

VOL. 3

NO. 33

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
Tuesday, May 5, 1981

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. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and pleasure that I have the privilege to inform this House of Assembly of what can only be described as a major step forward in the Province's economic development. While in recent years this government and this House of Assembly has presided over the important changes in the way our people manage and attempt to generate social and economic security from our natural resources, I am today able to announce that another important resource, the people's financial assets and collective consumer credit strengths, is being given important assistance by government.

Mr. Speaker, it was last August that my department was pleased to assume responsibility for co-operatives and credit unions in the Province. As a development department we saw our role as developmental. While we regard the role of inspection and regulation of co-operative societies as certainly important, it was our intention to apply a similar developmental philosophy to co-operatives and to credit union matters as has been our department's practice in the areas of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development programming.

Mr. Speaker, government's five year plan has clearly stated that "Government envisages an enhanced role for co-operatives in the future." Arising from this commitment, I am today announcing the agreement by government to implement phase one of a Co-operative Development Programme.

MR. GOUDIE: In association with the Credit Union Council of Newfoundland, the Canadian Co-operative Credit Society, the Newfoundland Teachers' Credit Union, and the Terra Nova Credit Union, government has agreed to commit up to a maximum of \$790,000 in funds over the next five years to support the consolidation of assets of two existing credit unions into what will be the Province's largest public credit union to be known as the Newfoundland and Labrador Credit Union Limited.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Credit Union will commence operations during this fiscal year with assets totalling \$23 million and an existing membership of 7,500 with five branches located across the Province. The commitment by government to this development reflects our confidence in the 38,000 members of the co-operative and credit union movement to continue to build a firm foundation for provincial sovereignty over our financial and consumer credit resources. Because of the fact that our Province is proportionately more dependent than any other upon national and international sources for private consumer and business credit investment, because of the fact that such a high proportion of consumer credit accounts rest with finance companies resulting in considerable income leakages for the Province, and because of the historical absence of locally controlled and developed financial institutions, government finds it important to assist those Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are working together co-operatively to build a stronger, more secure, financial future for all of us.

This decision, in combination with the investment of time, skill and resources from the co-operative movement, will result over times in increased access to

May 5, 1981

Tape No. 1256

NM - 3

MR. GOUDIE: low-cost financial services for our citizens, greater returns to the economy for the local re-investment of finance capital revenues, greater responsiveness by financial capital to the particular needs of the local economy, increased local control over the savings of New-foundlanders and Labradorians, along with increased competition in the financial marketplace.

MR. GOUDIE: Government's investment of these funds into the future of a sound public credit union development programme reflects the confidence which all of us have in the people of the Province to control, manage and develop their own resources. This progressive investment, at a time when there are so many compelling financial needs within the Province, highlights the importance which this government places upon provincial control and jurisdiction over all our resources, including our financial and consumer credit strength. It also reflects the confidence of government in the 38,000 people who comprise the co-operatives and credit union movement in all of Newfoundland and Labrador. This is the first in a series of decisions which government will be addressing to assist, within reason and discretion, in the enhanced development of the co-operative and credit union movement in the Province.

I take pleasure today in making this important announcement and offer my congratulations to the people of the co-operative movement for all of the work which they have done to help make this decision both possible and practical.

And just as a footnote, Mr. Speaker, not included in the statement itself, just as an example of the type of financial strength which credit unions hold throughout this country is that on a national scale credit unions are recognized as the fifth strongest financial institution in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I commend the co-operatives in this Province. As the minister pointed out, 38,000 members are now added to the largest credit unions in this Province who are now consolidating the resources so

MR. HISCOCK: they will have an asset of \$23 million and are extending membership to 7,505 branches.

The minister of this government is again getting into the cosmetic approach and trying to take credit for this merger that is becoming between these two credit unions. This cosmetic approach of \$790,000 in a five year plan, it sounds great, it sounds like the Council of Women's grant and the Arts Council grant, \$790,000 in a grant consolidating these two credit unions. One would go on to assume that these credit unions would not be able to merge with an asset of \$23 million if they never had this \$160,000 a year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, it is a great move on behalf of these two credit unions and I commend the credit unions for taking this progressive step. But as for the government trying to get on the tail of these two credit unions and their merger to say that it is a result of this \$160,000 cosmetic approach that it is getting, then, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the credit unions- in actual fact I think they would be a little bit upset by the fact that a Ministerial Statement is coming out in such a way as to take credit for this merger. This side again has pioneered-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: -this government has pioneered in the matter of co-ops in this Province and we will continue to press in this matter. We have many advancements in agriculture and fisheries and in credit unions and co-ops in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, this side supports this merger of these two credit unions but unfortunately not as the result of the government's initiative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

May I -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

We have in the galleries -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We have in the galleries today

visiting us, twenty-two Grade IX students from Stella Marie High School in Trepassey, representing both the districts of Ferryland and St. Mary's - The Capes. We hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome to the galleries two delegations from the Terra Nova district, namely, a delegation from the Town Council of Musgravetown, represented by the Mayor, Mr. Alfred Saint, and councillor Mr. Charles Butt; also, a delegation from the Port Blandford to Winter Brook World Development Association, represented by the President, Mr. Ewart Hall, co-ordinator, Mr. Day, and members, Mr. Max Gill and Mr. Herbert Hounsell. We welcome them today as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Further statements?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have two statements related to collective bargaining and I would ask members of the House to permit me to read them in succession.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

DR. COLLINS:

The first statement refers to the strikes that had been in progress at C.T.T. and W.C.B.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House at this time of the details of the settlement reached with employees of the NAPE bargaining units at the College of Trades and Technology and the Workers' Compensation Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot hear you.

DR. COLLINS: A new twenty-seven month agreement has now been entered into which provides for the following increases - and the dates quoted here refer to the C.T.T. unit. The W.C.B. unit is slightly different dates, but it is essentially the same agreement. 'April 1, 1980: \$1,000 or 8 per cent, whichever is greater; January 1, 1981: \$100 on all salary scales; step advancement on the salary scales for employees who qualify; cash bonuses in lieu of employees at the top of their salary scales; April 1, 1981: a 5 per cent increase on all salary scales. On the date of signing, there will be a \$300 cash payment to each employee; October 1, 1981: a 6.5 per cent increase to all salary scales; January 1, 1982: \$100 on all salary scales; step advancement on salary scales for employees who qualify; cash bonuses in lieu of employees at the top of their salary scales; April 1, 1982: \$100 increase to all salary scales; June 30, 1982, the contract expires.'

Mr. Speaker, this settlement provides for an increase of about 27.5 per cent over twenty-seven months as compared to about 23 per cent over twenty-four months under government's previous position as an average increase.



DR. COLLINS: Because of the staggered introduction of the increases, the cost to government will increase less than a half per cent during the first two years of this settlement as compared to the same period under government's previous offer. While the settlement provides for higher scale increases, it also provides a longer term and employees in bargaining units with whom these groups traditionally relate will receive increases achieved in the next round of bargaining three months earlier than these groups.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement now with regard to the teachers.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Was it not my understanding there was agreement to do both statements?

MR. NEARY: One at a time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, there was no agreement. That was my understanding as well.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the workers have agreed to the particular items in the contract enunciated by the minister, so quite obviously we also naturally agree with the contract that has been agreed to by the workers concerned. Of course, what this statement does not say, what this statement omits to point out, is the tremendous anxiety and frustration and bitterness that was caused in the settlement of this strike.

MR. FLIGHT: What face to get up in this House today.

MR. LUSH: What this statement does not indicate Mr. Speaker, what this statement does not enunciate, what this statement does not emphasize -

R. MOORES: Like a robber's horse, I tell you.

MR. LUSH: - is the tremendous erosion that has taken place with respect to the collective bargaining

MR. LUSH: process in this Province by the uncompromising attitude of the government in keeping these workers for eight months -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: -treated as dogs.

I can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that for the sake of labour in this Province, for the sake of the process of collective bargaining, that we never go through this kind of set of negotiations again. And I would hope that the government will adopt a more conciliatory, a more harmonious attitude when it is negotiating with the teachers particularly right now who seem to be in a bad situation with the government. So I hope that the minister will take a lesson from what has transpired by the bitterness and by the animosity that took place with this particular strike and will take a lesson from that and come to a quick resolution with the teachers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER(MR. SIMMS): Further statements? The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I should say I congratulate the workers on agreeing to this statement that I just read out.

The next statement relates to the matter concerning the teachers. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on behalf of government on the status of negotiations with the NTA in respect of the Province's teachers. Negotiations between government and the school boards and the NTA held last week were unsuccessful in reaching a new collective agreement.

MR. MOORES: Surprise ! Surprise !

DR. COLLINS: The major issue in the disputes is salaries, although several other issues remaining outstanding.

At the conclusion of the last round of talks, government's position remained the acceptance of the Conciliation Board Report which recommended increases of 9 per cent in each year of a two-year agreement. The NTA position was given to us at these talks at a total of 29 per cent over two years as follows; September 1, 1980, 10 per cent; March 1, 1981, 4 per cent; September 1, 1981, 10 per cent; March 1, 1982, 5 per cent for a total of 29 per cent.

Increments and upgradings add another 1.5 per cent per annum to the cost of these positions, bringing the total increase in average salary over two years to approximately 21 per cent under government's proposal and 32 per cent under the NTA proposal.

The impact of these differences in percentage increases on government's teachers' salary bill and the average teacher's salary are significant. Under the NTA proposal, the expenditure by government during the two year

DR. COLLINS: agreement on salaries and bonuses exceeds that required under the Conciliation Board recommendation by almost \$24 million. Under the government proposal, the average teacher's salary would increase from \$21,700 per annum at the beginning of the contract to over \$26,500 per annum, a total salary scale increase of \$4,800 over two years. The NTA proposal would see the average salary rise from \$21,700 per annum to \$29,000 per annum under the agreement, a total salary increase of \$7,800 over two years.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the demand of the NTA is significantly beyond the Province's fiscal capacity is self-evident. The ability of government to finance salary increases is directly related to the rate of growth in the government's revenue base. Public service salaries are paid, for the most part, out of current account revenues. The overall growth in revenues at the outset of the 1981 budgetary process was projected at less than 9 per cent and even after the various fiscal measures introduced in the budget were adopted, the growth rate is only slightly in excess of 10 per cent.

DR. COLLINS: These revenue growth rates give a general indication of government's ability to finance improvements in public sector salary levels or other expenditure areas. This is not to say that government can adopt any hard and fast rules with respect to salary settlements for various public sector groups, which must be arrived at by taking into account a large number of factors related to the individual group, as well as by examining the various interrelationships among the different groups. However, it is fair to say that the teachers' demands present government with a financial problem of such magnitude that we are unable to see any immediate resolution, given the constraints of our fiscal capacity. The increases being sought are also significantly beyond the type of settlements being achieved with other public sector employees.

Government would urge both the NTA as well as individual teachers seriously to consider the financial constraints of the Province in deciding on their future course of action in the present labour dispute.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing. If this were the first group that this government attempted to negotiate with you could understand their taking such a naïve or either naïve - and I have, because of the rules in the House, assumed that they are very naïve statements and certainly not the kind of statement that you would expect a Minister of Finance to give after just coming through the fishermen's strike last year, and the NAPE strike this year, to now dare the teachers. This is what they are doing on the eve of the vote, they are daring the teachers to go on strike, they are daring the teachers by saying that this information that is being presented is going to bankrupt the Province. They are trying to transfer

MR. STIRLING: the blame to the teachers; attempting to get public opinion against the teachers for the fact that this government has not managed the affairs of this Province properly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: They have not developed this Province, they have not negotiated, they have not got some of the kinds of projects, they have not got the Labrador power projects that could have been going ahead a year ago. Where would the extra money come from? No agreement signed on highways. And this government is attempting to now create the impression that because this government cannot manage properly, that they cannot budget properly, they are now attempting to blame the teachers for bankrupting the Province.

The mismanagement of this government, the inability to plan, the inability to negotiate, the inability - to debate, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are debating.

MR. STIRLING: Debate, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker, this statement, if I were outside the House I would use much stronger language because the Speaker

MR. L. STIRLING: has to maintain the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by the minister dares the teachers to go on strike and it does nothing to let the people of the Province know what the government plans to do for all of the children in the Province who are now faced with this government daring the teachers to go on strike. Now, Mr. Speaker, this statement is definitely not acceptable to this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to ask hon. members to join me in welcoming to the galleries today a delegation from the town of St. Anthony, Mayor Boyd Noel, Deputy Mayor Joseph Ollerhead and Councillor Charles Budgell.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements?

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Would the minister care to inform the House if it is correct that the Premier wrote a letter, a personal letter, to the major hospitals in this Province, St. Clare's, the Grace and other major hospitals, delivering an ultimatum to the hospitals to cut their expenditure by four per cent? Is this correct, that the Premier sent a letter out under his signature, A. Brian Peckford, and not under the Minister of Health's signature?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge it is not correct.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, have the hospitals, the major hospitals like St. Clare's and the Grace, been informed by the minister or by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that they are to cut their expenditure this year by 4 per cent?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, yes, I have written the hospital boards, not the major hospitals, all the hospital boards. The fact is I do not exactly know what - it is not cutting it by 4 per cent. It is actually, Mr. Speaker, actually the increase to the hospital board this year is just over 13 per cent. And the hon. member is giving the impression that it was cut back 4 per cent. I would say, yes, back 4 per cent from their original request.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: As my hon. colleague states, 'That is sheer nonsense,' Mr. Speaker. Now has the hon. Minister of Health been advised of the repercussions, of the hardship that these restraints are going to cause in the hospitals, in these major hospitals, especially St. Clare's and the Grace Hospitals? Has the minister had any meetings or been informed of the serious repercussions that these drastic restraints are going to have upon the operations -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: I am talking to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) not the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The Minister of Fisheries is an expert on every department. He is a know-all who knows everything about every department except the fisheries of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



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

MR. S. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Health - if I can get his attention for a moment -

MR. ROBERTS: His understanding is difficult to get, his attention is not.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

- if he would tell us about the meetings that he has held, if he has had any meetings with the administration of the hospitals to discuss the serious repercussions that these restrictions are to have on the major hospitals here in this Province.?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I said initially that I wrote all the hospital boards, They had made certain requests and we had cut them back by four per cent of what their requests were. And the fact is all hospitals, and I do not say this as a general thing because there may be some a little up on account of programmes that had to be annualized, but something in the vicinity of just between thirteen and fourteen per cent increase.

