

Vol. 3

Friday, Nov. 13/81
10:00-1:00

No. 81

Indexed by R. Dawe (81-Nov.-19)

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1981.

The House met at 10.00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and myself in an hour's time or so, Mr. Speaker, will be giving some additional detail and information as it relates to our detailed response on the federal budget of last evening. But I thought that I would try to, as best I could in the time since last night, provide the members of the House - I hope that I have been able to get them to the members of the Opposition - three documents that have been provided -

MR. STIRLING: No, I do not have them.

MR. BUTT: They are coming around now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - to the Opposition that we have been able to put together hurriedly last night and this morning. So supplementary comment will be made at eleven o'clock or eleven-thirty and in the next week or so as we study the five or six different documents.

My prepared statement, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the budget is as follows: In its totality the federal budget deals a cruel and heavy blow to Newfoundland. First it fails to provide any hope to our economy. The fishery, of which the federal government guards selfishly its jurisdiction, there is no indication -

MR. NEARY: What about your own budget?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to read it without interruption.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The fishery of which the federal government -

MR. NEARY: Table it!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Hon. members are fully aware that a member has a right to be heard in silence. He has so requested and I would ask hon. members to adhere to that tradition and ruling.

MR. CARTER: Throw him out.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The fishery, of which the federal government guards selfishly its jurisdiction, there is no indication that the problems now facing it will be assisted. The DREE department is not given any profile and therefore it seems we can hope for little chance of having the proposals before the federal government approved quickly. These two areas, if assisted, would provide jobs and stimulate the economy. The federal government actually admits that unemployment will rise. There are no special job creation programmes to assist high unemployment areas. To the homeowner facing higher and higher mortgage costs, Mr. MacEachen has the audacity to explain that most people will be getting higher monies to cover the higher costs. Where help is provided it is very little and will, in large measure, be an interest deferral which in the long run will cost the homeowner more. A most cruel blow is struck in the area of established programme funding affecting post-secondary and health services.

The federal government's own table, which I have just circulated to members of the House

PREMIER PECKFORD:

which I have just circulated to members of the House and to the press, shows Newfoundland losing at least \$7.8 million next year and escalating each year to \$11.1 million in 1983 - 1984, \$15.3 million in 1984 - 1985, \$18.7 million in 1985 - 1986 and \$24.3 million in 1986 - 1987, for a grand total of \$77.2 million over the next five years. This is the federal government's own figures, and because one part is based on provincial revenues, which are falling, it is probable the cutbacks on this programme might even be greater.

This cutback will have a severe impact on Newfoundland. This programme is dedicated to two areas, post-secondary education and health care. At a time of high inflation generally, and most particularly in these areas of post-secondary education and health, reduction of money is difficult to contemplate.

The whole equalization formula is being changed, it would seem, and whether Newfoundland will improve in this area is difficult to know at this time. We have some of our people doing additional calculations right now to try to find out.

The crucial point here, though, is this: Even if there is a positive side on equalization - and let us hope there is - inflation of our expenditures will more than eat up such an increase. Additionally, the likely federal argument that increased equalization, if this is really so, can offset the reduction in established programme funding will not wash. Established programme funding was set specifically to deal with post-secondary education and health care, so that a certain amount of money could be guaranteed in these very important social programmes. The demands for extra equalization money, if, I repeat, there really is any - and that will depend upon the economy each year - will more than swallow it up.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Roads, primary and secondary education, water and sewer, and normal increases in all other areas will normally take up any additional costs in equalization and you will not be able to transfer it into post-secondary education and health care, otherwise you would be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

All of these areas will need massive amounts of money just to keep at the level we are now at in primary and secondary education and water and sewer and all the other areas outside of post-secondary education and health care.

It is very ironic, Mr. Speaker, that as Newfoundland - and this is a very important point - as Newfoundland loses money on post-secondary education and health care, \$77 million over five years, Quebec in the same period gains \$164.9 million on this programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are down \$77 million over five years, Quebec goes up under this programme by \$164.9 million. Regional disparity and unequal treatment will be increasing in this programme.

The small amount of help being provided in the personal income tax will not cure our problems or put enough money in the pockets of consumers to stimulate economic recovery. And this is what

PREMIER PECKFORD:

most of the economists have said last night and this morning. There is a small decrease in certain personal income taxes but it is only around the thirty to sixty dollars a year range and it will not put enough money back into disposable income, which is available to consumers to spend, to stimulate the economy very much. That amount of money is just not enough to do it.

Additionally, little help seems to be forthcoming in transportation - a vital part of the Newfoundland economy. The Trans-Canada Highway, the Trans-Labrador Highway, the Newfoundland Railway seem destined to remain without help and incentive. At the same time, special mention is made of new marine facilities in Vancouver; St. John, New Brunswick; - and you have copies of it here, you can read it over yourselves - and Halifax.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) Norma and Gladys

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is difficult to see how this budget helps Newfoundland and many of the problems it faces, especially when many of these problems can only be solved with federal help and most particularly when many are a federal responsibility. In the coming weeks the provincial government will be further studying the federal budget documents and will be meeting with federal officials to fully ascertain the impact of this budget. We will argue that these areas of negative impact must be arrested and that greater sensitivity must be shown to our problems. It seems that this small Province and its government, with an over taxed population, is left as it so often is, alone, to solve economic and financial problems that it did not create and for which it is largely not responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition

has approximately three minutes.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible) the federal minister was

in your office.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I think we predicted yesterday

what the response would be of this government, which did not have the intestinal fortitude to let the people know that they have already sent out to all the departments and told them what the cutbacks were going to be, what the reduction in services would be. But typical of the way that this government operates, the great public relations job -

MR. NEARY:

Propaganda.

MR. STIRLING:

- they kept it all back so that it

can now all be blamed on the federal government. And they have gone back to their normal, natural instincts, Mr. Speaker, to attack Ottawa, to attack Canada, a cruel and heavy blow is the kind of language that they use. Now what was the alternative, Mr. Speaker, instead of that attack in expecting the worst from Ottawa? What was the alternative this morning? Could they not, as a reasonable government, come in here this morning and say, 'It was a complicated document, we have been working on it and we are going to delay any attack on Ottawa until we have all the facts, because, Mr. Speaker, I saw last night, I saw the federal Finance Minister (Mr. MacEachen) say

MR. STIRLING:

that there would be no cutbacks in post secondary education and in health care.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: That is what the minister said.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government -

MR. LUSH That is like the oil formula that distributed a couple of years ago.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: : That was up to three barrels.

