do you agree with what Mr. Rompkey said over the weekend?

MR. S. NEARY: I do not know what Mr. Rompkey said. I do not always agree with everything Mr. Rompkey says any more than I agree with everything the hon. gentleman says. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sending out a warning, I am sending out a message to this crowd, that the oil ship is going to pass us by.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: If they adopt the attitude, we will sit on it like the Fonz, we will sit on it until hell freezes over, what will our grandchildren say? If we develop it and make a deal, what will our grandchildren say? I say what will our grandchildren say if we do not.

MR. HANCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: They are using the same argument with the Lower Churchill. Let her flow into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, let the water flow into the Gulf because our grandchildren-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Do not be so foolish, 'boy'

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it away.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my philosophy, the philosophy of this Party and the feelings of people of Newfoundland, have nothing to do with giving anything away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORCAN: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - what it has to do with, what the whole thing has to do with, what it is boiled down to is common sense. And everybody knows that a deal has to be made, Mr. Speaker. You strike a deal and you get the best deal you can for Newfoundland. That is the only way the thing is going to be -

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) bad deal (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, we will decide in this House whether it is a good deal or a bad deal.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: And it so happens, Mr. Speaker, that on the Upper Churchill deal, that the Tories voted in favour of it in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: Did they now?

MR. S. NEARY: And so, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying this, is the hon. gentleman saying that they are afraid to enter into negotiations, afraid they might overcome, they might be beside themselves and then somebody will make a bad deal? Is that what he is afraid of? Well, I would say get out of the government and let us take over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And we will soon make a deal to get the development of the resources in this Province going.

MR. MORGAN: And give it away again.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was down the other day to Burnt Island.

MR. STIRLING: All deals with Ottawa are bad deals.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes all deals are bad deals.

The hon. gentleman must look under his bed every night to see if he can find a bad deal, he must have nightmares about bad deals. It has nothing to do with bad deals, Mr. Speaker, it has to do with common sense and making the best deal you can for Newfoundland.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the Trans Canada Highway.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was down the other day to Burnt Island for the opening of a fish plant. And I took down the only living Father of Confederation with me and he cut the ribbon for the opening of this fish plant. And what I said to the people in Burnt Island is so true - and they were there by the hundreds. The first thing we did that day was that the former Premier addressed three high schools, 1000 students, the vocational school 130 students -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: - signed the register in Isle aux Morts and was given a plaque engraved by the -

MR. MORGAN: Now we know the truth.

MR. S. NEARY: - showing the appreciation of the people of Isle aux Morts, signed the register at the town hall in Port Aux Basques and then opened the fish plant, cut the ribbon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. S. NEARY: - and made a major speech at the opening of this plant. And what I said to the people is so true, Mr. Speaker, I said ' It is like old times, it is just like old times, I said, to see Mr. Smallwood back cutting a ribbon'.

MR. BARRY: Did they all cry?

MR. S. NEARY: Because that is something we have not seen in this Province of late.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. S. NEARY: We have not seen any sods turned or any ribbons cut -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - in this Province for a good many years, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - and do you know why? Because they are afraid they are going to make a bad deal, so they do not make any deal, they do not do anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Alright they always ask the rhetorical question, Will we give it away like the other crowd, are we going to give it away? And I must say, Mr. Speaker, looking around at this other crowd, I do not remember anybody on this side being Premier of this Province, I do not remember anybody.

MR. MORGAN: And you never will either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: But I do remember this Mr. Speaker, I do remember this that they will always ask the rhetorical question, What about Mr. Smallwood when he gave everything away? And he gave nothing away, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

March 17, 1981

Tape No. 430

RA - 5

MR. S. NEARY:

But I say to them, how can they jump over seven years of corruption and mismanagement? How can they jump over that? How can they ignore that fact? How can they ignore practically a whole decade of corruption and mismanagement and waste in this Province? They jump over that,

MR. NEARY:

They jump over a Cabinet of which they were members, most of them -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - twelve of them members of that Cabinet, they would jump over that to get at poor old Joey Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to say that the situation in Newfoundland is changing. She is turning around, and Mr. Smallwood now is emerging the elder statesman in this Province and the Tories now are beginning to look sick. And, Mr. Speaker, I never uttered truer words in my life than I did down in Burnt Island. And no wonder, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are discouraged, discontented, disillusioned, and fed up with Tory times in this Province. Is it any wonder? When you look back, when you just think back, Mr. Speaker, of the number of sods that were turned, the number of buildings that were opened, schools and -

MR. MORGAN: And that were closed shortly after.

MR. NEARY: - hospitals, and parks, and fish plants, and mines. When you look back at those days, Mr. Speaker, it would do your heart good, it would do your old Irish heart good on this Paddy's Day, Mr. Speaker, just to think back, and you can realize how I reminisced in Burnt Island the other day, and how it slipped out, Mr. Speaker, that it was like old times to see a Liberal out cutting a ribbon for the opening of a fish plant.

MR. BARRY: Did you cry?

MR. NEARY: It is something that we have not seen in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in a good many years.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time, it is getting near six, I wish I had the time to go through all of these clippings that I have taken out of the Mainland newspapers, "Newfoundland Premier may call vote on separation."

PREMIER PECKFORD: Misquoted.

MR. NEARY: Misquoted, he says.

"Premier Peckford's mouth rides again." "Premier sailing on wind of niches" "Tough man on the rock." I wish I had time to quote from these Mainland newspapers. If there is one thing that the Premier of this Province will go down in history for, he will go down in history for creating bad blood between this Province and the Government of Canada, between this Province and the industrial world, the international industrial world, creating bad blood between this Province and other provinces of Canada, bad blood between this Province and the oil companies, and, Mr. Speaker, has made himself in the process, the most hated Premier across this nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: The most popular.

MR. NEARY: Now, that is a reputation, Mr. Speaker, that I would not be very proud of, and if I were the government members, or supporters of the government, or the Premier of this Province, I would not boast about that reputation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms):

The hon. member 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 that the House do now adjourn.

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