I wrote letters and I asked them to respond to me about what this would mean in regard to their programmes and when I would get the information back from them I would be meeting with them again. And while this is not necessarily a normal process-- the normal process is for us, as a department, to meet and negotiate and discuss budgets with every hospital board, and this will be done, I will be discussing any repercussions, but we are not anticipating any. It is not meant to have to cut back on any services.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman undertake to table all the correspondence between his department and the major hospitals in connection with this matter? I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the hospitals will be now forced to use old, torn-up linen; they will have to use old gloves, that should be thrown away in surgery; there will not be enough nurses.

MR. NEARY: There will not be enough nurses to -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The very purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions, not for the hon. member to give information, unfounded as it may be.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, that is quite accurate. If the hon. member has a question, I would ask him to ask it.

MR. NEARY: Well, is the hon. member aware of what the four per cent cut has done to the morale of the hospitals? Is the minister aware that the major hospitals like St. Clare's will not be able to hire Summer staff this year, staff to replace nurses who go on vacation? They will not be able to hire any extra staff. And is the hon. gentleman aware that in the emergency units of some of these hospitals they do not know have properly trained staff, only one trained person in one hospital that I know of, to operate the respirators and so forth, one trained person and the number of respirators is being reduced to five?

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman aware of this?

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps it might be as well to refer to Beauchesne, the Fifth edition, on questions, A prohibited question could be hypothetical, "contains inferences, contains imputations, but most of all be a speech however short, nor be of unreasonable length.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech obviously within the parameters of

MR. MARSHALL: Question Period. It is not permitted.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): With respect to the point of order, it is an accurate point of order. Also I might add that with respect to asking supplementary questions, there should not be any need for lengthy preamble and this I believe is the third supplementary question the hon. member has risen to ask. I would direct him to ask his question. I believe he has asked a question, or several questions there: maybe he has completed the asking of his question. But certainly it should be as brief as possible.

MR. NEARY: There were three or four questions there in one but the final part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is is the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY:

aware that these hospitals like St. Clare's do not have enough staff now, cannot afford to hire enough staff, to cover all the shifts, enough trained staff?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I have contacted the hospitals. Our assessment is that they - you know, in determining the budget, we think that they can carry on without any cut backs and we have asked them to give us information as to how they can handle it under this particular percentage cut. And I am getting that information back. We do not anticipate - you know, the hon. member making statements about using old sheets and this kind of thing, I think is utter nonsense.

MR. NEARY: I am asking you if that is true.

MR. HOUSE: It is utter nonsense. That has not come to my attention. And, incidentally, I have received information back from a lot of the hospital boards now and that is not the kind of information that I am getting. The information that went out was reasonably straightforward. It stated that, you know, they were asking for something like a 17 per cent, 17.5 per cent increase in operating budgets and we tried to cut it back to between 13.5 per cent and 14 per cent and we asked them what they would do in order to meet that. We have no thought of them cutting back on any of the services.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Health, growing out of his answer. Would he tell us the nature of the 17 per cent increase which he tells

MR. ROBERTS: us the hospital boards requested? Was that figure one which included any new or expanded services or was that figure the estimate that the hospital boards put forward as to what they would need to operate at the presently existing levels of service? Now, I trust the minister has grasped the question, in which case perhaps he would give us the answer. And I could phrase it another way just to make sure the minister gets it: Is the 4 per cent, cut back from 17 per cent to 13 per cent, that he has told us about, is that a cut back below presently existing levels of service? Because we all know it will cost more this year to provide the same level of service that was provided last year.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, these budgets are done on an individual hospital basis. It is done by a team visiting the hospitals throughout the Province during the first part of the fiscal year, and this 17 per cent, as far as I can gather - and I would have to say that I cannot be certain about it - but the 13.5 to 14 per cent is what we would anticipate to take care of existing services and, in some cases, some programmes that have to be annualized this year because of the late start last year.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The minister did not answer the question. Now I ask him again, the hospitals have given him their estimates which he tells us are 17 per cent over last year in dollar amounts. Would he tell us whether that is their estimate of what they need? I am as familiar as the minister is with what goes on in the Health Department budgeting process. Would he tell us whether it is their estimate of what they need for their delivering the services, what they need to provide this year to the people of this Province the same level of services as last year - yes or no?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. member, I told this hon. House, that I was not totally aware of -

MR. ROBERTS: We know the minister is not totally aware.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the estimates that they made were 17 per cent above and we felt that they could give the same service as last year -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - with about 13 per cent.

MR. STILRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). Now that we have had this challenge to the teachers delivered by the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) challenging them to go on strike, we can presume that the teachers will have no other choice but to accept that challenge because of the insulting matter

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The members seem to be in a very frisky mood today. There is a point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen cannot have it their way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: There are rules that govern the conduct of the House and one of them is that questions are not to contain imputations. The hon. gentleman is raising a question to the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) which contains an obvious imputation, that is, an imputation as to the intent of a statement made by the hon. the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: That is his own subjective judgement of the nature and the effect of the statement and is an imputation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, there were no imputations. What the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was saying was fact. And this is the third time that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stood up today with spurious points of order to interfere with the Question Period, which is only a half an hour, Mr. Speaker, and if he would allow this side of the House to get on with the Question Period then we would probably get some information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, obviously a question should not be argumentative in any event because that clearly is outlined in Beauchesne. The hon. members asking questions are permitted a slight preamble. I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has had a slight preamble. Now if he has a question I would direct him to ask his question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STILRING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In summary then, in view of a statement made by the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins), would the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) outline for the benefit of this House what steps she has taken to assure the parents of this Province and the students of this Province that they are not going to become the victims of this unreasonable dispute caused by this government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there are three parties to this dispute and the government as one party is doing all in its power to see that a reasonable and fair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: - contract is reached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: That is the key to ensuring that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - the students and the parents of the Province will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is very difficult to hear answers, and I presume when members ask questions they want to hear to answers, but it is very difficult when there is a great deal of disorder in the House. And I would ask hon. members to please restrain themselves and let us get on with the Question Period.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, reaching a fair and satisfactory and reasonable agreement with the teachers, which will be in the best interest of all the taxpayers we represent, is the key to ensuring that students will not have their classes or their education interrupted, and government is doing all within its power to see that that is achieved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is because of insulting answers like that that you get people aroused on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point in the hon. Leader of the Opposition making comments on a ruling. That is not allowed either. I would ask him to direct his question, please.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: The Speaker, of course, has the absolute right to interpret anything, but it was not a comment on the Speaker's ruling, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would not want to -

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member has a question I would direct him to ask his question, please?

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The question I would like to ask the minister is would she be specific in setting out for the benefit of the students -

MR. FLIGHT: And the parents.

MR. STIRLING: - we are either going to have a settlement, in which case there is no problem, the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) has already set out that they are not prepared to make a settlement. The question is, assuming that there is now going to be a strike, would the minister please set out for the benefit of the students and the parents what contingency plans can be made to reassure the students that they have not wasted a year's work and what plans have been set out to make sure that they get their grades

MR. STIRLING: and that they are going to be promoted next year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

M<sup>S</sup>. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) for government have repeatedly indicated the willingness of government to continue bargaining, to continue negotiating to reach a satisfactory settlement in this dispute. And I along with, I think, the parents and the students of the Province trust that will be possible.

As for a year's school work being wasted, that certainly will not be the case. People have done their work from September until now in their school year, it has been a successful year, and there really is not any point of speculating what might happen if classes are interrupted,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE: We trust that that will not be necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is the same kind of situation that caused the government to sit on their hands all through the fishermen's strike last Summer, all the while hoping that something would happen. Now I ask the minister, based on the little bit of information that she has given, can she at least assure the students and assure the parents that if a strike does go ahead that she will take the action that is necessary to guarantee those students that they will be given full credit for the work that they have done this year and they will be promoted and their problems set aside next year? Would she give the assurance that that is going to be done?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, again I am really not predicting that there is going to be any interruption in classes. Certainly students will get credit for the school work they have done until now in this school year, of course they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the high likelihood of a strike because of the attitude of the government thus far, could the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) indicate to the House whether she has made any suggestions to the NTA to take care of the serious situation that will be created within the Grade XI level this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, public examinations in our Province are required for Grade XI students for

MS. VERGE: high school graduation. These public exams determine half the Grade XI student's final marks, the other half being based on the year's work as evaluated by the teachers in their own schools. Public exams are set, administered and marked quite independent of the collective agreement with the NTA.

MR. THOMS: We know that. Why do you not answer the question? We know that.

MS. VERGE: Recently a new salary or remuneration rate for the marking of the public exams was established to the satisfaction of the teachers and we are hopeful that public exams will be carried out as usual, that Grade XI students will complete their year's work and be given credit for the successful completion of their courses and graduate from high school.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A supplementary. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we know all that, but can the minister assure this House of what steps she has taken to assure - or can she indicate to this House whether there will be public examinations this year, and whether or not there will be a marking board this year, and whether or not, if there is a long strike, the students in Grade XI, who presumably pass their Grade XI, would get a diploma to show if they have completed Grade XI? What steps is she taking in that direction?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Ah, shut up, maw-mouth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Minister of  
Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I think the  
whole tenor of the series of questions that have been  
addressed to me is very disturbing, it indicates a certain  
expectation of a strike on the part of the teachers and I  
think it is destructive. I think most of the people we all  
represent in this hon. House very much hope that a strike  
will not be necessary and that a satisfactory contract will  
be settled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: If you want to hear something  
destructive, Mr. Speaker, if the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. F.B. ROWE: Yes, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. F.B. ROWE: - if the minister does not  
have any contingency plans -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. F.B. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for  
Trinity - Bay de Verde has a supplementary question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, does the minister  
realize that it would be much more disturbing and much more  
destructive if she has no contingency plans in the likelihood  
of a long-drawn-out strike this Summer? I am asking this

MR. F.B. ROWE: questions: Are there going to be public examinations or are there not, if there is a long strike? Will there be a marking board? And will the students get a diploma or will they not get a diploma?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I already explained in response to the earlier question that the public exams have nothing to do with the collective agreement. The public exams are set, they are administered and they are marked by teachers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - under arrangements quite separate and apart -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - from the collective agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
Is the hon. Minister finished?

I am not sure, I could not hear.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am simply making the point that public exams which are given in our Province now for only Grade XI students, unlike former years, and which determine half the final mark in Grade XI for high school graduation, are given and administered and marked by teachers under arrangements which are quite separate from the collective agreement. The public exams have no bearing on the present dispute.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. the member for

Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

My supplementary to the

minister, Mr. Speaker, is we all know we are within days of a strike vote that may or may not indicate a strike. The parents do not know, the students do not know, and obviously the minister does not know. But one of the big concerns that I find, from parents in particular, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, is in the event the outcome of that vote means a strike, there may be a strike, will the students be required, and only the minister makes this decision, not the NTA, not the schools boards, the minister, is there a possibility the students will be required to return to school during the Summer to make up for any time they may have lost as a result of a strike? Will the minister in her capacity as the administrator indicate that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, there is no arrangement, no plan, no intention to have classes for kindergarten to high school in the Summer. It is not felt that that would be possible, practical or desired by students or parents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). The average teacher's salary - it is here in the average teacher's salary - how does the minister and the Department of Education get at the averaging? Is this the classroom? Or is it also the school board officials, the supervisors, their superintendents, the principals? And that this here is a deception to deceive the public into thinking that the majority of the teachers in this Province are getting \$21,000. In actual fact they are not getting that at all, they are not even near it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the total salary bill for all teachers, that is all members of the Newfoundland Teachers's Association, classroom teachers, subject teachers, specialist teachers, principals, school board co-ordinators, assistant superintendents and superintendents - the last of whom, of course, are not in the NTA - all of these teachers, totalling 7,800 in our Province, were paid collectively last year \$189 million-plus. If you take that total salary bill of \$189 million-plus and divide by the total number of teachers of all descriptions, you get an average salary of more than \$21,000, it is over \$23,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister has indicated that there is no possibility that the students would go back to school. Now let me ask the minister this particularly inasfar as Grade XI is concerned: Assuming there is a loss of time of three weeks as a result of a strike

MR. G. FLIGHT: vote, how will the students be prepared with the curriculum to cope with a Grade XI exam that has already been prepared? The Grade XI exams in this Province have already been prepared based on a curriculum that ends on June 15th., for instance. How will those Grade XI students be prepared to write that exam having missed three weeks of that curriculum? Would the minister indicate to me, particularly inasfar as the Grade XI's are concerned?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I think my answers to the previous questions cover this ground as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS. VERGE: Every effort is being taken by government to reach a satisfactory agreement with the teachers. We certainly hope that interruption in classes for Grade XI or any other grade will not happen and we are not basing our present actions on that expectation.

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

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, we have agreed in the Province there may be a strike. And in the event there is a strike the Grade XI students may lose three weeks of a curriculum, three weeks of school. If there is no strike there is no problem, but if there is a strike there is a problem. How will the Grade XI students, without going back to school after school closes, be prepared to write an exam that is based on a curriculum out of which they have lost three weeks, Mr. Speaker? How will the minister guarantee that those students are in a position to write an exam in Grade XI that is based on a curriculum out of which they lost three weeks in the event of a strike? Now that is not a fantasy thing, Mr. Speaker, that is facts. If there is a strike they are going to lose time.

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. the member for Exploits is getting his three week figure, but-

MR. FLIGHT: Or four weeks or five.

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean Windsor-Buchans.

MS. VERGE: Windsor-Buchans, I am sorry

Exams may be set at any time between now and when they are actually administered. You know, there are a lot of arrangements for evaluating Grade XI students' work. As I explained already, the present system is one of shared evaluation where half the mark is based on the year's work in any case and there are a number of students in our Province who do not take the public exams.