MR. LUSH: The three barrel system

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this government is a master at pulling things out of context, creating an impression.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Winning election.

MR. NEARY: Let us have one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Yes, winning elections, winning elections is the name of the game for that side of the government. Once they win, they do not know what to do. They are not very good at electioning but they are not very good at running the government, Very good at managing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ho!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: As a matter of fact, they do not have the stomach to manage or to govern or to face up to the real problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. I will ask the hon. members on this side as well to give the hon. the Leader of the Opposition the right to reply.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for the protection of this Chair. I gladly welcome them if they have the nerve to get into the debate. They do not have the stomach to manage. They do not have the stomach to take part in it. The Premier has to get up like an ayatollah and say, 'Silence' I am now going to speak!

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have here is the same old attack. But the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, are getting sick and tired of a provincial government that does not deal with the real problems. Now, what is this government doing? Where is the budget for this government? Now that they know what they are doing, what are they doing about the things under their control? Mr. Speaker, they talk in terms, there might be a positive side of equalization! Well, Mr. Speaker, now the Premier is trying to prod his spokesman over there to see if he cannot get a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the deception that is created by Table 3 does not deal with the specific question that he includes in his public statement and the specific question has to do with educational funding and health care. Now, Mr. Speaker, I assert that, based on what the federal minister said last night, there will be no cut in post-secondary education or health care. What this table is, this table may indicate that because the federal government, because the federal government has cut the income tax for most Newfoundlanders, this government, taking 58 per cent, may not get as much money as they normally would. That is maybe where the problem is, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ho!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: And the truth of the matter is that the people should not take this statement that the Premier

MR. STIRLING: has just given in his rash manner until you get all the facts on that budget. It is a very complicated budget and neither the Premier nor anybody on this side has enough facts right now to make the kind of statements that the Premier has made. It is not fair for him to do it. It is not fair to Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, ho!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: And he is back to his normal state of having his opposition mentality and fed-bashing, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: A different tone now (inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: Listen to the Minister of Energy
(Mr. Marshall) now.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, coaching from the man who is the half minister of a lot of things but still can keep his law practice going downtown.

MR. NEARY: And represent The Bank of Montreal.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get personal.

MR. NEARY: That is not personal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal in a different tone, as was indicated by the minister, for a very serious situation. The old dread that Newfoundlanders have had for generations, the dread of TB, has raised its ugly head again in the Humber Valley district. And I would ask the Minister of Health (Mr. House), who also happens to be the member for Humber Valley, to explain what the situation is out there at the present time.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the situation is in Deer Lake, in the center of the Humber Valley district. There was a case identified last May and a survey was done under the normal procedures and eleven cases were identified. That is eleven cases, that is people who were infected, and there were about, I think, another eleven of what they call 'no lesion' reactors, people who reacted but the X-ray did not show up any case of TB. The proper procedures were followed according to what

MR. W. HOUSE: has been done in other places in Newfoundland and indeed in North America. And again a survey was done in September and three new cases were identified. All the eleven cases have been treated and have a clean bill of health. And right now, of course, there is going to be another survey done in December. We are -

MR. NEARY: How many schools?

MR. W. HOUSE: In one school at this point in time.

MR. S. NEARY: Why do you not do the other schools?

MR. W. HOUSE: Just wait for the answer - just wait!

I am just pointing out that we are depending entirely on the expertise of perhaps one of the best and most knowledgeable people in Canada in TB control and that is Dr. Knowling. And, of course, the procedure she follows she is saying that this can be overcome in the way they are doing it. If in December it is found necessary to go to other schools, of course it will be done. But we are following the pattern that has pretty well eliminated TB in Newfoundland now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is indicative of one of the real problems this government has. As long as it is in the book and it is in regulations, the fact that people are dying does not make any difference. That is why the minister could stand up two weeks ago and tell us our health care was in good shape when everybody else in the Province -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - was saying that it was in a state of collapse and they were only providing emergency services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! A supplementary.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question that I have to ask is that regardless of what it says in your book or from your experts, the truth of the matter is you started with one case last May, that developed into twenty-two cases, and now in September three new cases. Now, Mr. Speaker, when will the minister do what the people want in the area? The simple, basic thing that they want in the area is to prevent any new cases by having a complete survey done about everybody who could have come in contact with the TB, that whole area. What is wrong with doing what the people want and that is surveying everybody in the Deer Lake area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to react to the first statement about the fact that the health care was in a state of collapse and we did not act. We acted in the lab and x-ray strike when the hospitals advised us -

MR. FLIGHT: You acted all right.

MR. HOUSE: When the hospitals advised us that there was an emergency and they could not cope with it, then we took decisive action and we remedied the situation.

The particular thing is I think the hon. member is a little bit of an alarmist saying people are

MR. HOUSE: dying. There have been no people dying - one I think last year, and perhaps one the year before - no people dying from TB in this Province. The fact is that the people, the public health people in Corner Brook and in Deer Lake, Dr. Hogan and the public health nurses, have contacted practically everybody who could be in contact with the people who were identified as infected.

The fact is - the member is saying there are twenty-two people, there are not. There are eleven and three, fourteen. The first eleven have been treated successfully, the other three are on active treatment now.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of things that, you know, you create alarmist situations when everything is going very well. And if there is deemed to be a need to go into further schools it will be done, and we will be discussing that with the people who are expert in the field. And that is one of the things that we have to depend on, Mr. Speaker, in the medical world, the expertise. And, as I said, Dr. Knowling is perhaps one of the top experts in TB control in North America.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) did not deny that there were people with cancer who were dying who could not get lab and X-rays because this minister would not face up to the problems. Now you

MR. STIRLING: can legislate people's rights away, you can break a strike, but you cannot legislate TB out of somebody.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at one time in this Province there was a massive X-ray programme going all around this Province. Now, what is the harm in being extra careful? Instead of trying to check to find out who met somebody on a 'plane or a bus or where they may have given that contact, what is wrong with doing what the people want? - and that is doing an X ray of everybody in the area. What possible harm can come out of making sure instead of waiting until six months down the road when you have somebody with a real problem? Why cannot that testing be done, Mr. Speaker? What is wrong with a test being done on every school child that every parent wants to have done?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if every parent wants it done. I saw a programme last night - I have had some contact with the people out there and know pretty well how people feel about it.