MR. FLIGHT: All Grade XI does.

MS VERGE: There are a number of options which are open for evaluating Grade XI -

MR. FLIGHT: All Grade XIs write your exams.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to change the subject for a minute and get back to something a little more basic. I would like to ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) when we can expect to have the Mahoney Royal Commission Report tabled in this House. If hon. members will recall, we were told before the House rose that the Cabinet would study it for two or three weeks and then it would be tabled in the House. When can we expect to have the Mahoney report tabled, the report which, as members know, investigated the wrongdoing and the skulduggery and the corruption that went on in the provincial Department of Public Works for the last ten years in this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and this House can be assured that the government will be tabling that report very shortly. It is in the process of final consideration right now. And the hon. member can rest his cotton-pickin' little soul in patience, Mr. Speaker, because this government does not sit on reports -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - does not sit on Royal Commission reports, not like the one the hon. gentleman sat on with respect to the Holiday Inns in 1971, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This government puts the reports - any reports that come in are tabled. The Mahoney report is in the process of its final stages of consideration and will be tabled in a very short period of time.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Lewisporte. We have time for one supplementary question.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the - okay, one question. It is for the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and it has to do with sitting on reports. A year ago, Mr. Speaker, just as a preamble, an RCMP investigation was ordered into the Devine contract. That was one year ago, Mr. Speaker, and the RCMP told the media this morning that their recommendations as a result of that investigation were presented to the government six months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: Now, where are the RCMP recommendations with respect to that and what action is the government going to take?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -  
now, this is where hon. gentlemen opposite ask questions  
that contain imputations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard  
what any member of the RCMP is alleged to have said, but the  
report on Devine Advertising is in its final stages, as well,  
of consideration. It is not the RCMP, Mr. Speaker, neither  
is it in this administration, any

MR. MARSHALL:

member of this government, neither will it be any member of the Opposition that will or will not decide whether criminal charges are to be laid in any instance. This is to be decided, Mr. Speaker, at all times by the Director -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - by the Director of Public Prosecutions. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, you have a certain unenviable state in a society whereby people can get prosecuted for political purposes or political expediency.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: As the hon. gentleman there opposite would love to have certain people treated.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) last couple of years.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give an answer to a question asked this morning in Committee. It is related to the Forest Access Road Programme.

The following forest access road programmes will be tendered for my department over the next several weeks. Bloomfield - 2.5 kilometers, plus a bridge; Twin Brooks - 4.0 kilometers; Bellman's Pond - 5.7 kilometers; Weir's Pond - 1.6 kilometers; and Barrisway - 4.5 kilometers. Other roads will be constructed in the current construction season.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: This seems to be an unusual procedure. In the past whenever a question was asked in one of the committees then it was answered in committee. But the minister is answering the question in the House. I have not heard that procedure before, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Speaker to rule on this extraordinary occurrence.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, the Chair must plead some ignorance here. I did not hear the preamble. I called for Answers To Question for Which Notice Has Been Given, I presume that is what the minister was doing. If he was not doing that then that is a different matter.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, this morning in Committee there was a question asked on forest access roads on which we did not have the material available. I took notice of it and said I would in turn give it to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the Committee finished?

MR. POWER: Yes. Our estimates are passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Committee finished reviewing your estimates?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I will take that matter under advisement.

Any further answers to questions?



ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion one, the Budget debate. Yesterday the debate was adjourned by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted yesterday, I had completed a few preliminary remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: After the performance we have seen from the ministry today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - I do not find it strange that anybody is leaving, I find it strange that anybody stayed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member.

MR. ROBERTS: Has Your Honour got something to say or was that the limit of Your Honour's intervention?

MR. SPEAKER: I was just trying to get order.

MR. ROBERTS: I am grateful to Your Honour. I do not know why it is; I get up to say a few mild mannered words of gentlemanly rebuke to the ladies and gentlemen opposite and they get all uptight. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), as nice a soul as ever trod the floor in here, is all uptight today. And the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who is the milk of human kindness personified, is up making nasty references to imputations. I mean, what is wrong with this crowd? Of course, that is the story, is it not? That is the story.

MR. NEARY: They are on the verge.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a bit of a dilemma here to say I had finished a number of introductory remarks and sketched in a preliminary way some of the points which I wanted to make, but I have got something else I have got to do today in the interest of a certain voluntary

MR. ROBERTS: group with which I am proud to be associated. So I shall draw my remarks at this stage to a close fairly quickly. I know that is much to the regret of my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who has so little to entertain him that he has to try to make poor sport with poor me. But there is some hope because I shall not be moving an amendment but I think my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been persuaded to leap into the breach and he will be - I believe particularly if either the gentleman from Stephenville or the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), or even the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) invites him, the member for LaPoile may be prepared to move a modest amendment to a very immodest budget, and that will give of course all of us the opportunity to say a few modest things again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say one or two things.

MR. ROBERTS:

First of all, I wanted to say to the gentleman from The Daily News, to prove that I at least read his copy this morning, that I did not say, and I am not asking for any correction, I just want to be clear that all understand, I did not say-and Hansard will support this and verify it-that I prefer Mr. Levesque's separatism to the Premier of this Province's separatism. What I did say was that Mr. Levesque at least had the intellectual integrity, the intellectual honesty to say outright that he is a separatist. And I simply want to have that stand. I do prefer Mr. Levesque's honesty, intellectual honesty to the Premier's prevarication. The Premier has made -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

- statements two or three times

and then he is -

MR. J. CARTER:

This is unparliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

It is perfectly parliamentary,

Mr. Speaker. It is the truth, and truth is a defense, truth is an absolute defense in libel, in slander, and even to the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that I will resist the temptation to take a part the Minister of Health (Mr. House) because he will do that to himself, in political terms, but he has not given us the information that he had ought to have given us with respect to the hospitals. My suspicion, and it is confirmed by the minister's evasive and vague answers to the questions posed to him today, my belief based on that is that the government have ordered a minimum of 4 per cent cutback. And the minister may try to fudge the point or he may not even realize he is fudging the point when he says that that is a cutback from their requests.

MR. ROBERTS: I suggest to Your Honour and to the House that 17 per cent figure of which the minister spoke is the amount that the hospitals have put in as being the amount which they need to operate during this current fiscal year without any cutback in services or personnel.

MR. NEARY: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it is an increase over last year. The wages have gone up, the cost of everything has gone up, the government have put up the cost of hydro, the cost of all the supplies have gone up, the cost of the wages have gone up. And I would suggest that a 4 per cent cutback will mean a cutback in services, or a cutback in personnel, or both. And I would hope the Minister of Health (Mr. House) participates in this debate, and I would hope when he does so he tells us the full complete and accurate story without trying to fudge around because it will come out.

I have heard myself, since there was some recent publicity in the House about some questions I had asked, I have heard from eight or ten of the hospitals, informally, of course, not officially, but nonetheless we have phones and our numbers are listed; unlike the Premier's, every member of the Opposition has a listed phone and one does get phone calls, one does get information, and the information is that the hospitals are going to have to cut back this year. It is not simply a matter of not expanding, which is what the Minister of Health tried to convey. My understanding is that it is a matter of cutback because the amount the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has requested is not enough.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: And of course, Mr. Speaker, that has yet nothing to do with the harsh reality which the Minister of

MR. ROBERTS: Finance (Dr. Collins) must contend with, and that is the fact that the nurses are negotiating, the hospital workers are negotiating, and the x-ray and laboratory technologists are negotiating, and I understand those negotiations are going to be very, very tough indeed in a monetary, in a financial sense. And, of course, the whole burden of what I said yesterday was to show conclusively that this government is making a bed to lie in, and it is a very rocky and uncomfortable bed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rotten too.

MR. CARTER: What would you suggest?

MR. ROBERTS: What would I suggest? I would suggest ~~the~~ government, Sir, I say to my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), a government that is first of all concerned with the people of this Province; and secondly, capable to deal with the problems of the people of this Province, and be prepared to work. And I would suggest that all three of those are not present in the present administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are Liberals.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I would suggest.

AN HON. MEMBER: All right.

MR. ROBERTS: And if the hon. gentleman wants to know how to get that I would simply say to him that since he is so intimate with the present Premier, so close to certain portions of the present Premier, that the very least he should do is advise the present Premier to call an election, and let us let the people decide, any time.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) erupted.

DR. COLLINS: A death wish.

MR. ROBERTS: A death wish. Yes, it would be a death wish on the Premier's part. I concur entirely. It would be a death wish on the Premier's part.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Nothing would give me more pleasure, and I am sure nothing would give more pleasure to any of my colleagues or to the people of this Province, with the exception of thirty-three temporary MHAs than to know that an election had been called.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do want to touch on one or two other things.

MR. CARTER: In which district would you run?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, the hon. gentleman erupts again. The hon. gentleman, Sir, erupts himself regularly.

MR. CARTER: Where would you run?

MR. ROBERTS: Unlike the hon. gentleman, I have been elected in every district in which I have run.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about just one or two other things very briefly. First of all, the news that the NAPE workers have made a settlement is very welcome to all of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: I think I voice the sentiments of most people in Newfoundland and Labrador when I say that the people are angry with the government for making these workers stay out for seven and eight months and they went back to work for an offer that the government could have made them at the start.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: But if ever there was a case of a group of men and women callously, coldly, cruelly treating a group of fellow Newfoundlanders, people who are on the very low end of the economic scale, then that case is shown by this government's treatment of those workers.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: We will see what the government does now with other groups of workers, we will see what the government

MR. ROBERTS: does with groups of men and women who perhaps have more clout in the economic or in the political sense or in the social sense. Of course, the only party to which this government subscribes is a cocktail party. We will see how they treat these people and we will compare it with how they treated the workers at the college and the workers at the WCB.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: These workers, I think we all admire them; they stuck to their guns with courage and the dignity in the face of provocation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: - and they won. They won a victory, they won a monetary victory and, even more importantly, they won a moral victory. And I would say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that if it was not for his pig-headed attitude and the pig-headed attitude of the perpetual pooh-bah from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) that strike could have been settled months ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBERTS: - and on the same terms. And I say to the Minister of Finance further that if he persists in that kind of attitude he and his colleagues are going to drive the teachers of this Province out on strike! The kind of attitude we saw in this House today, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the same lady who said, 'Well, teachers need a challenge, 'Boy!' How many teachers have come up to me and said that they are going to challenge the Minister of Education, they are going to challenge her! What was the phrase? - the teachers welcome Grade X11, they need a challenge, they do not have enough to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh boy! That tells a great deal about the minister and it tells a great deal about the

MR. ROBERTS: administration of which she is associated.

MR. NEARY: Over-paid and under-worked, she also made that statement.

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon.

MR. NEARY: Over-paid and under-worked.

MR. ROBERTS: She said that too, they are over-paid and under-worked? Well, we will find out.

So that is ahead. It is a time for the government of this Province to come to grips with reality. It is time for them, for example, to pay heed to groups like the Newfoundland Medical Association which has made it perfectly clear there is not enough money in the budget to operate our health services this year. It is time for the government to come to grips with statements such as those made by the President of the University, Dr. Morgan, who has made it perfectly clear that there is not enough in the budget to enable the university to operate at its present level of services.

DR. COLLINS: What should we do, print it?

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Do you want us to print it?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member suggests, 'What should we do, print it?'. I think they should start by getting the economy of this Province going. They should start by supporting some policies that do work.

MR. MORGAN: That is the Liberal way.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment, when we look at all the economic indicators, the unemployment was never as high during the Liberal years in this Province as in the Tory years, never, not ever, not once. Taxes were never as high.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not once.

MR. ROBERTS: Not once, not ever.

MR. CARTER: Burn your boats.



MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not for burning, unfortunately.

I want to touch on just one other point. The report of the Public Accounts Committee; it is too bad the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is not here but I hope he is within earshot, if he is not within the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is a very poor substitute for many things, including the President of the Council.

The Public Accounts Committee report informed us, and in fact it simply reminded us in this instance, that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) a year passed had said that a police investigation was being made into a contract that had been awarded by the government. In fact the minister, if my memory serves me correctly, ordered that investigation to be made, as is his prerogative and as is his duty. We are now told that the report of the police, the report of their investigation, has been in the hands of the minister or his officials, and it matters not a wit or a hoot, we can only deal with the minister, we cannot deal with the officials ever since the Crickle/Down case-and the minister might care to look at that

MR. ROBERTS: that that report by the investigating officers has been in the hands of the minister and his officials in the Justice Department for six months, in round terms. I did not hear the statement made, but I understand from those who did hear that in fact it was made today by a spokesman for the RCM Police.

MR. NEARY: In replying to a question from the CBC.

MR. ROBERTS: Replying to a question from the CBC radio news or television news people. Now I would say to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that that puts a very heavy onus on him and his colleagues. I agree completely, and, in fact, nobody could question that it is not the police who decide whether charges are to be laid or not, that is the prerogative of the law officers of the Crown. And I say, too, that the minister is wise to delegate that decision and not to take it himself. It would be imprudent and possibly improper for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or any political level figure to decide whether or not such a prosecution should be laid. Although, of course, the final authority rests, as it must, with the minister. And simply because it would be politically a dangerous act, does not mean that legally the minister is absolved or has the responsibility lifted. But, and this is the important 'but', what we now know is that there was an investigation ordered by the Justice Minister and we now know that the police have made a report. The report must have recommendations in it. It can have three possible recommendations; that there is evidence to support a criminal charge, that there is no evidence to support a criminal charge, or that further investigations are necessary. There are only three possible recommendations that the police could have made after they made their investigation. So it is one of those. It is up to the Crown, the law officers of the Crown, the minister and his

MR. ROBERTS:

officials, to decide

what to do.

But first of all, they have to tell us why they sat on it for six months. Because we also know that the subject matter of this investigation was intensely, partisanly political and that, Sir, is the danger. That fact, and it is a fact, the unanimous report of the PAC, signed by seven members of this House representing both sides, all of them members of probity and of integrity, the unanimous report of the House has made it quite clear that that Devine contract, so-called, was an intensely political and partisan matter, a matter, I might add, in which by virtue of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, many of the present ministers are involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear! Right on!

MR. ROBERTS:

Twelve, is it?

MR. LUSH:

Twelve, including the

Premier.

MR. ROBERTS:

Twelve, including the

Premier, were in the Cabinet. Now whether they were misled or fooled or not, use the words, 'by virtue of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility' -

MR. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

I beg your pardon?

MR. CARTER:

How about you when you were

in Cabinet?

MR. ROBERTS:

I am responsible for what

went on.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. ROBERTS:

And I have never denied it.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand by what I did if the hon. gentleman is willing to stand by what his colleagues did. And he was in a cabinet and he

MR. ROBERTS: did not leave it of his own choice, I might point out. The hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) left the cabinet at the point of a boot, and the end of that boot was encased in the foot of the then Premier. Dismissed! Dismissed for incompetence. By heavens, that says something. For a person to be dismissed for the Moores' Cabinet for incompetence, how bad must he have been?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am being perfectly serious, and I am saying something that, whether the hon. gentleman from St. John's North realizes it or not, goes right to the heart of the administration, to the integrity of this administration, and the administration of justice in this Province.

MR. STIRLING: He is on the Committee.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. In fact, he is on the Committee, and he signed it, and doubtless accepted it or he would not have affixed his signature to it.

MR. STIRLING: He very strongly supported it.

MR. ROBERTS: We have the facts. The facts are, first of all, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) ordered an investigation. Secondly, that the results of that investigation have been in the hands of the minister or his officials. And I do not care whether he has physically seen the paper or not, he is the minister, he is responsible for everything that happens in that department, responsible to this House, and, in law, to the people of this Province. It has been there for six months, we are told. And thirdly, we are told by a Committee of this House, and they have put their evidence in their report and it is unchallengeable, that the matter is intensely political, it is an intensely political, partisan matter in which at least twelve of the

MR. ROBERTS: present Cabinet were involved.

Now, I make no charges, I cast no imputations and I draw no inferences, but I do say -

MR. CARTER: You could have fooled us.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is not difficult to fool the hon. gentleman, that is why he is a Tory.

- I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the ministry, and I do not care whether it is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) wherever he is, and whenever he chooses to honour us again with his presence, and I do not care whether it is the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), or even the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), let the least among them speak, I do not care who it is, but the ministry has a duty very quickly to make a statement as to what they are going to do. Now, it is what they do. The DPP is an official. They can be guided by his advice if they wish. The DPP is an extremely competent law officer. They might be well advised in the ministry to be guided by his advice. But it is the ministry that decides.

MR. ROBERTS: All prosecutions are in the name of the Crown, and the Crown in this sense is the Minister of Justice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. ROBERTS: And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or his representative, his spokesman, has got to tell this House very quickly -

MR. NEARY: He was also in the previous Cabinet.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he was in the - no, the Minister of Justice was not, he was the Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he was. He was in the Cabinet too.

MR. ROBERTS: Only for a couple of months.

MR. NEARY: Well, he was there.

MR. ROBERTS: Only for a couple of months.

Oh, yes, he was there as Minister of Education years before that.

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, of course, and the best Minister of Education we have had in some time. But the fact remains that as it now stands there is a very grave question. The very grave question arises from the fact, and the very grave question is, What has the ministry done with this intensely political matter? Are they going to prosecute? I do not know and I really do not care. That is up to them to decide. I do not have the information. I do not know what the police have recommended, I do not know what the police have found. I have not the least idea, nor do I care to know. Or have they decided not to prosecute? And I think it is fair and entirely relevant to ask why have they not said something? They have had the report for six months.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a cover up.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it may be a cover up or it may not. There may be legitimate reasons. They may need

MR. ROBERTS: further information, who knows?  
All I will say is that there is a very heavy duty incumbent on the ministry and if there is no statement within the next day or so - and I do not care whether it is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or it is an acting minister or other ministers, somebody to speak for the Cabinet - if they do not make that statement then there will be inferences drawn. And there could only be one inference drawn, that the ministry are interfering in the administration of justice for partisan political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, that is the challenge.

MR. NEARY: It would not be the first time.

DR. COLLINS: That is not a challenge, that is a slur.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not a slur, it is a challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: But I will say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that his conduct and that of his colleagues is a slur, in trying to hide a report, in trying to hide their action on it. And they have taken no action. Maybe they have decided not to lay charges, I do not know, and I could not care less. That is their job to administer justice. But I will say to him it is no slur to tell him that the report has been in the hands of him and his colleagues, in the ministerial sense, for six months and we do not know what they have done. The people of this Province do not know. And I will say again that if there is no statement within a day or so then the people of this Province, and I among them, will draw the inference, the unavoidable, inescapable and correct inference that the ministry are hiding something. Now that is a challenge to him. Let him tell the truth, let him tell the full truth, let him tell the complete

MR. ROBERTS: truth. I am not saying he has not, but I am saying let him tell it and then we will judge, because this is potentially a most serious matter.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: This is the matter that destroyed a President of the United States. That is what got Richard Nixon into trouble. This is the matter that destroyed the career of a minister in this Cabinet, not telling the full truth. If there is one - you know, we can have political arguments and we can argue back and forth, and we may be right or we may be wrong, but this goes right to the very heart of the very system of justice by which we live and by which we are governed. And the facts are out. I did not bring them out. I was not even aware of them until I was told of them. I have no access to what the law officers of the Crown do or no access to what the police report or do not report. But I will say to the minister, for he is the only minister here - I am not counting the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) or the Minister of - what is he? Labour (Mr. Dinn). The only important minister who is here is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I will say to him -

MR. CARTER: Do not be so small.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not being small, I am being accurate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Truthful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Fisheries is not important you are saying.

MR. ROBERTS: No, fisheries is important, Mr. Speaker, fisheries is important. It is the minister who is not important, but fisheries is perfectly important.

MR. MORGAN: Wait until you want something in your district again. You can give Mr. Hickey a call.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) made that statement in this House with the Mayor of St. Anthony and two of the councillors here. Let them carry the word back that the Minister of Fisheries said in response to a little tiff that he and I had - and he has grabbed up his papers and has gone home now; he is angry; he has taken his ball and bat and gone home, he cannot be pitcher - but let them carry the word back, the next time I want something for my district he will not give it to me because he is annoyed at me. Oh, fiddlesticks! Oh, fudgy! Do they really think the people of the Strait of Belle Isle will be blackmailed by anybody including - not a tin pot tyrant, a tin pot tea kettle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Fisheries!  
Of course, fisheries is important, it is the minister who is not. He is self-important.

MR. STIRLING: He tried that out in Bellevue.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he tried it in Bellevue and the people of Bellevue gave him what for. The people of the

MR. E. ROBERTS: Province will give them what for - the blackmail and the arrogance. Anyway, I was only going to say a few words. But I would say to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the point about the -

MR. H. BARRETT: Tell us about the reservations for tonight.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now my friend for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) comes ill-equipped to a battle of wits. He would be well advised to restrict himself to those things about which he knows something, if, in fact, there are any. If not, I would suggest to him he seek good advice, because good advice is what the hon. gentleman needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that to give hon. gentlemen opposite words of wisdom is like putting pearls before swine. So I say to my hon. friend, I am about to conclude my few humble remarks and if he will but let me get on with it. Now he is a man of conscience and probity and integrity and I respect him for each and all of that. And I would suggest to him that he might ask of his colleagues in the ministry, because he too stands in the same political cesspool as they do.

MR. STIRLING: He also signed the PAC report.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, he signed. He is Vice-Chairman of the Committee and I am sure he too, wants to know. I am sure he wants to just as I am sure he wants to know when the Premier is going to act upon the finding made in last year's report, unanimously, which said that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), as he now is, had knowingly and repeatedly breached the Public Tenders Act of this Province. Which is one of the shining jewels, one of the few, but nonetheless one of the shining jewels in the diadem that sits so askew upon the brow of our Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to be about my master's business but there are some things which have to be done and there are many behind me who - the best is yet to come, I assure hon. gentlemen opposite. I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the best is yet to come. This is but going before to prepare the way -

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) snake.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Hold on now, hold on now. You know, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is the only person I know who would call the Prime Minister of this country a snake. You know, I find that completely beyond the pail, You know, I do not call his leader names. I may criticize their conduct and I do but I think it is kind of shameful that a person who has been elected to this House in all seriousness can call the Prime Minister of Canada a snake and mean it. I mean, he may be chortling over there, but he means it.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the House, too.

MR. E. ROBERTS: In the House, yes. I find that very hard to take as a Canadian, as a Newfoundlander. I do not care about partisan. I have my own feelings about Mr. Clark, the leader of the Tory Party. I think he was a disastrous Prime Minister.

MR. L. STIRLING: You should forgive the member for St. John's North.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, I forgive him. He does not know any better.

MR. L. STIRLING: No, no, he is having trouble with his head again, that is the problem.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Who, the member for St. John's North, having trouble with his head?

MR. L. STIRLING: Again.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The trouble with the head of the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is he has no head. He has lost his head many times in this House.

Mr. Speaker, let me say it has been a pleasure to have these few brief words on the Budget. I think it is a sad and very disillusioning document. I think it reveals the intellectual bankruptcy of this government and the political bankruptcy of this government and what appears to be the inability of this government to cope financially. All of the concerns of the people of this Province are easily identified, none of them has been dealt with in any way by this Budget. If ever there was a Budget that calls for a general election it is this one. And nothing would give the people of this Province more pleasure than to have the chance to render a verdict.

And so I will leave the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with but one simple thought that even he ought to be able to appreciate because it is simple: That if he believes this Budget is the document that he has held it out to be -

MR. TULK: Social conscience.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - the document with a social conscience, then let him wait upon his leader, whenever his leader next returns to this Province from his southern holiday -

MR. HODDER: I understand he is in the mental hospital.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, he is not there. No, no! They have cut back services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: When next the Premier returns to the Province let him wait upon him and say, 'Premier, let us have a general election. Let us let the people rule on this one'.

MR. E. ROBERTS: And now that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is back and I believe the acting Minister - am I correct, the acting Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is acting Minister of Justice? Is that correct?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Okay, I thank him.

MR. NEARY: He grudgingly acknowledged that.

MR. STIRLING: He is not acting very well but he is acting.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, but he is the acting minister. I say to him, I do not know if he heard what I had to say about the Devine thing, but I think it is incumbent upon him in the interest of the administration of Justice in this Province to make a statement to the House. The police have apparently made a report. They had to recommend one of three things.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not care what they recommended but I do care what decision has been taken. It is of no interest to me, Mr. Devine or his company or anything else is of no concern to me. What does concern me is that some recommendations have been made one way or the other, the matter is intensely political, it involves in the ministerial sense twelve members of the present Cabinet, it involves people who were prominent in public life in this Province as well as some who are prominent, and it is a perfect example of a case where the interest of justice and the interest of decency both demand an immediate and a full statement as to what has been done. And I accept the hon. gentleman's ascertainment that it will be done on the advice of the law officers of the Crown. He and I would both recall the late Guy Favreau, a man of honour and of stature who made a frightful mistake in being his own chief legal advisor. He made the right decision but he paid a dear price for it at the hands of the Tory party. I do not suggest that the ministry should be so foolish as to take decisions on that kind of prosecution, whether to go or not to go, but I do suggest that the House should be told what is being done now that it is out that the police have made a report and that it is out that the matter is -

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member yield?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Sure, on this matter. I will be delighted to, of course.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle yields to the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this government is not hesitant to let justice - not let justice take its course but to demand that justice must take its course in

MR. MARSHALL: any matter. As the hon. member will indicate, this is not the kind of thing I know that the hon. gentleman would want to let insinuations pass with respect to it. But as the hon. member will understand, these matters are entirely, as to whether or not criminal action is taken, criminal proceedings are taken at any time, lie entirely and absolutely in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions. And if we ever get to the stage where prosecutions are taken either for political expediency on the one hand or because of political pushing on the other hand, we have the type of state, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think any of us have ever had and that we would ever want to have. Now the position on this, as I indicated in Question Period this afternoon, is that it has to go to the Director of Public Prosecutions, it has gone to the Director of Public Prosecutions, it is in the course of investigation and when that investigation is completed, immediately, as soon as the Director of Public Prosecutions is completed the House will be informed. But the House at the same time is not going to be put in the position of sitting in trial on the thing. It is going to be informed of the decision of the Director of Public Prosecutions at the time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I heard what my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) had to say and of course he cannot really be serious when he says that the decision as to whether or not prosecution is taken rests with the DPP. The DPP is a senior law officer. This House does not look to the DPP for the administration of justice, this House looks to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and to the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. ROBERTS: Now I think I know what he means and he means what I said earlier that the Crown; the law officer, the Attorney General, may choose to be guided by the DPP, but I am not going to let the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) shelter behind the skirts of a public servant. We have no right to question a public servant and we would not dream of it. We would say that it is this ministry that is responsible and we would say that this ministry owes the people of this Province a full and a complete statement. Now I do not know what the statement should be because I do not know the facts of the matter. The police did one of three things in that report. They either recommended there be a prosecution, they recommended there not be one, or they said further investigation is needed. I have no idea what they said, but I think it is incumbent upon the - and I do not expect us to be told, but I expect the Crown, the ministry, to tell us what is being done. It has been around for six months. That is enough investigation. You know, Watergate did not take six months to expose. I do not know what more is needed, and I am not going to attempt to prejudge, but I think that the minister ought to tell the House and there ought to be a proper statement made in this House so it can be dealt with in the usual way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said that is but a few brief preliminary words. We on this side think this Budget is a monstrous document, a sad, misshapen, leaderless, dispirited and altogether quite lumpen document. We shall be moving an amendment of no confidence in it. We shall be voting for it and we hope the gentleman on the other side will approach it in the proper way and that they will ensure that the steps are



May 5, 1981

Tape No. 1277

AH-4

MR. ROBERTS: taken so that the people of this Province can judge. Because, after all, that is what we should have. We have now had two years of this government. Let us have an election and we will see if the minister can convince the people of this Province that he is right or we will see whether we can convince the people of this Province that we are right. One thing is for sure: The minister's budget

MR. ROBERTS: is not a step forward, it is a step back, Sir, and a very sad one at that.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. ROBERTS: Can he speak in the Budget debate?