The fact of the matter is that we, I think, in Newfoundland perhaps have some of the best expertise in the world on the control of TB.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: All that one has to do is look back to ten or twenty years ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - to see the status that we were in and see how it has evolved, and that has been in no small measure due to the vigilant control that we have had and the vigilant control that is still being carried out. The fact of the matter is we do not think it is necessary to go to massive X-rays on this situation, but if it points out in

MR. HOUSE: the next couple of months that there is a problem, we will be looking at it.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) wait until somebody dies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, that is the alarmist situation, 'somebody dies'. Nobody dies from TB now.

MR. STIRLING: Except for the case last year.

MR. HOUSE: The fact of the matter is there is one case, and these were cases that were perhaps forty years old.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: So the point is it is very well being looked after and if there is a necessity for further reviews of various other schools it will be done, but at this point in time, we are waiting for the results of the December tests.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Could the minister confirm that the number of patients presently treated in Davis Inlet for tuberculosis has increased from last year, that the number of patients who have been treated in Davis Inlet for tuberculosis this year is more than last year?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information. I will certainly try to get it for the hon. member. There has been no indication to me stating that there is any increase in Davis Inlet. There may be; I do not

MR. HOUSE: have the information but will seek to get it for the hon. member. Certainly, there is not a crisis indentified there.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. It is a sort of simple, elementary, basic question that I would like to start out with. I have a whole series of questions to ask the minister in the next couple of weeks but we have to start out from scratch, Mr. Speaker, because I am not sure, after listening to the Premier this morning and over the last couple of years, whether or not the processing of fish comes under provincial jurisdiction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I will start out by asking the minister a simple, basic, elementary question

MR. NEARY:

that I should not have to ask. But for the sake of those who may think that Ottawa is responsible for everything, could the minister tell the House who is responsible, once the fish comes out of the water onshore and is processed in the plants, whose jurisdiction does that come under? Does it come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government? Does it come under the jurisdiction of Ottawa or does it come under the jurisdiction of the United Nations?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell the House ? A simple yes or no answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Does the processing of fish - once fish is landed onshore does it come under provincial jurisdiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the question was more than a very brief question so I guess I will answer it with more than a yes or no. Mr. Speaker, the fish when it is caught by the fishermen and pulled aboard the boat, is, I would say, federal responsibility; in the water and aboard the boat. It arrives to the wharf to be landed and it is still a federal responsibility. And then when it is being lifted by federal installed hoists, using net bags and hoisting machines, it is still a federal responsibility. When it is lifted up over the wharf and until it is landed on the wharf it is still federal responsibility. When it gets on the deck of the wharf, finally, finally it becomes provincial responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Then we have the responsibility to move that fish from the wharf into the nearest plant. Hopefully

MR. MORGAN: the plant is as close as possible because we do not have all the roads paved to transport the fish over. So then the fish is taken into a fish plant and that fish plant could be built there by a number of factors involved. Number one, it depends on the financial assistance available to build that plant, whether the funds came from the Newfoundland government or the federal government. In most cases the funding available for the building of a large fish plant is federal responsibility again, not the Department of Fisheries but from the Department of DREE. So if you want to put it in simple form I guess it is simple to say both governments are involved but the responsibility for licenses, as we all know, is under our responsibility, the Newfoundland government. But the plants themselves, the size of the plant, the expansion that takes place, is usually controlled by the federal government because they have to give authority, they have to give authority from one Department of Fisheries to the other Department of DREE which is involved in financial assistance before any expansion can occur throughout the Province with regard to fish plants. So the federal responsibility should have some control over the amount of expansion of fish plants in our Province, and over the past number of years they have not done that. They have been dishing out money right and left in incentive grants for large expansions on the Northeast coast, large expansions, and the approvals were given by the federal minister. The licenses were given by the Newfoundland government to process certain species of fish. So I guess it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, there is responsibility on both sides.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I think, Mr. Speaker, I am not absolutely sure, but I think we have established now the fact that once the fish lands on the wharf it becomes provincial responsibility. I believe that is the fact. Taking it then to the plants, processing it, granting licences to fish plants and finding markets for that fish is the responsibility of the Province. I hope at long last we have that established because I am not sure, listening to the Premier over the last couple of years, whether or not the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was running an office that really did not do anything, that you may as well close it down and put somebody from Ottawa in the Minister's office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Now let me ask the minister this—there is a whole series of questions that have to be asked about the fishery but I am going to start at the important ones first and then work back. In connection with marketing, which is a provincial responsibility, the Fishermen's Union and people in authority, people that know, say we have to strengthen our markets—and I do not mean the minister going off on little joy rides around the world. Now does the minister intend to bring legislation into this House to expand the terms of reference of the Canadian Salfish Corporation to let them market all the produce of the sea, or does the minister intend to bring legislation into this House to set up a separate corporation to market all the produce of the sea in future in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for asking that questions with regards to marketing

MR. MORGAN: of fish products because indeed it is a very important part of the overall fishing industry and that is the reason why the Newfoundland government under Premier Peckford is leaving no stone unturned in assisting in every way possible to find markets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: We have travelled and we will travel more.

MR. STIRLING: The patronizing Minister of Fisheries.

MR. WARREN: On the taxpayers' money.

MR. MORGAN: I am called Morgan the travelling Minister of Fisheries sometimes -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - but I tell you, when I travel I do not travel alone; I travel with companies from this Province who are doing all they can in working with us, the government, to try to find markets, because if there are no markets for our fish products we are not going to have a vibrant fishing industry. We have to have markets for our fish products, we have to have good quality fish going into these markets. And looking at the marketing and the control of marketing, there is some concern, I expressed some time ago, with regards to the marketing and the need for some consolidation of the marketing effort. I said publicly in the Province some months ago that I felt the companies did not have their act together in marketing their products in the USA, and I told the companies in meetings with them.

There is a need for a co-ordinated effort to market our fish products whether it is in the USA, our neighbours to the South, or in the European Economic Community, or in the Far East. And that is what we are doing right now. As a government here we are working in co-operation and co-ordination and I feel it is not necessary to have any legislation.