MR. CARTER: Of course. What do you think?

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly do not question the minister's right to speak, but this debate began on a motion by the minister.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WHITE: So he spoke.

MR. ROBERTS: And the motion has never been put, nor is it put until the end of the debate. The minister speaks

at the end - I am not even sure he can speak at the end. The minister has made his speech. And my point of order is that I do not think he has any right to speak again in this debate.

If there is an amendment he may certainly speak.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: But I raise that as a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order.

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

While my hon. friend is checking the reference here, you can only speak once in the Throne Speech debate and only once in the budget debate, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Minister of Finance spoke, as everybody knows, spoke on opening day, and he has officially spoken. He has spoken for the government, and we gave him the

MR. NEARY: privilege on opening day to bring in the television cameras and the microphones so that he could be recorded. So everybody knows that the hon. gentleman has spoken and he cannot speak twice. If the hon. gentleman can speak twice, then everybody in this House can speak twice, Mr. Speaker. And I submit the hon. gentleman is out of order and if they do not want to put up another speaker, let me go on as speaker and I will move an amendment so that the hon. gentleman, if he wants to get back into the debate, can do so.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order, the hon. the House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will just let Your Honour rule on the point of order. I was just getting up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, as I recall it, the minister has spoken previously and cannot speak twice unless he is closing the debate. So the ruling is the member has already spoken.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, are you not going left to right? I mean -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - the hon. member was standing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: First of all, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.  
I understood that the hon.

MR. MARSHALL:  
gentleman was up speaking on a point of order, that the  
hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Just a second now. The hon. the  
member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was standing up on a point of  
order. The hon. the member for LaPoile stands up on every-  
thing. He stands up on speeches, he stands up on points of  
order. It is my understanding that - I do not know that  
Your Honour has yet made his ruling on that point of order,  
and until Your Honour makes his ruling on the point of order,  
we cannot proceed with the debate. .

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

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in  
anyone's mind in this House, including the Government House  
Leader's (Mr. Marshall), that the Speaker had made his ruling  
on the point of order and had so informed the House, and  
Hansard will show such, Mr. Speaker. And not only that,  
Mr. Speaker, but the gentleman from LaPoile was recognized  
as the speaker and he was recognized by Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. There is  
no point of order.  
  
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, prior to 1972,  
before January 18, 1972, one of the big points, one of the

May 5, 1981

Tape 1278

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: major points made by the  
Opposition of that day was that Newfoundland was -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - on the verge of bankruptcy.

that she was going down the tube. There was no way that Newfoundland could survive because of the public debt. The present President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. John's East, was one of the members who sat in Opposition who condemned the government at that time for its horrendous - they used to refer to it as a horrendous public debt. And there were one or two others, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who was also in Opposition at that time. They went out of their way, spent most of their time, they concentrated practically their whole effort <sup>on</sup> trying to destroy the administration of that day by saying that Joey was going to sink her, she could not survive, the public debt was going to put us under.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the public debt at that time? What was the public debt ten years ago? Prior to the Tories taking over in this Province on January 18, 1972, what was the public debt? Well, I will tell the House what the public debt was at that time. The public debt was under \$800 million, under \$800 million, and part of that public debt, by the way, was inherited from a previous government, a previous administration. Apart of that \$800 million was inherited from a previous government or a previous commission.

MR. HANCOCK: But we had things going then.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the public debt which the Tories said was going to sink Newfoundland, was going to bankrupt Newfoundland, was less than \$800 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did we have to show for that \$800 million? And I might add, Sir, that \$800

MR. NEARY: million debt was accumulated over a period of twenty-three years, twenty-three years. Now, less than \$800 million, what did we have to show for it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Progress.

MR. NEARY: Well, we had hospitals to show for it, we had a university to show for it, we had vocational schools to show for it, thirteen of them, we had a College of Fisheries to show for it, we had a College of Technology to show for it. We had 152 schools built, we had thousands of miles of roads, blacktop which revolutionized Newfoundland,

MR. HANCOCK: The new Trans-Canada.

MR. NEARY: The Trans-Canada Highway, about 500 or 600 communities brought out of isolation through a road network that connected them up to the mainstream through the Trans-Canada Highway. We had water and sewerage going everywhere in the Province. What else did we have? Where is that 333?

MR. HANCOCK: Hold on! Right here, right here.

MR. NEARY: Let me see some more examples.

MR. HANCOCK: Something dear to my heart.

MR. NEARY: \$800 million going to bankrupt the Province.

MR. HANCOCK: I will find them for you.

MR. NEARY: Yes rhyme them off there. Rhyme them off. Water and sewerage, public buildings, Arts and Culture Centres. You would not know to listen to this crowd now, Mr. Speaker, the way they dole out their little piddling few dollars to the arts and council groups, you would not know but they were the ones who originally supported arts and culture groups in this Province. Every Arts and Culture Centre in Newfoundland today was built by the Liberal Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. STAGG:

No, that is not so.

MR. NEARY:

That is so. Even the one in Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

That is not so.

MR. NEARY:

That is so.

And then we had, Mr. Speaker, a  
revolution in the -

MR. HISCOCK:

Co-ops.

MR. NEARY:

- co-ops, in the development of our  
natural resources, the opening of mines, the opening of  
industries, and Mr. Speaker, we had one



MR. NEARY:

of the most prosperous periods in our whole history. And yet the debt, the public debt after twenty-three years so we were told by the Tories, was horrendous, it was going to sink Newfoundland, it was going to bankrupt the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what has happened in a ten year period.

MR. HANCOCK: We built and rebuilt 6,000 miles of roads. Do not ever let them forget that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we built and rebuilt 6,000 miles of road in that twenty-three years when the Tories said we were going to bankrupt Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by comparison just let us see what has happened in the ten years of a Tory administration in this Province. Well, in ten years the provincial debt has tripled. Now remember - I have to repeat this for the sake of the people who may be making notes - that the public debt prior to January 18, 1972, less than \$800 million. Since January 18, 1972, up to the present time, less than ten years, the debt has more than tripled. And at the end of the present year, at the end of this fiscal year the debt, the provincial debt, will be \$3,200 million or, to put it another way, \$3.2 billion.

MR. THOMS: No!

MR. NEARY: \$3.2 billion. In ten years, Mr. Speaker, the Tories have driven up the public debt by \$2.4 billion, \$2,400 million. They upped it by \$2.4 billion in less than ten years. Now remember the whole debt of Newfoundland prior to January 18, 1972, was less than \$800 million. Now it is \$3.2 billion. In less than ten years they have driven it up by \$2.4 billion. And, Mr. Speaker, you would not mind so bad if they did anything, if we had anything to show for it, but they have more than tripled the public debt and not a solitary thing to show for it.

MR. NEARY: How many miles of road have they built? How many schools have they built? How many hospitals have they built? How many Arts and Culture Centres have they built? How many public buildings have they built? How much water and sewerage? How many trades schools? How many colleges of trade? How many universities? How many mines have they opened? How many new industries have they set up? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is zilch, zero.

MR. HANCOCK: Only what they have closed and the Liberals have opened.

MR. NEARY: Only what they have closed down, as my hon. colleague reminds me. And, Mr. Speaker, during that time we have seen the most blatant examples of extravagance and waste in our whole history. What a nerve and what a gaul and what a face this crowd have! The Minister of Finance must have the face of a robber's horse to come into this House and ask for increases in taxes, to ask to have the tax on gasoline changed from twenty-eight cents a gallon to 22 per cent which meant right off the bat, by the way, a four cent a gallon increase. But as the price of gasoline goes up 22 per cent, up goes the tax to the provincial government. The price of permits have gone up. We are told that big game licenses in the Province this year will cost fifty dollars, a substantial increase. The price of vehicle permits, the price of a permit for your vehicle has gone up substantially. Everything, Mr. Speaker, they have managed to put up everything.

MR. NEARY:  
House that this a -

And I might remind the

MR. TULK:  
diesel fuel.

Twenty-six per cent on

MR. NEARY:  
diesel fuel - this is a crowd that went around the Province and said they were not going to increase taxes. They do not call a gasoline tax a tax. I believe if you look at the budget that you will see the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying that we are going to change the gasoline tax from twenty-eight cents a gallon to twenty-two cents. And I might further point out, Mr. Speaker, that wherever I have travelled in Newfoundland in the last month I am told by the ordinary person in this Province that they did not know, they did not realize that the Provincial Government was taking twenty-eight cents a gallon on a gallon of gasoline for a provincial tax - twenty eight cents.

Twenty-six per cent on

I will bet you there are people on the other side listening to me right now who did not know that the provincial tax on gasoline was twenty-eight cents, compared, I might say, Mr. Speaker, to the present federal tax of ten cents a gallon.

Most people were shocked when they heard it, that the provincial tax on gasoline was twenty-eight cents, now going to be changed from a flat rate to a percentage rate which gives the Province increases. Everytime that a gallon of gas or a gallon of heating fuel or a gallon of fuel oil goes up in price, the tax to the Province is greater. So why should they not encourage Mr. Lougheed out in Western Canada to drive up the price of gasoline and the price of heating fuel to the consumers in Canada to world prices? Why should they not encourage it? That is the real reason, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, it was cruel and callous what this government did in their budget. They are making the people of Newfoundland pay for their mismanagement of the last ten years.

MR. HANCOCK: They are making them suffer.

MR. NEARY: They are making the people of this Province, as my hon. friend says, suffer, suffer because they were unable to cope with the problems of this Province. As my hon. colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) so ably put it in his few remarks there a few moments ago, before he took his seat, Mr. Speaker, when he referred to the incompetence of the members of this government, they are unable to cope with the problems of this Province.

So what they have done, Mr. Speaker, is they have driven the public debt up to \$3.2 billion and not a single thing to show for it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why should I talk so much about the public debt? Well, I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that the public debt of \$3.2 billion, and I have had occasion in the last couple of days to discuss this with financial experts, with people who are expert in the field, I believe the public debt, Mr. Speaker, which has tripled over the last ten years, has control of this Province. This Minister of Finance, when I questioned him the other day on the public debt and the rate of interest we were paying on the public debt, and if we were having trouble borrowing and so forth, the minister, like a doctor with a bedside manner, told us that everything is under control. 'Nothing to worry about, everything is under control'.

Well, as I say, that reminds me of a doctor sitting down by the bedside of his patient who

MR. NEARY: just passed away, or who is just about to take his last gasp, and the doctor goes out and tells the relatives, 'Do not worry about a thing, everything is under control'. Whatever that means, Mr. Speaker, everything is under control. Well, I have a feeling that everything is not under control.

And I am told that in the bond market today there is a chaotic situation developing that is going to have a devastating effect on Newfoundland's borrowing in the future. The minister, the other day, told us that the interest rate on our borrowing, according to the last bond issue that I believe was floated in Europe, was around 13 per cent, 13.5 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be. It may have been 13.5 per cent a few months ago but it changes. The changes are taking place so rapidly that I am told today that the interest rate, if the Newfoundland Government went to the market today, the interest rate would be 16.5 per cent. Now 3 per cent - they are going to borrow \$200 million this year - on \$200 million, how much is that?

MR. TULK: How much, \$200 million?

MR. NEARY: On \$200 million. It is \$6 million, a difference of \$6 million. Since the minister gave me the information the other day on the interest that the Newfoundland Government paid on its last bond issue of 13.5 per cent, it is now, or will be when they go to the bond market again, 16.5 per cent. A difference of 3 per cent of \$200 million that they will borrow this year is an increase - only within a matter of a few days - of \$6 million. So it will be \$206 million.

MR. NEARY:

That is what that bond issue will be. And I am also told, Mr. Speaker, by the people who are in the know, that it is going to be very difficult, not only for this Province but for any other province in Canada. It is even difficult, I am told, for the Government of Canada to enter into any long-term arrangement on the bond market, that the investors are just not putting their money - they have been scalded so often in Canada that the investors, especially in the United States, are not entering into any long-term agreements on the bond market at the present time, no fifteen-year term bonds, no twenty-year bonds. Short-term is all they will invest their money in.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: How long?

MR. NEARY: You are talking about quick turnover of maybe a year, three years, a maximum of five years, less than five years.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: They have to be paid back and you pay through the nose for that kind of money. The Government of Canada, who floated a bond issue recently, discovered that the investors are just not buying long-term bonds and so this government here will be no exception. It is happening to every government, practically, across Canada - will find that the investors want to roll over their money quickly. They are not prepared to enter into any more long-term bond issues. They have been scalded, they have lost too much money, and the interest rate changes too quickly and

MR. NEARY: so, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there will be problems unless Alberta again comes to the rescue of the Province and they will probably end up owning us down here body and soul.

MR. TULK: Owning the government.

MR. NEARY: They will own the government. They are calling the shots now as far as the price of oil in Canada is concerned. Mr. Lougheed pulls the strings out in Alberta and Mr. Peckford, our Premier here, jumps. Every time he pulls the strings our Premier is like a jack-in-the-box, he jumps. And so if we have to go that route, well, then, it seems to me that not only will Alberta own and control Newfoundland, but there are a number of other provinces in Canada, too, where they will be calling the shots, and that would be tragic and unfortunate indeed for Confederation with the attitude of the Premier of Alberta. But that is what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be a hard, hard year to float a bond for this Province, to float a bond issue, at any reasonable interest rate. I say it will be 16.5 per cent. It is that now and I will say that they will not be able to get a long-term arrangement with their bonds. It will be anywhere from a year to three years at the most, I would say, possibly five years. They may be able to negotiate a five-year deal. So, Mr. Speaker, we should spend some time in this House talking about and showing some concern about the public debt. The public debt - I do not want to be like the Tories back in the old days, back in 1972, preach doom and gloom and say that the Province is on the verge of bankruptcy, say that the Tories are going to put her under, but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, unless we can develop our natural resources in this Province where we can get additional revenue, we might find ourselves in a very sticky financial situation, and therein lies the problem. While the provincial

MR. NEARY: debt of this Province has tripled, no new development has taken place, no new industries have been opened up. All they have been doing is attacking individuals and companies and corporations that have been interested in developing in Newfoundland, and they always use the smoke screen, 'Oh, we are not going to be like the Liberals, we are not going to give it away'. Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with it, nothing at all to do with it. 'We are not going to develop the Lower Churchill', they said, 'because we do not want to give it away. We are not going to develop the forest industries and the mines in this Province because we do not want to give it away.' Well, as my hon. friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said, 'Do you have to give anything away to negotiate?' Negotiation is a two-way street. The government are not always right. The Premier of this Province is not always right. There is another side to every story.

MR. WHITE: He says he is always right.

MR. NEARY: I know he says he is always - he is so self-opinionated that he would like everybody to believe that he is always right.

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible) he is the only one.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he is the only honest one. Well, we tested that honesty and we found out



MR. NEARY: that when it is convenient to do or say that, then anybody can operate under these rules, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I am so concerned about the provincial debt, I am so concerned about the lack of a tax base that we have in this Province - we were steamrolling along right up to 1972, we were going full speed ahead, and then all of a sudden a dead stop, all of a sudden they slammed the brakes on. And so whatever tax base we have in this Province, whether it be from the Upper Churchill - and we can talk all we like about it being a bad deal, but there is some income there, some revenue there, there is a community there - the mines in Labrador or the forest industries, whatever tax base we have in this Province, the people of this Province can thank the Liberals for it. And it is a good thing that we were active for twenty-three years or Newfoundland certainly would be bankrupt today. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am so concerned about the public debt, and we are on this side, that I would like to move the following amendment seconded by - if I do need a seconder - my hon. friend the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White): By striking out all the words after 'that' and substituting thereof the following: 'That the House regrets that instead of the Province having control of its public debt, the public debt has control over the Province, given that the debt has tripled in the past ten years (up by \$2.4 billion during that time to a total provincial debt of \$3.2 billion) and the House regrets further that the people of this Province have nothing to show for such a drastic increase'.

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Truer words were said by no man.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Butt):

The motion is in order.  
The hon. the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank Your

Honour for your courtesy.

I want to talk now, Mr.

Speaker, a few moments about the high cost of living in this Province. Apart from the devastating effect and impact that the tripling of the provincial debt is having on the people of this Province, inasmuch as the extra taxes that the government are collecting as a result of this budget that was just brought down about a month ago - as a result of that budget, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared to say that a small fraction of the increase in taxes was necessary due to inflation. Anybody, any fair-minded person would make that statement, that part of the reason for the increases in taxation and the increase in gasoline in this Province is due to inflation that is hitting the whole world. But 50 per cent of the increase in taxes, Mr. Speaker, has been brought about by mismanagement and extravagance and waste on the part of this administration, and their neglect. And one of the areas that they have neglected, and one of the areas where they have socked it to the consumer by putting four cents on the price of gasoline, is in the area of the cost of living in this Province.

We have the highest taxes in Canada, we have the highest sales tax in Canada, we have the - I believe we are in the top three - highest income tax in Canada. It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have the highest taxation in Canada and we have the highest cost of living in Canada.

And, Mr. Speaker, does the government not realize that everytime they whack four cents

MR. NEARY: on a gallon of gasoline,  
that they are driving up the cost of living in this  
Province, every time they do it?

MR. HANCOCK: They do not care, "Steve".

MR. NEARY: Do they not care about  
people, Mr. Speaker? Every time they allow Newfoundland  
Hydro to increase electricity rates in this Province they  
are driving up the cost of living

MR. NEARY:

for the consumer. That has to be passed on to the consumer. Newfoundland Light and Power Company are not going to dip down and pay it out of the record profits that they made last year, the consumer has to pay it. And the latest round of increases, the latest application by Newfoundland Hydro, we are told by cousin Vic, is being made because Newfoundland Hydro wants to establish a good credit rating for themselves. Somewhere down the line they want to be in a position to borrow \$15 million or \$20 million, \$20 million or \$30 million and they want a good credit rating. They want the financiers and the business world to look upon them as a pretty nice bunch of guys who have a pretty good credit rating, so what do they do? They sock it to the consumers.

And, Mr. Speaker, let nobody be fooled by this charade of going down to public hearings down at the Public Utilities Board. It is a sham. It is hypocritical. We have got a similiar situation happening now in connection with the closing of Deer Lake Airport. This government, to show you how hypocritical they are, they say, 'Oh, we will finance, we will help the groups in Deer Lake finance the preparation and the presentation of their briefs to the Canadian Transport Commission'. Well, I hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the member for Humber Valley does not think that the people of Deer Lake are swallowing that little bit of bait that he is throwing out, a few crumbs that he is throwing out, the pap. I hope the hon. gentleman does not think that his constituents in Humber Valley are swallowing that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure they are.

MR. NEARY: Sure they will take it, Mr. Speaker, the same as the consumer groups who go down before the Public Utilities Board. Sometimes they are given a handout by the Province, a few dollars to hire a lawyer or hire an

MR. NEARY: engineer to help them prepare their briefs, make their presentations. But they know before they go in there, Mr. Speaker, it is a foregone conclusion. They know that they are in a make believe kangaroo court. They know when they go down there that this government gives Newfoundland Hydro the ultimatum, their own Crown corporation, they give them the ultimatum to increase electricity rates. And they know that the members of the Public Utilities Board are political hacks. One was a flunky for John Crosbie, the Chairman of the Board now, I believe. Mr. Crosbie managed to get him appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope they do not think that they are fooling anybody in this Province. The people have given up on hearings before the Public Utilities Board because all they ever get in the decisions from the Public Utilities Board is this, that we - members of the Public Utilities Board saying that we, it is our duty to see that the investor gets a fair rate on his return, gets a fair rate on his investment. The people, the shareholders of Newfoundland Light and Power Company are the ones that the Public Utilities Board are protecting by saying that the shareholders are entitled to a fair income on their investment. And that is not what they are put there for at all. They are put there to protect the consumer and not worry about the investors. And so the consumer is licked before he starts the same as the people in Deer Lake are licked before they start. And this government can pass out all the platitudes they want. The people in Humber Valley are not being fooled by these thirty pieces of silver. They are not being fooled into thinking that because this provincial government are going to give them a few shekels to prepare their case and their presentation to the CTC, that this is all that this government can do.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this about the Deer Lake Airport and I told a crowd of people on two occasions now when I visited Deer Lake, I told them this, I said, do not

MR. NEARY: be fooled by the federal government, do not be fooled by the provincial government. I said, 'You realize as well as I do that EPA, Mr. Harry Steele especially, is not the reason Deer Lake is closing, although Mr. Steele may be doing the politicians a favour, may be taking the heat off the politicians. EPA is a business that has to show a profit and is showing a profit, and has to show a profit to survive. The decision to close Deer Lake airport is not the decision of EPA or Mr. Harry Steele, the decision is a political decision.'

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. NEARY: Right on! It is a political decision and nobody is being fooled by that. If Mr. Steele wants to take the rap for the politicians, wants to take the heat off them, I would say, good for him - a good friend to have around, a good man, a good entrepreneur in this Province. I like him very much. And we were the ones who started EPA. But the people of Deer Lake are not being fooled. The people of Deer Lake know, Mr. Speaker, they know this. They know, and the ladies I spoke to yesterday when I came through there, they know this. They know that they have the ideal situation. They have a minister in the provincial government - a minister, not a backbencher. Their member is a minister in the provincial government. That is a fact. And they have a member in Ottawa on the government side of the House. What better situation could you ask for, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And they also know this, that the members in Corner Brook, who represent the city of Corner Brook, and the members who represent adjoining districts, the Humber Valley - Tory members, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) for instance - the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), the member for Humber East (Ms Verge), the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout),

MR. NEARY:

all Tory members, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Baie Verte was Liberal but

went a Tory.

MR. NEARY:

The people know this, that these members so far have not lifted a finger to help the people of Deer Lake to keep that airport open, especially their own member, especially the Minister of Health (Mr. House). Mr. Speaker, they are so disappointed with the Minister of Health that you would not believe it. They are so disappointed that he has not been more vocal, that he has not produced in this crisis. The livelihood, the economy of the whole community is being affected, the livelihoods of large numbers of people being affected. And what does the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) do? He persuades his colleagues to give the committee that is preparing the brief a few shekels to help them with their presentation. That is their first step. Well, I will say this to the minister: he is awfully naive. The one and only step that is going to keep Deer Lake airport open, the one and only thing that will keep Deer Lake airport open is dollars and cents.

EPA claim they are losing \$500,000 a year by landing at Deer Lake and Stephenville, \$.5 million a year. And Mr. Steele is quoted publicly as saying that he is not asking for a subsidy, and he told me that personally, that he is not asking for a subsidy, and he does not want one, but if the Government of Canada wanted to keep Deer Lake airport open and they were sincere about it, they were genuine about it, and they offered him the \$.5 million a year subsidy plus an increase annually based on inflation, then he would not have any choice but to take it. And that is what they should be concentrating on. There is the solution to the problem, Mr. Speaker. That is the solution to the Deer Lake problem. And I hope the message goes out today to the people of Deer Lake, because I promised them that I would raise

MR. S. NEARY: this matter in the House of Assembly and I could not think of a better time to do it than at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) themselves.

MR. NEARY: I just finished telling the hon. gentleman -

AN HON. MEMBER: Wake up, will you.

MR. NEARY: - the only thing that is going to solve Deer Lake's problem is a half million dollars plus an annual increase to take care of inflation. My hon. friend knows that. That is the only thing that is going to solve Deer Lake's problem, save the airport at Deer Lake.

MR. TULK: And they would not trust their own member.

MR. NEARY: And Mr. Speaker, have I heard their own member, have the people in Humber Valley heard their member expounding that theory? They certainly have not and if they have, he has not been vocal about it.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) three meetings.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says he attended three meetings. Well, if the hon. gentleman can produce the evidence and documentation to show that he has pushed hard for the solution that I just gave to this problem, then I would feel I would have much more respect for the hon. gentleman. But at the moment I have to agree with the people in Humber Valley that the Minister of Health (Mr. House), the member, has let his constituents down. He has let them



May 5, 1981

Tape No. 1286

RA - 2

MR. S. NEARY: down and he has let them down badly.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) how many more (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I say that knowing that I am levelling criticism at my colleagues in Ottawa. Sometimes I wonder if we have not elected all Tories up there in Ottawa. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder if we did not elect seven Tories instead of two. What are they doing? They are shutting down the railway. They are laying off railway workers right across this whole Province. They are shutting down airports. They have got the fishery in a chaotic condition.

MR. HANCOCK: The hon. gentleman over there (inaudible), by the way.

MR. S. NEARY: And Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder, is it any wonder that I say to myself sometimes what are they, what did we send up there, Liberals or Tories? We would have been just as well off if we had sent seven Tories up to Ottawa, at least they would have done more squawking and more fighting.

DR. COLLINS: Would the hon. member permit a serious question?

MR. S. NEARY: Serious question? The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to speak. While I have got the momentum going and while I am on this trend, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there is one thing that people will have to say about me above anything else, they may not like me, a lot of them may hate me -

MR. HANCOCK: Ah, come on now boy you are not that bad.

MR. NEARY: -and a lot of them may be lukewarm about me, but one thing they can say is I call it as it is. I call the shots as I see them.

MR. HANCOCK: No pay-offs (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: And that is why I am able to boast about

MR. S. NEARY: the fact that I am nineteen years-  
going into my nineteenth year as a member of this House,  
six general elections, two separate districts. But I call  
the shots as I see them, Mr. Speaker, and I do not care  
whose toes I walk on when it is in the Provincial interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And in this particular instance I have  
to condemn, I have to condemn the politicians, especially the  
Ottawa politicians and some of the provincial politicians, who  
are playing games with the fishermen, who are playing games  
with the people of Deer Lake, who are playing games with the  
railway workers in this Province. I think it is a shame.  
There are certain matters where you have the provincial  
government arguing and fighting with Ottawa where I dis-  
agree with the Province. I disagree with the way the Pro-  
vince has handled the offshore negotiations. I disagree with the  
provincial stand on the constitution and I would think by the  
end of July that the Premier of this Province, along with  
seven other Premiers in Canada, will regret that he ever  
heard tell of the constitution. The Supreme Court, in my  
opinion, will rule in favour of the Government of Canada.  
They should. If they do not, they certainly should. I think  
they will. And by the end of July the Premier of this Province  
will think that somebody hurled a handful of horse dung at him,  
before the end of July of this year. He will never want to hear  
tell of the constitution again. And so that was an error in  
judgement on the part of the Premier of this Province. He seems  
to be crusading lost causes. What will he take up then,  
Mr. Speaker? Once the constitution matter is settled and the  
constitution is brought home from Great Britian, what will he  
crusade then?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 5, 1981

Tape No. 1286

RA - 4

MR. S. NEARY:

He will have to get another lost  
cause.

MR. HANCOCK:

No, he will have to go back at  
oil and gas again.

MR. NEARY: It will have to be a lost cause of some kind. He is presiding over lost causes in this Province. Will he then try to bring St. Pierre into Newfoundland, get St. Pierre to join Newfoundland? Will he try to get Greenland to become a part of the Province of Newfoundland? There must be some other lost cause that he has in mind to take the place of the constitution issue when he loses it and when he loses the codfish battle what will he find then?

MR. HISCOCK: Salmon or lobster.

MR. NEARY: When, when he loses the codfish War does he have another lost cause to put in the place of that? And when he loses the offshore issue what lost cause will he start crusading then? After July he will become known as the Premier of lost causes.

MR. TULK: They are all over there.

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I started to say. What I did start to say was that on these three major issues I am with the government of Canada all the way. I am with the Government of Canada, all the way. We are toe to toe, eyeball to eyeball on these three issues. But on three other issues, on three other issues, Mr. Speaker, I am totally opposed to the Government of Canada's policy, totally opposed to it. The lay-offs on the Newfoundland Railway are unnecessary, in my opinion.