MR. MORGAN:

If you are going to work in a voluntary atmosphere, if you are going to work in co-operation, surely you do not need legislation to force somebody to do something when they want to do it voluntarily. And the large companies like Fishery Products and National Sea and the Nickersons and the Lakes, these have

MR. MORGAN:

been the four major companies in the market place, and we are working in close co-ordination with them, and we will in the future, to do two things; first of all to ensure that the quality is improved, and that is where we may have to, and I say 'we may have to,' bring in legislation. In co-ordination with the federal government, to bring in legislation to enable the companies to ensure that they have good quality products going into the market place. That could be by means of export licences to be issued by the federal government, and it could be by means of legislation provincially here to control the quality or to improve the quality right from the harvesting level, from the fisherman's level.

But to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, in capsule form, we see no need for any legislation to control marketing. We see no need at this time to expand the terms of reference for the operations of the Saltfish Corporation, not at this time.

Just last week I met with twelve companies that produce saltfish around the Province, all twelve of them, and before any changes are made to the Saltfish Corporation I will be getting their views and opinions as to what changes are required.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

I must ask hon. ministers when replying to questions to try to get their answers as brief as possible because there are other members who wish to ask questions and have questions answered. And I realize the topic is an important one, and could require a lengthy answer but I would ask ministers to remember that point.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

You see, it is very, very seldom we get questions on fisheries so I get carried away when I get a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I am not sure what the minister rose on then. There was no recognition of him but I presume it was a point of order so I will rule it was not a point of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to be able to debate that answer just given by the hon. gentleman, which was really a non-answer. Did I understand him correctly when he said that he did not contemplate bringing any legislation before the next session of the House to amend the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation? Because I hope hon. members are aware, Mr. Speaker, that in order to change the terms of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation it has to be done in this House, through an act of this Legislature, and not up in the Parliament of Canada. And to get a new corporation to market all the produce of the sea has to be done in this House. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, Mr. Speaker, that there is no legislation contemplated to beef up the Saltfish Corporation to give them jurisdiction over other produce of the sea, or no legislation contemplated on the part of the minister to set up a separate corporation to market fish fresh? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying? If the hon. gentleman is saying that, Mr. Speaker, then that is very disappointing. But I just wanted to make sure that I am clear on what the hon. gentleman is saying. Is that what he is saying?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, no, I did not say we had no plans to make any changes to any aspect of the fishing industry. In fact, right now, Mr. Speaker, with regards to markets and quality we have before us, the government, one of the most important reports ever submitted to us on the inshore fishery of our Province, the Paddock Royal Commission. And that commission has addressed practically all aspects of the fishing industry, as it pertains to the inshore sector in particular, and even taking in part of the offshore. And that report addresses the marketing problem. It addresses the role of the Saltfish Corporation. And what I am saying today in the House is that when we have fully assessed the recommendations of that report, when we have held discussions with the Fishermen's Union, when we have held discussions with the saltfish producers, when we have held discussions with the Fish Trades Association, we as a government here, the Premier and his Cabinet, will make decisions on these recommendations. Maybe there will be a need for some legislation - maybe, we do not know yet - but we will fully assess the recommendations and look at possible ways of bringing in some of the recommendations made in the report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and it is regarding the report compiled by CN officials concerning the ferry services in the Province. I understand that the minister has made the report public but it is not tabled in the House; perhaps he has, but I have not seen it. I understand, however, that one of the recommendations of that report was that the government establish a Crown corporation in the Province to own and

MR. B. TULK: operate ferry services. I would like to ask the minister, if they are going with that recommendation, will they own and operate the ferry services? If not, why they are not?

And I also understand by rumour - I want the minister to confirm something for me - I understand by rumour that instead of doing that, the government now plans on buying out the ferries and tendering their operations. I would like for the minister to tell us what the cost of that will be and when will be the programme be in operation.

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

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions asked by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). Most of the those questions were answered in a press release that I made a number of days ago. The report that the member refers to, Mr. Speaker, was due to be tabled this morning and will be done so in the proper place on the Order Paper. If I remember the first question correctly, it was asked whether, in fact, government intended to establish a Crown corporation to manage the ferry system. And if the member had read the press release that was issued and the statements that were made subsequently -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. DAWE: - he would have realized that government indicated that it would not be -

MR. S. NEARY: Do you think that is all we have to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite could be referred to like a gentleman in Codroy Valley refers to Leo Cormier's cows as someone

MR. DAWE: as having more lip than Leo's cows got udder, but unfortunately what comes out of the hon. member's mouth has nothing to do with that life-giving elixir that comes from the cow's udder but might be associated more with the part of the cow a little higher up on the anatomy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: You are the expert on the other end of the cow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I understand the minister has not completed his answer yet.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the decision, as was made public, is that government will not at this time be accepting the recommendation to establish a Crown corporation to manage the ferry system or in fact to establish a single operator but will, in fact, be the operators - the Department of Transportation will be the operators of the ferry system. And it is government's intention in this line, based on some recommendations in the report for vessel deployment and inadequacies in the system, to purchase some vessels as quickly as possible, to do some deployment changes in the existing ferry system, and to continue under management contracts. With existing ferry operators where government will purchase vessels, they will enter into management contracts to operate those vessels.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I understand too - I would like to point out to the minister that perhaps instead of making press releases he might pay us the courtesy of first tabling reports in this House and making reports to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I understand that of the boats that are presently in service, the only one that is presently being purchased is a boat by the name of, I think it is the Lowland, is the name of it and I understand that that boat is in the Premier's district and has been perhaps tied up since it was purchased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What? What?

MR. TULK: I would like to ask the minister if indeed they are acquiring the Lowland, if that is the only one that they are presently acquiring, where it is going to be in operation and is it indeed going to be an operation in Fogo and will the Hamilton Sound then become a swing vessel or will it be still used on the Fogo run?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. members had indeed read the press release that was put out prior to the House of Assembly opening, they would have realized that in that release it also indicated that government was entering into negotiations as it related to vessel purchase and that for the length of time that negotiations were going on until government decided whether in fact it was going to purchase a particular vessel, that that would remain obviously with the department and with the people we were negotiating purchase from. And once that decision has been made, once vessels are purchased, once the decision has been made where that vessel will go, the hon. House and the people of Newfoundland,

MR. DAWE: and the people who will be using the ferry service will be informed.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Do I understand the minister then to say that he has not entered into any agreement with anybody to purchase that extra vessel called the Lowland and that the Hamilton Sound will still remain in service in Fogo, from Fogo to Carmenville? And when can we expect the change to take place, if indeed it is going to take place at all?

MR. NEARY: They are going to buy the Lowland, you know that and bail out Weir.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I can only say again, the negotiations are ongoing as it relates to the purchase of, in this case, four vessels that we hope to purchase over a period of time. Negotiations are ongoing and when it is appropriate to make those negotiations public I will do so.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation a question.

Would the minister tell the House what input he had into the decision or why he permitted the Motor Registration Division to increase pickup licences in excess of 50 per cent, from \$60 to \$92, why he permitted the ordinary people in this Province to be gouged in that way by his department and what input he had into it?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members can remember back as far as the Budget Speech -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: - it was indicated at that particular time that, through an increase in licence fees to commercial vehicles and to motorcycles, that the Department of Transportation and then the government would realize a certain amount of revenue. The increase for commercial vehicles, pickups being included in that particular category - not all pickups, Mr. Speaker; pickups below 22,062 kilograms have an increase of only \$15, the same as large vehicles. An increase to vehicles over that will be

MR. DAWE: \$32 right across the board.
It is an increase placed on commercial vehicles,
Mr. Speaker, not necessarily only on pickups.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I am sure hon. members would
like to join me in welcoming to the gallery today one of
the new Councillors-Elect for the City of St. John's,
Mr. Ron Pumphrey, who is seated in the gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
table for this hon. House, a report done for this
government by CN Marine on the interprovincial ferry
system.

MR. SPEAKER: Further reports?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I, too, am glad
to see my good friend and fellow Bell Islander sitting in
the gallery today. I must say, I am really proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present
a petition on behalf of eighty-eight residents of
Burnt Island in the electoral district of LaPoile.
Eighty-eight people signed this petition back some time
ago to ask for an extension to their water system.

Hon. members will recall this
is about the third time I have presented a petition in this

MR. NEARY: hon. House in connection with this matter. Back in 1979 during the provincial general election, Mr. Cabot Martin, who was the Tory candidate, was faced with a demonstration in Burnt Island and at the time, he received a wire from the Premier telling the people of Burnt Island that they would get a water supply for their community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have the first phase of the


MR. NEARY: water supply, but after the first phase, work was discontinued and last year there was no provision in the estimates for the second phase. And what these residents are asking for now is the second phase of the water supply for Burnt Islands and an improvement to the present water supply because they are having problems with pressure as a result of the water that is being used in the fish plant. When the fish plant is operating at full capacity, residents cannot get any pressure worthwhile in their homes.

Now I invited the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) to meet all the town councils in my district a few weeks ago. First I met the minister downstairs near the Bank of Montreal and I invited the minister to come to LaPoile district to meet with the town council where, I told the minister, she would get a very friendly and warm reception and the minister thought that was an excellent idea and thanked me and told me - I believe the minister said it was the first time that a member, at least a member of the Opposition, had invited the minister to come to his district for a visit. And the minister said that she would probably do it. Well, then I confirmed my invitation in writing to the minister. I wrote the minister and I thanked her for her interest and I again extended an invitation in writing. Well I have to tell the House that I was sorry to see that the minister then, after that, started playing games. The minister did agree to go and meet the councils in LaPoile district and sent me the agenda on the eve of her departure to meet with the councils - sent me her agenda. I knew nothing about her visit, she told me nothing about it. The councils all invited me and I would only assume that the minister did not want me to attend or she would have let me know that she was going. But one of the meetings that the minister held when she was in my district was with the ladies in Burnt Islands who are

MR. NEARY: fighting for the second phase of the water supply, and the Town Council in Burnt Islands. And the need for the second phase of this water supply was forcefully brought home to the minister. I am glad to hear that the minister did assure the delegation and the Town Council in Burnt Islands that she would very seriously consider putting funding in next year's estimates for the second phase of the water supply so that the people of Burnt Islands, Mr. Speaker, would not have to continue to carry water in buckets and in barrels in the backs of their cars. The minister has now seen it first-hand and I thank her for that and I hope now that she will be a little more considerate and see to it that they get the second phase of their water supply in the next few years.

It gives me great pleasure to table this petition, Mr. Speaker, and I whole-heartedly support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: I would just like to respond for just a minute or two. I did meet with the council in Burnt Islands and I listened to their problems with regard to the water system they have now and there is a study ongoing to try to resolve the problems with that water system. That is ongoing now and I am hoping that we will be able to upgrade that system very, very shortly.

The second phase of the Burnt Islands water system was included in our proposals last year, it was in top priority, but unfortunately there was not enough money to go ahead with all of the top priority proposals and it will be continued this year.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): To the petition, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling).

X MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to support the petition of the people in Burnt Islands. I did a tour of the district with the member. And I take it that the minister has now confirmed that the people in Burnt Islands will get their second phase next year.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no!

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is what she just said.

MR. STIRLING: That is what she just said.

MR. NEARY: It will continue next year.

MRS. NEWHOOK: It will be included in our Budget -

MR. NEARY: It will be included. That is fine.

MRS. NEWHOOK: - in our program, it will be included.

MR. STIRLING: Included in the Budget or included in the list?

MRS. NEWHOOK: I do not know, I cannot tell you what the decisions will be. All of them are included. They are all included.

MR. TULK: She is going to put it in the Budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. STIRLING: You see, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the reasons I was giving the minister the opportunity to confirm her promise which she has promised to put in the Budget. And I am very pleased that she has now confirmed that promise, that the people in Burnt Islands will get their second phase of the water and sewer.