MR. CARTER: Where is the member going to supper?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. HANCOCK: Where are you going to supper? Do not answer that.

MR. NEARY: No, I have to say just for the benefit for the hon. gentleman, that I will not be going to a one hundred and fifty dollar a plate dinner for the simple reason that I cannot afford it.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) a poor man talking.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: They are giving the tickets away to some of their supporters (Inaudible) you might be able (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into this because that is strictly an internal matter -

MR. HANCOCK: Sold out a week ago.

MR. NEARY: -but just for the benefit of the hon. member, I could have had a ticket. Somebody, some capitalist offered me a ticket.

MR. HANCOCK: You did not get an invitation?

MR. NEARY: I was offered a ticket by a capitalist and I turned it down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I, personally, do not approve of these kinds of fund raising dinners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And again, I have to say that I am sorry to have to say that, that does not mean that I am rebelling against my party.

MR. HANCOCK: Hold on until you hear the speech tonight it is worth a hundred and fifty bucks.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that does not mean-

MR. HANCOCK: Hold on until you hear it.  
See you tomorrow night.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that there is dissension in the rank.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) a man of principal.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: I am reporting (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: It does not mean that I am a maverick, that I am against my own party. I would say there are an awful lot of Liberals in Newfoundland like me.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: -who cannot afford a hundred and fifty dollar a plate dinners. I would like to go and see-Mr. Speaker, if anybody on either side of this House thinks for a moment that I am anti - Trudeau, they had better think again. I am probably the only person in this Province who has a son named after the Prime Minister of this Country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Pierre, my young fellow was born-

Pierre was born, my young son, one of a twin, was born on April 3, 1968, he is now a teenager, and I was in Ottawa at the convention that elected Pierre Elliot Trudeau, I voted for him, elected him leader of the Liberal Party of Canada. So I make no apologies to anybody, and I do not care what side of the House they sit on, for raising this matter. I am just as much of a supporter of Trudeau as anybody in this country. I would sit down and eat with him. If he had a twenty dollar a plate dinner that I could afford it would be more in line with what I could pay. A hundred and fifty dollar a plate dinner is a little bit too much for me. Illusions of grandeur.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

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

MR. HANCOCK: Now you will see when the next - call an election and find out. You have not got guts enough to call an election.

MR. NEARY: There are others, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: Maw mouth is not happy because he did not get an invitation.

MR. NEARY: There are others on this side of the House who feel the same way as I do who will not be going, but I am not going to elaborate on that, that is an internal matter. I just want to say that, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) over there?

MR. NEARY: - that by God there is nobody who can challenge my loyalty to the Prime Minister of this country -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: -or the Leader of this party.

MR. HANCOCK: Ah boy, that is a man speaking.

MR. NEARY: Nobody has a son called after the Prime Minister of this country, and that is how much I think about him.

MR. THOMS: They all call their sons, Joe over there.

MR. NEARY: So when it comes - when it boils down -

MR. HANCOCK: That is only because they are dumb.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)everybody is called Joe (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: What it boils down to , Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Joe who?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (MR. BUTT): Order, please! I have to ask the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) and the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to restrain themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: It is about time.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Way to go, Mr. Speaker, way to go, Mr. Speaker. It is about time somebody shut them up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so in the crunch, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, and I was glad the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) raised that matter, that was something I did not mean to inject into the debate, but I am glad he raised it because certainly somebody will be asking questions of where is the member for LaPoile, where is the member for Carbonear, where is the member for Fogo, where is the member for - two or three other members -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) a few more (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Five.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And the member for Windsor-Buchans.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point that

I am making -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) people boy, handle people.

MR. NEARY: Are you sure of that, 'Jim'?

MR. HODDER: I guess so.

MR. NEARY: Check will you? Check to see if --

MR. HODDER: No I do not have one (inaudible) twenty-five to six.

MR. NEARY: Well ask her. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that in the crunch I will come down everytime on the side of



MR. NEARY: Newfoundland, and I hope nobody will question that.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) CNR layoffs.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am going to deal with the CNR layoffs now. I do not have much time left but I want to say this about the CN - I dealt with the Deer Lake Airport situation. And I am on the side of the people in Deer Lake, I want two airports in Western Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Two, one at Stephenville and one at Deer Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I will say to the hon.

gentleman right now that the only way Deer Lake Airport will be kept open is if the Government of Canada will put a half million dollars in the pot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And I hope that message goes out to Mr. Pepin and to the Government of Canada. Mirabel Airport, I am told cost - what? - \$5 million a week is it, a month? \$5 million a month. The Government of Canada is pumping into Mirabel Airport, I am told - I am not sure if it is \$5 million a week or \$5 million a month.

MR. MORGAN: \$5 million (inaudible) a month.

MR. NEARY: A month, \$5 million and they cannot afford a half a million for Deer Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A year, a year.

MR. NEARY: For a year, Mr. -

MR. MORGAN: Elliott wants to.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I tell you what I would do if I had my way, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - instead of having a \$150 a plate dinner, I would have a bunch of picketers over there. If I had my way I would have people from Port aux Basques in complaining about or picketing about the layoffs, 195 workers in Port aux Basques, 150 here in St. John's, plus, right along the whole railway line.

Mr. Speaker, this government should not crow because they have not done very much about it. As a matter of fact, I heard the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) the other day on the radio making a very weak statement about containerization, about the impact and the effects that it would have on the railway and on the workers of the Newfoundland railway, very, very weak indeed. I say, and I will say it, I said it in Port aux Basques, I have said it in every community I have been in Newfoundland and I will say it in this House, that I was one of the first to support the idea of containerization. But, Mr. Speaker, we were not told by CN that there were going to be massive layoffs as a result of containerization. We were not told that. We were told there was a special Manpower agreement between CN and the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks to take care of 350 employees, redundant positions 350. That was what the original agreement was signed for. Now it is up around 700 or 800 employees, we were not told that. And I would say now to CN that if I had my way, and I hope

MR. NEARY: the provincial government would take the same position, if I had my way, if they do not keep these people to work, do not keep the employees on the job, no containerization. That is the stand that I would take.

Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: How can you avoid it? Well, here is how you can do it, Mr. Speaker. In Port aux Basques for twelve years, between twelve and fourteen years in Port aux Basques they used a formula known as attrition. That meant, Mr. Speaker, that when an employee retired, died, quit, he was not replaced. Don Jamieson was the godfather of the attrition formula in this Province, and he managed to persuade his colleagues in the Government of Canada to put so much money into CN every year to keep the surplus labour on the payroll, keep them working, better to keep them working than to lay them off and throw them on unemployment insurance and welfare, and he managed to do that for twelve years. Now, suddenly, the Government of Canada says to CN, 'Reduce your deficit in Newfoundland', and how do they do it? They do it on the backs of their employees. That is how they intend to do it. They could have followed on with the attrition formula. The work force - the stevedores alone in Port aux Basques dropped from around 800 ten or twelve years ago, now down to 320 and gradually going down all the time. So they could have had their containerization. They could have gotten into containerization in a big way in this Province and they could have done it without causing any fuss. They could have done it and had the good will of the people of this Province, especially the communities where CN workere will be laid off. They could have had the good

MR. NEARY: will of everybody if they had used the attrition formula or if they had carried on carload freight simultaneously with containerization in Port aux Basques, and they could have done it if they had cut out the subsidy to the private shippers in this Province. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada subsidizing the private shippers, subsidizing Clarke Steamships, subsidizing Crosbie, Chimo, subsidizing Newfoundland Steamships, to provide competition for their own Crown corporation? Does that make any sense, Mr. Speaker? Well, that is what they have been doing for the last fifteen years.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to knock containerization. I know that the Newfoundland railway has to be revitalized, I am all for it. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot stand in the way of progress in this Province, that if containerization is the route we have to go, well, sobeit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - sobeit, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If that is the route we have to take, containerization, well then-if that is the route we have to take, sobeit. The people of Port aux Basques, the people of St. John's, the people in Bishop's Falls, the people in Corner Brook, the people in all the railway stations, in all the junctions and all the railway line right across this whole Province do not want to knock progress. They do not want to stand in the way of progress, but they want their jobs, Mr. Speaker, and there is no need to lay these people off as far as I am concerned. The big Government of Canada could have very easily applied the attrition formula to those who are not covered under that special Manpower agreement,

MR. NEARY: who can take early retirement.

They could have -

MR. MORGAN: Did you ever see CN's offshore investments?

MR. NEARY: Well, I am only dealing right now with CN's operations in this Province.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, again, I am sorry to have to knock the people who I know and like so well up there in Ottawa, I am sorry to have to knock them. If they get mad with me I cannot help it. If I offend them I cannot help it, but I really and sincerely believe that the people of Deer Lake and the CN employees in this Province are getting a royal shafting and that the politicians in Ottawa are playing games with the livelihoods of these people and their families, Mr. Speaker, and I do not like it, I do not like it. And I guarantee you, anything I do not like I am not very backward in speaking out against, and I do not like that sort of thing. I do not like it. I do not know how many members of this House have taken the trouble to go down to Deer Lake, to go down to Port aux Basques - the Speaker was down the other night with me. You could not find a more decent people on the face of this earth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was that?

MR. NEARY: In Deer Lake, in Port aux Basques and in various other communities that are going to be affected by these lay-offs. They are God-fearing Newfoundlanders and I hate, Mr. Speaker, and I despise a smart aleck politician who will

MR. NEARY: play games with the lives of these people and their families and that is what is happening.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is complaining?

MR. NEARY: I am not prepared to name names.

MR. MORGAN: You are (inaudible) against people here.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hat fits the MP for the area I would say -

MR. THOMS: It fits the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: I think I have gone far enough, Mr. Speaker, I have gone far enough. And I have gone far enough and I have made a statement and if I care to elaborate on it later on I am quite prepared to do that too. But I will tell you this, that nobody is going to walk on these people as long as I have my health and strength in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. And I hope that CN will reconsider their plans to layoff 700 or 800 of their employees.

AN HON. MEMBER: In this Province?

MR. NEARY: Right across Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many in Port aux Basques?

MR. NEARY: One hundred and ninety-five in Port aux Basques alone, 150 in St. John's, so many in Corner Brook and Deer Lake and Bishop's Falls. And my hon. friend knows full well that the five or six jobs in Deer Lake at this particular point in time, can drastically affect the economy. You have got transport companies pulling out of Deer Lake. The whole economy of Deer Lake is just about ready to collapse.

MR. HOUSE: Not really.

MR. NEARY: It is. And whatever the hon. gentleman says or does constructive to try to save the jobs for people in Deer Lake, he can count on me. I will put partisan politics aside anytime. But I would like to hear something positive and something constructive. And I would like for the hon. gentleman to be more vocal on behalf of his

MR. NEARY: constituents. And so I hope, Mr. Speaker, that CN will reconsider their plan to throw 700 or 800 or 1000 of their employees into the unemployment scrap heap, because that is what they are going to do. They should reconsider that. And if they do not, Mr. Speaker, they may be sorry, they may regret what they are doing.

I was in Port aux Basques on the 23rd. of April to a meeting and I will never forget it as long as I live. And I said to Mr. Kingsley, the representative of CN, I said, 'How come all of a sudden we can no longer have the attrition formula working here in Port aux Basques? How come you are going to layoff 105 CN marine employees? Why not do it through attrition, cut the work force back to the point where you want it through attrition?' He said, "Attrition is not fast enough". Not fast enough! They cannot get rid of their employees fast enough. You know, that man would have given the CN employees to be layed off, he would have given them their notice on Christmas Eve if he was allowed to get away with it. That is how cruel and cold and callous they are, Mr. Speaker. And they are not going to get away with it. And I am hoping that the communities that will be affected by these layoffs will mobilize their forces, will unite and fight CN tooth and nail.

Now, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is back in her seat, another great disappointment to the constituents. She wrote a letter to the newspaper. The extent of the effort of the Minister of Education was to write a letter to the newspaper.

MS. VERGE: I have done a lot (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like to see the evidence.

MS. VERGE: I talked to the railway people in Corner Brook.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am glad to hear that. I hope the minister will stand in her place in this House and lambaste all those who are responsible for these layoffs, lambaste them.

MR. MORGAN: But then she will be in confrontation with Ottawa (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, so what! That kind of confrontation -

MR. MORGAN: But your colleagues in Ottawa (inaudible) confrontation in Ottawa with the fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Speaker, that kind of confrontation I like. I like that kind of confrontation. Unnecessary confrontation I do not like, frivolous.

MR. MORGAN: You (inaudible).

Now surely you do not mean that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to say something now perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) might agree with me on. Again I have mixed feelings on the licensing of fishermen in this Province.



MR. NEARY: My heart tells me, 'Yes, yes,'  
but my head says, 'No, no.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have examined this matter of licencing fishermen from every angle, and I have been in just about every fishing community in my district except two and I have heard from them on the 'phone on a continuous basis. LaPoile and Brand Bruit are the only two communities I have not been in since the licencing policy came into effect, but I will be there by the 12th or 15th of this month. But I know the feelings of the people down there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the licencing of fishermen in this Province is 90 per cent good, 10 per cent bad. And I think the Minister of Fisheries and the Government of Canada moved too quickly. I think they upset 500 years of tradition in Newfoundland overnight and in the process they have upset an awful lot of people. They have satisfied the Fishermen's Union and they have satisfied the full-time fishermen, and I have no doubt but many of the problems that I am talking about here today will eventually be resolved, but unless we get up and speak about them, unless we put some pressure on, I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if many of the problems that have been encountered by fishermen since the federal licencing policy came into effect will be solved.

I will give the House one example, I will give the House a couple of examples. But I will give the House one example of where I think the federal licencing policy is wrong. I will use the example of Mr. George Billard, Jr. in Grand Bruit. George Billard, Jr. in Grand Bruit, like his father, George Billard, Sr., is a full-time fisherman and nobody but nobody can deny him that. He has fished from the time he came out of school up to the present time, salmon, lobster and cod, fished all his life. And, Mr. Speaker, in the community of Grand Bruit I would say, apart from a couple

MR. NEARY: of store owners there, that most of the fishermen are full-time fishermen in Grand Bruit. I am just using Grand Bruit as an example.