I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a councillor visiting this morning because the municipal level of government is probably the single most important level of government dealing with the day-to-day problems that people have, and they have been treated with the utmost of contempt by the provincial government. This provincial

MR. STIRLING: government which is so concerned about the rights and the constitution refused to agree to have municipalities recognized as a level of government. And the people in Burnt Islands, Mr. Speaker, have been subjected to the same discrimination as other municipalities in this Province throughout rural Newfoundland in that the government has forced them to take property tax but, because it cannot be implemented immediately, they have cut back on their grants programme. There is not a municipality in rural Newfoundland that has not been hurt of this government and put in a most unreasonable position. They will collect their volume of taxes, but if they happen to have property tax in place then the government will match the grants fifty/fifty. But because this government has not been able to do assessments, they will not be able to have property tax in place. They have been cut back in their budgets, cut back in their grants, and they all have to increase their own taxes, double and triple, and they are still not getting an adequate grant from the provincial government.

So, Mr. Speaker, this government, if they look at the results throughout the Province of the municipal election starting with St. John's and going through all of the municipalities, they should see that what has happened in this Province is a rejection, rejection of people who supported the provincial government's position and the dictatorial attitude of this provincial government in forcing councillors to do things that they did not want to do in their own community, forcing them in under municipalities.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the petition and the need that these people have all over this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. STIRLING: The reason that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is so sensitive, Mr. Speaker, is that he knows he has been finished -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
The prayer of the petition, please.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the prayer of the petition, but it is very hard to do it when you get an arrogant, uncaring government on the other side that provoke you into responding to their inane interjections, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Inane is the correct word.

MR. L. STIRLING: And when the Minister of Fisheries goes home to look up that word he will decide tomorrow whether he is insulted or not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, dealing with Burnt

Islands -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) we will make a clean sweep of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order!

MR. STIRLING:

Dealing with Burnt Islands, Mr.

Speaker, and the hundreds of people all over this Province living in rural Newfoundland that have not been treated fairly by this government, they have not been treated fairly at all by this government. They have had their grants cut back, a subject over which they have no control. The people of Burnt Islands were given a promise last year that their second phase would go through and they were treated like most other municipalities, cut off in midstream. One of the reasons why a lot of people did not have full councils is because they realize that they have been made the scapegoat and they are taking the criticism which should be directed at this provincial government. But the government is not going to get away with it, Mr. Speaker. We are going to bring in petitions from people like the people in Burnt Islands because they deserve better treatment, and we on this side will make sure that they get better treatment, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies," carried.

(Bill No. 106).

On motion, Bill No. 106 read
a first time ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Government Reorganization (General And Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 66)

On motion, Bill No. 66 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act," carried. (Bill No. 113)

On motion, Bill No. 113 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour And Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act (No.2)," carried. (Bill No. 104)

On motion, Bill No. 104 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act," carried. (Bill No. 107)

On motion, Bill No. 107 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. John's Assessment Act (No.2)," carried. (Bill No. 108)

On motion, Bill No. 108
read a first time, ordered read a second time presently
by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister
of Transportation to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The
Highway Traffic Act (No. 3)," carried. (Bill No. 110).

On motion, Bill No. 110 read
a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. the Minister
of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Insurance
Companies Act," carried. (Bill No. 99).

On motion, Bill No. 99 read
a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. Minister of
Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary
Act," carried. (Bill No. 46).

On motion, Bill No. 46 read a
first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice
to introduce a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors
In The Statute Law," carried. (Bill No. 89).

On motion, Bill No. 89 read a
first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
Motion the hon. Minister of
Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Convey Certain Trusts
And Properties In The Province To The Montreal Trust Company Of
Canada," carried. (Bill No. 52).

On motion Bill No. 52 read a first
time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Summary Proceedings Act," carried. (Bill No. 64).

On motion, Bill No. 64 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Provincial Parks Act," carried. (Bill No. 100).

On motion, Bill No. 100 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teacher Training) Act," carried. (Bill No. 50).

On motion, Bill No. 50 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Grand Falls Hospital (Management) Act, 1961," carried. (Bill No. 114).

On motion, Bill No. 114 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The St. Clare's Mercy Hospital (Incorporation) Act, 1960," carried. (Bill No. 61).

On motion, Bill No. 61 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X Motion, the hon. Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador," carried. (Bill No. 109).

On motion, Bill No. 109 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

X
 Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Status Of Women Advisory Council Act," carried. (Bill No. 105).

On motion, Bill No. 105 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 20.

X
 Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 70).

On motion, Bill No. 70 read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave.

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 2.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 2, second reading of a bill.

MR. SPEAKER: It is by leave, I presume?

MR. MARSHALL: I have (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Such a motion would require unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies," (Bill No. 106).

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

X
MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who at the present time is engaged in a dialogue with other provincial ministers on The Morning Show as to the -

MR. STIRLING: A press conference.

MR. MARSHALL: No, not press conference,
a dialogue.

MR. STIRLING: We saw him in the House.

MR. MARSHALL: A commitment that he made a long
time ago to give an assessment with other provincial
Ministers of Finance throughout Canada on the Budget which
was delivered last night, the disastrous budget.

While the Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins) is down giving an appraisal of the Budget
given by the federal Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen)
yesterday, I have great pleasure in introducing on his
behalf an agreement which he has entered into with the
same federal Minister of Finance in the spirit of
co-operation which this government has with the federal
government for the Reciprocal Taxation Agreement Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, previously,
the Canada-Newfoundland Reciprocal Taxation agreement
came into effect on October 1, 1977 and expired on
March 31, 1981. This agreement is intended to be for
a period of six years. The previous agreement was for
six and one-half years, and this agreement expands the
agreement now for a six year period.

The purpose of the legislation
is that it provides for the mutual payment of sales taxes
and fees by the federal and provincial governments, one to
the other.

Prior to the signing of the
agreement, that is the agreement that was in 1977, there
were inconsistencies existing in relation to purchases by
federal departments and agencies which were not subject to
provincial consumption taxes. The same problems arose over
purchases by provincial departments and agencies which were
or were not subject to federal excise and sales taxes.

MR. MARSHALL: Another problem area which was there before 1977 concerned the economic disadvantage to the private sector where they had to compete with certain governmental bodies which had particular cost advantages as a result of existing tax exemption practices. So in 1977, in order to cure and to erase or mitigate these difficulties, the 1977 agreement was entered into. In essence, through that agreement, the Reciprocal Taxation Agreement, the federal government remits either directly or indirectly to participating provinces - and the participating provinces are Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and Ontario - they remit to participating provinces payments in lieu of provincial taxes and fees on its consumption and usage of goods and services which were not previously liable to tax, that is previous to 1977, while the provinces in their turn pay federal sales tax on their purchases of goods which had been previously exempted. So that is the main purpose of the bill and it is the main purpose of the agreement.

The main objective of this taxation bill is, of course, to make the federal and provincial consumption sales taxes applicable to both levels of government in the same fashion as they apply to the private sector.

Now for the information of the House, with the signing of this new Reciprocal Agreement on April 14th, 1981, a new Reciprocal Taxation Agreement is required to be put in place before the House of Assembly to ratify the new agreement. So really what this legislation is seeking is a ratification of a renewal of this taxation agreement for a further six-and-a-half year period. Also for the information of the House with respect to the amounts received pursuant to this agreement, Newfoundland has received the following amounts in lieu of provincial sales taxes since 1977. It was only in effect six months in the fiscal year 1977-78 in which case \$1.9 million was yielded; the following year it grew to \$5.3 million; in 1979-80

MR. MARSHALL: it dropped to \$4.4 million; 1980-81 it was \$7.3 million, and the estimate for 1981-82 is \$6.7 million. Under the reciprocal programme the federal government - well, I have already said that payments were in lieu. So that is the purpose of the legislation. The legislation then is here to ratify the agreement which was entered into and give the agreement legislative sanction. X

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

X MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the government is doing here is asking the House, asking us as members, to ratify a Reciprocal Tax Agreement with the Government of Canada that was signed back several months ago. So, Mr. Speaker, any recommendations or any changes or any suggestions that we may have at this particular point in time are completely irrelevant. The agreement is already in effect and what the minister, who introduced the bill, is asking us to do is to rubber stamp the agreement. We did not get an opportunity to debate the agreement before it was signed, we did not get a chance to have any input into it, so the only thing we can do at this particular stage, Mr. Speaker, is to have some general comment on the negotiations and relations in general between the provincial government and the Government of Canada.

It does illustrate to me, Mr. Speaker, this agreement, that there can be good relations with the Government of Canada. Obviously the senior civil servants had to sit down and hammer out the wording

MR. NEARY:

of this agreement and then they passed it over to their ministers who put their signatures on it on behalf of their respective governments. Now that is the way things should be, Mr. Speaker. It has been very unfortunate in this Province in the last two years especially - well, in the last several years, but more especially in the last two years - that this kind of relationship has not existed with the Government of Canada. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to this House that relations with the Government of Canada have never been as bad since Confederation as they are at the present time. This government, especially the Premier and some of his ministers, but led by the Premier, have continuously blasphemed the Prime Minister of this country and the Government of Canada, ridiculed, scorned. They have spent practically their whole time sending out from the eight floor of this building a barrage of propaganda, hate propaganda, anti-Canadian propaganda against Ottawa and against the Government of Canada. It is a wonder, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder that the Government of Canada is talking to this government at all. It is amazing that they are still talking to them.

MR. TULK:

What government? There is no government over there.

MR. NEARY:

Human nature being what it is, Mr. Speaker, with the names and with the description that comes out in some of these news conferences and press releases from the eight floor, from the Premier's office, it is a wonder to me that anybody up in Ottawa is talking to this government at all. Somebody in Ottawa must be turning the other cheek.

MR. TULK:

They have to be saints.

MR. NEARY: They must be turning the other cheek. They must be saints, as my hon. friend says. The Prime Minister of this country and the ministers in Ottawa must be saints to put up with what they have put up with from this government, especially the Premier, in the last couple of years. But despite all of these things, Mr. Speaker, despite the barrage of propaganda, the hate campaigns, the hate Liberal campaign that has been going on, the hate Trudeau campaign that has been going on, it has been possible to negotiate -

MR. STAGG: The public is afflicted with that one, the hate Liberal campaign.

MR. NEARY: - it has been possible to negotiate a few agreements. And we have one now here in the House today, Bill 106, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government And The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies." This reciprocal agreement has meant a substantial amount of money to this Province, Mr. Speaker, This year we are told it will mean in the vicinity of \$7 million will go into the general revenue of this Province as a result of this agreement, almost \$7 million. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that more revenue will go into the provincial treasury as a result of this agreement than provincial money will go into the federal treasury. The hon. gentleman did not give us the figures, but I would like to see the figures. I am only making a guess, but my guess would be that more federal funds, more taxes, provincial taxes collected from federal government agencies and from the Government of Canada, will go into the provincial treasury, then provincial money will go into

MR. NEARY:

the Federal treasury. That is just a guess on my part. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has the figure and maybe when he is closing the debate he will let us have these figures.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill. I regret very much that we did not have an opportunity to debate it before it was signed. There are one or two suggestions that I am sure I want to make and I am sure other hon. members of the House have suggestions that they would like to make. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what about the municipalities in this Province who have a difficult time trying to squeeze a few dollars in taxes or to get an agreement in lieu of taxes for their municipalities? What about the town councils and the municipalities around this Province? I see the hon. minister - I am not sure if she was smiling- but perhaps the hon. minister could tell us.

Gander, I would assume, is one place - I do not know what arrangement they have with the Ministry of Transport, if they are paying taxes or if they have an agreement with the town council in lieu of taxes. Perhaps the hon. minister could enlighten us on that. But it certainly has been a problem over the years. Municipalities with beautiful federal buildings and structures, and the federal government carrying on big business in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Gander, Stephenville, in St. John's and I suppose post offices, Mr. Speaker, in practically every community in Newfoundland.

I am told the problem - what is the problem with the provincial?

MR. STIRLING:

The provincial government does not pay their share of taxes.

MR. NEARY: I see. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed of what the real problem is as far as municipalities collecting federal taxes are concerned. The provincial government does not pay the taxes either and if they -if the provincial government establishes a precedent, then the Government of Canada would have to fall in line, is that it?

MR. STIRLING: They already do. In most cases the post office and that sort of thing, they pay a grant in lieu of taxes.

MR. NEARY: In most cases the federal government are willing or are indeed paying taxes to municipalities.

MR. STIRLING: The provincial government pays nothing anywhere.

MR. NEARY: The provincial government does not pay a cent in taxes.

MR. CALLAN: No grants either.

MR. NEARY: All the buildings they have, no, Mr. Speaker, just the normal grants, the routine grants, that is all. The provincial government should follow the example, Mr. Speaker, should follow the example set in this bill and that is that they should enter into a reciprocal agreement with the municipalities all around this Province whereby the provincial government would pay taxes to the municipalities.