Now, Mr. George Billard, Jr. every year in the slack season went to work for three or four or five or six or seven weeks with Newfoundland Hydro because in Grand Bruit, as hon. members know, the electricity is generated through diesel generating plants in the community. It is the same way in LaPoile and Grand Bruit. So Mr. George Billard, Jr., in the off season when the fish are slack, when the T. J. Hardy smack that goes around collecting the fish is off, he goes to work with Newfoundland Hydro relieving the operator of the diesel generating plant. But under the federal regulations he is not allowed to do that anymore. He cannot accept that job anymore for three or four or five or seven or eight weeks in Grand Bruit. He is forced now to draw unemployment insurance. And, Mr. Speaker, I am only using him as an example. There are hundreds like that.

Let me say the same thing about members of local roads boards. We still have local roads boards. In Grand Bruit and LaPoile and Petites, which are only three communities in my district, they still have the local road board. There are no cars, no vehicles, no traffic lights, just paths and bridges, maintained through grants from the Department of Transportation. And they get their grant of a couple of thousand dollars every year in the slack season when the men are not fishing, when the boats are in for refit, when the smack is off, and they go to work on the local roads, spend that \$2 thousand or \$3 thousand. This year, Mr. Speaker, they are not allowed to do it. Now, these are 100 per cent fishing communities. They are not teachers who are moonlighting, they are not policemen who are moonlighting, they are not carpenters who go out and work in the construction industry and then go back fishing, these are people in communities

MR. NEARY: that are 100 per cent fishing communities. Now, I ask the House -

MR. HOLLETT: Get us a meal of tongues, will you?

MR. NEARY: Yes, 'Don', I will bring them up from Eric King's, the best tongues in Newfoundland.

But, Mr. Speaker, that to me is wrong. And every time I check on it, every time I try to do something about it, it is so frustrating that I am told, well, they went to the Appeal Board and they were turned down.

MR. NEARY: Another example, I just thought of this one: I was there on Sunday for the rededication of the United Church in Petites and a case that was brought to my attention is that of a Mr. Major in Petites who did not fish last year. But do you know why he did not fish last year? He had an operation on his bowels. He was sick and he could not fish, so he did not have any receipts for last year. The man was a fisherman for thirty-five years of his life but he could not fish last year, he could not produce the receipts. He went to the Appeal Board and they turned him down. Now he is back, he is a full-time fisherman now at this very moment. While I am speaking in this House today he is probably steaming in towards T. J. Hardy's plant in Rose Blanche to put his fish in. A small boat - he does not have a big boat. But because he could not work last year, he was sick, he is a part-time fisherman.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) all the problems.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I think what has happened here - the Government of Canada were trying to remedy a situation, they were trying to correct a situation. They were trying to create a profession of a full-time fisherman. They were trying to eliminate the moonlighters. And I am all for that. I do not think anybody in this House, including the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), is against getting the moonlighters out of the fishery and getting a hard core of fishermen. I do not believe anybody is opposed to that, including Your Honour, Mr. Speaker. But in the process of doing that I think they went too far, and as I said earlier, they probably went a little bit too fast. They have changed 500 years of tradition overnight. I am not against the policy.

MR. P. WALSH: The same thing they are trying to do with the Constitution.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: No, the Constitution is a different matter altogether. As a matter of fact, I am all for Ottawa on the Constitution.

But it is so difficult, Mr. Speaker, it is so difficult to get a licence changed, the expense and the inconvenience and the frustration of it. You would not believe - I mean, the bureaucrats -

MR. MORGAN: Now they have to go to Moncton after this year, you know.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is a different matter altogether. But the bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker, do not seem to know what they are doing. I have had men come to me, fishermen, I have been in their homes, and a man says, 'I have been given a part-time licence, and the reason I was given a part-time licence is because I worked helping Eric King build his fish plant last year; but this man over here across the road, he also worked side by side. He and I did the same work, and he got a full-time licence. And this man worked on the Orange hall last year and he got a full-time licence and I only got a part-time licence.' You know, I think, Mr. Speaker - I do not think the bureaucrats know the geography of Newfoundland. I mean, all you have to do, all the MPs up there have to do is say, 'Look, Grand Bruit, there is no industry in Grand Bruit, there is no industry in LaPoile, there is no industry in Petites except the fishery - a few bullseye shops, that is it. So any man there, unless he goes up on the Great Lakes, should be a full-time fisherman. And if he wants to go out and get a few stamps on the roads, or a few stamps in the Hydro station, then he should be allowed to do it. That is part of the tradition of these communities and it should not be changed. And I will condemn anybody who changes it. I think it is wrong, and it is about time they came down off their high horses and recognized these problems.'

MR. NEARY: I called Ottawa the other day and they said, 'Oh, well,' - Mr. George Billard, I have to go back to him again - 'Mr. George Billard, yes, we know about his case. We feel sorry for him, we sympathize with him, but the regulations at the moment forbid him to work during July or August when he is off, when he is not fishing, but we are trying to get the regulations changed.'

MR. MORGAN: Wait until you hear the make-up of the new Appeal Commission for the Province, not one fisherman involved at all, not one fisherman, nobody involved in the fishing industry in the Province, not one soul - to be announced in the next two weeks (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, just to wind up this part of my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave the impression that I am against licencing full-time fishermen, I certainly am not. Making two categories of the fishermen, I am not against that. But I certainly am against the procedure, the process, the speed at which they went in this matter and the number of people who have been marooned for the rest of their lives, because what happens, Mr. Speaker, just listen - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) probably knows this - what happens is that these part-time fishermen that I am talking about in these communities this year will be allowed to fish for salmon and lobster but next year no salmon and lobster.

MR. MORGAN: And to top it all off, they cannot fish -

MR. NEARY: What are they going to do? Are they going to sit there like zombies?

MR. MORGAN: And to top it all off, they cannot fish for herring for bait this year to make their trawls with -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: - down on your coast.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So what do they do next year? What will they do?

AN HON. MEMBER: Buy fish.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN. HON. MEMBER: They will have to buy it.

MR. NEARY: They will have to sit there, no license. I would suspect that a lot of these people are going to say, the h-e-two sticks with the licensing programme and they are going to fish anyway. My God, I would be much of their mind.

MR. MORGAN: There is going to be a court case I would say pretty soon on that one.

MR. NEARY: I would be much of their mind. And I guarantee I would contribute to a test case in Grand Bruit or in LaPoile. I am only using these three communities because they happen to be in my district, but you can go right down that Southwest Coast and the Northeast Coast and you find -

MR. MORGAN: Stacks of examples in my office right now, stacks that high.

MR. NEARY: - and up the Great Northern Peninsula and you will find the same thing. So I am not against two categories of fishermen, I am all for it. I am all for the fishermen being professional people like the lawyers and the teachers and the doctors, I am all for that. I am all for the fishermen and their families having good incomes. But I think we have to watch out for traditions in this Province, Mr. Speaker. That is the right word I think, tradition. Let us not throw 500 years of tradition out the window, throw out the baby with the bath water as they say. And that is what we have to do.

And so these are three issues that I disagree with Ottawa on to a certain degree. I am not 100 per cent in disagreement with them. But I will tell you this, and

MR. NEARY: I want to say this again, that I hope nobody will come up to me tomorrow, or I will not pick up the paper tomorrow and hear that I am a maverick, that I am attacking Ottawa, that I am attacking Trudeau, that I am attacking this one and that one.

MR. MORGAN: No, you are attacking policy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I am doing, I am standing up for Newfoundland and I am standing up for Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal Party, forget the Liberal Party, stand for Newfoundland, boy, that is the idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have about six more minutes, I believe, so before I -

MR. MORGAN: By leave until six.

MR. NEARY: - before I take my seat I want to get on to another matter that has been concerning me for some time and that is the matter of representation in this House and in the Cabinet. I often wonder why the policies of the provincial government are aimed at the urban centers of this Province, especially at St. John's? And the minister tried to justify the synchrolift in the budget and incorrectly, I might say; that the Government of Canada were let off the hook by the provincial government who, for the first time I suppose in Canadian history, decided that they would subsidize a federal Crown corporation and a very wealthy one, I might say, at that. And I often wondered why it was done and without any regard at all to Marystown. So I sat down one night, Mr. Speaker, and I took my pen in hand and I wrote down the names of all the Cabinet ministers, and I wrote down the number of districts we have in Newfoundland and suddenly it dawned on me, why the provincial government



MR. NEARY: programmes are aimed at urban centers. There are eleven districts in the city of St. John's, eleven, and out of the eleven districts seven of the members elected are in the Cabinet. Eleven districts, seven out of the eleven in the Cabinet. So, Mr. Speaker, is it not only natural that all the policies of this government would be aimed at the city of St. John's? Why the city of St. John's is the capital city. The newspapers are here, the television stations are here, the radio stations are here, the public buildings are here. Even if they only had

MR. NEARY: one member from St. John's in the Cabinet their presence still would be felt in the Cabinet of any government in this Province.

MR. NEARY: But seven out of eleven. Why, Mr. Speaker, you can go from Cape Bonavista to Cape Chidley in the North, over 1,000 miles of coastline, and include the three members in Labrador, and that whole territory, that thousand miles of coastline and the whole territory of Labrador only elect ten members, one less than in the city of St. John's. Eleven members in the city of St. John's, seven in the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, is to say the least, unfair.

MR. CALLAN: The other four -

MR. NEARY: It is unfair.

MR. CALLAN: The other four would be in but they cannot afford it.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CALLAN: The other four would be in but they cannot afford it.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. But it is very unfair and that is why, Mr. Speaker, we have no realistic fishery policy in this Province. That is why we have no policy for rural development in this Province. Everything, practically, is St. John's oriented. And I am not saying that St. John's is not entitled to whatever they can get, I am not saying that. The ordinary person in the city of St. John's probably feels that he is entitled to everything he can get but, Mr. Speaker, what it does do, it brings out the worst, if you want to put it that way, or the best I do not know, but I would say the worst, in the government. This government is still fighting

MR. NEARY: Confederation. That battle I thought was settled back in 1948 and 1949. As members know, St. John's voted overwhelming against Confederation. The rural parts of Newfoundland voted for Confederation. Farmers, fishermen, miners, plant workers, ordinary people, loggers, voted for Confederation. St. John's voted against Confederation. But I thought the battle was settled back in 1949, but apparently it was not. And what we are seeing today in this Province is a continuation of the battle, a resurrection of the battle against Confederation. That is why we are seeing such an anti-Canadian, anti-Trudeau, anti-Government of Canada attitude in this Province. That is why, they are still fighting, they are still fighting the Confederation issue. Seven out of the eleven Tory members in St. John's, some of them, if you traced their backgrounds back far enough, Mr. Speaker, you would see that their ancestors were anti-Confederates.

MR. TULK: And the problems you are talking about are a result of that confrontation.

MR. NEARY: And all of the problems that I referred to, as my hon. friend reminds me, are a result -

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

MR. NEARY: - of that confrontation.

It is getting us nowhere, Mr.

Speaker. It is about time, for instance, that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council who is now, I suppose, the acting Premier, it is about time that he stopped his anti-Confederate tactics. It is time that he accepted Confederation as one of the great blessings of this century. The hon. gentleman should get down on his knees and thank Almighty God for Confederation. But instead of that, he is one of the prime movers, the leader in the anti-Confederate groups that we see in this Province today.

MR. NEARY: So you still have that gigantic struggle going on, Mr. Speaker, between St. John's and the outports, the anti-Confederates and the Confederates, and the real reason for it is that the representation in the House, and especially in the Cabinet, seven out of eleven, is unfair.

MR. TULK: More than that, because you have the member for Gander, urban.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: Your fool of a hero (inaudible) Confederation, you know that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the people of this Province are so discouraged and so disillusioned? Is it any wonder why we have so much discontent in this Province at this present time? Everywhere you go, and I do not care what part of the Province you are bound to hear people grumbling, you are bound to hear people express concern. The teachers - I get on the plane, the teachers who are travelling the Province sit down beside me and talk to me. I go to the airport

MR. NEARY: airport, another group was talking to me. And hon. members should remember back in 1971 when the teachers turned. Hon. members should let that -

AN HON. MEMBER: They did not have collective bargaining arrangements.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon. It was the Liberals that gave the teachers the check-off, gave the N.T.A. the check-off, that made the N.T.A. in this Province. It was the Liberal party that gave them the check-off. And so, Mr. Speaker, if I may wind up my few remarks, this confrontation, this attack, this -

MR. CARTER: It is not yet six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired now. I thought it was -

MR. NEARY: It is not getting us -

MR. SPEAKER: - six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: It is not getting us anywhere, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the government will realize the error of their ways in short order and come to their senses and try to do something for the people of this Province, try to cope with the problems that are confronting the ordinary people of this Province instead of being continuously on the attack, being anti-Canadian, anti-Confederate, and still fighting the battles of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I understood there was leave.

MR. MARSHALL: There may be leave, but from here there is not.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is just a few minutes to six and it would be my intention to adjourn the debate very shortly but just one quick point.

DR. COLLINS: I understand now there is a motion of non-confidence on. Of course, there is no doubt that I have the ability to speak again.

MR. MARSHALL: Right, exactly. He walked right into our trap.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member mentioned about the urban, rural thing. I had hoped that that had been laid to rest. This is one Province. This is not the urban area against the rural area. If we go back to that old hat, that old divisive thing that perhaps was legitimate in the 1920's, you know, I think we are lost. We are a Province, we are one people and we will achieve our objectives if we think of ourselves that way. If we think of ourselves as townies and outport people, if we think of ourselves as West coasters and East coasters, or if we think of ourselves as Labradorians Island of Newfoundlanders, we are lost, we are totally lost. We will only get where we are if we stick together and we behave as a Province.

With those words I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Finance adjourns the debate. The hon. the President of the Council.

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.