MR. STIRLING: The municipalities now have to pay taxes to the Province.

MR. NEARY: I see. My hon. friend, who is an expert in these matters, informs me that the municipalities, the town councils, Conception Bay South already pays the provincial tax, but it is only a one way street. The provincial government does not pay taxes to the town of Conception Bay South.

MR. CARTER: Why should it. Do not be so foolish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and so we have a precedent here that should be followed here in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (H.Newhook) should take steps immediately. The minister should be screaming and shouting and bawling at her colleagues. "Look, we do not pay any taxes to municipalities." We have highways, depots, public buildings, we have all kinds of projects.

MR. TULK: You have no worry. She will run again out in Gander.

MR. NEARY: No, she will not run. Wince Baker will take care of the hon. the minister the next time around.

MR. S. NEARY:

will take care of the hon. minister the next time round. That is guaranteed. He has just headed the poll and, Mr. Speaker, I will make a prediction right now that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook), will resign, will not run anymore. I will make that prediction right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will find out in due course, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman will find out about the NDP down in his own area the next time round.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder does the hon. gentleman want me to go up in the upper end now and start and go right down the line and tell the hon. gentleman who will not be with us after the next election. Does the hon. gentleman want -

MR. J. DINN: Nobody is listening to you.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, there are more people listening to me, Mr. Speaker, than listen to the hon. gentleman, especially in the labour movement, especially in the labour movement, according to the letter I had the other day from the President of N.A.P.E. Sometime -

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) last year.

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the Premier did not have the courage to do anything about it. The hon. gentleman is finished with the labour movement of this Province. If I had the latitude under this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would start in the upper end and I would go right down to the rail and I could name at least fourteen hon. members on the government benches who will not be with us after the next provincial general election.

MR. F. STAGG:

MR. S. NEARY: According to the latest polls that were done, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's image has slipped so badly in the last several months that now he is popping up everywhere. He has more time allocated every day to have his picture taken eating an apple or pinning a medal on somebody, more time to have his picture taken, more time to call news conferences and to pump out propaganda. Because, Mr. Speaker, he has been instructed to try to beef up his image. His slippage has been bad in the last several months. And his slippage is going to be worse in the next few months. You cannot make a silk purse out of sow's ear and that is what they are trying to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: That is what they are trying to do, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to make the Premier look like a leader when in actual fact the only thing we have is an arm waving, fanatical menace. The man is a menace! The man is a menace to the Province and if he is not removed from office shortly, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland will never recover from the depression, from the recession that we have in this Province. The man is a complete menace to this Province and should be tossed out.

So, Mr. Speaker, sometime when I get the opportunity I will name hon. gentlemen - Your Honour might be pleased to find out that at this particular point in time, unless the situation changes drastically, I have to give Your Honour credit for doing a good job and will be a hard man - now, mind you, I am not saying that it is impossible to put the hon. gentleman out, but the hon. member will be a hard man to unseat, he will be a hard man! But the gentleman who just came in around the curtain, he is just the opposite!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: That particular gentleman will be an easy man to unseat! Easy! Finished! Absolutely finished, Mr. Speaker. And so there is the difference.

MR. B. TULK: Even his own members are saying it.

MR. S. NEARY: Even his own members are laughing at him and saying, 'What a disaster we have here in the hon. gentleman'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. member for Exploits (Dr. (Twomey), who is looking at me there with a jaundice eye, I hope the hon. gentleman will not run again. I do not think he will. I hope he does not. I would not like to see the hon. gentleman get hurt. I think he will retire. I think the hon. gentleman should retire because next time round there

MR. NEARY:

is going to be a change. The hon. gentleman would be well advised to consider turning in his badge after this term is up, which I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will do.

And the member for Placentia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

The anti-confederate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may as well go now down to the Lieutenant-Governor, or to the Speaker, whoever he has to give his resignation to, and say, "Look, I am sorry that I fooled the people of Placentia for so long. I am sorry that I ran six or seven times and then I got the sympathy vote. I should have stayed out of it. I could not even put good drinking water in Southeast Placentia, even though the government has spent a couple of million dollars on it."

That gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is

finished. Finished.

MR. PATTERSON:

You should run against me, boy.

MR. NEARY:

There will be no splitting the vote down in Placentia the next time. There will be no two Liberals scrawbbing and scrapping each other the next time. It will be a head on fight, a head on fight between a Liberal and a gentleman who can think of nothing but resettlement.

MR. CALLAN:

The Argentia Stadium is in an awful mess.

MR. NEARY:

The Argentia Stadium is in a mess. The ferry service is in a mess. Everything in Placentia is in a mess. And I know because I have occasion to go down there fairly regularly.

MR. YOUNG:

Gambling.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ran into the hon. gentleman there one day.

MR. YOUNG:

I was invited.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was invited too.

But the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) now may as well turn in his badge, absolutely finished. And I will tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something else, that I am looking at a member, a minister by the way, a member who may as well hang up his hat as to go back to Happy Valley/Goose Bay, to go back to Naskaupi. He may as well forget it. He is only wasting his time to go back.

Now, that is four I have named already. I gave Your Honour the benefit of the doubt. It will take a strong man to put Your Honour out. But all the polls that have been done -

MR. MARSHALL:

That is why Your Honour is letting

him go on with his -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, what an accusation.

MR. NEARY:

When I draw up my list, Mr. Speaker,

I do not - when I draw up my list of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

- when I draw up a list of twenty-

nine members -

MR. STIRLING:

- going to get to Mount Pearl.

MR. CALLAN:

That is on the Avalon Peninsula.

They are not supposed to.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are fifty-two seats in the House, fifty-two seats. We would only need twenty-seven to form a government. I can name you twenty-nine we are going to win, twenty-nine seats is what we need to win. I am not listing Ferryland as one of the twenty-nine, although it is possible to win it. But I am not listing it. I am only listing the sure bets. And one of them happens to be St. George's, where the hon. gentleman is in serious, serious trouble.

MR. DAWE: Come up any time.

MR. NEARY: Serious trouble. They have to get me now to straighten out the hon. gentleman's problems down there, to straighten out his telephone service for him. They are writing me about the bridge, what has happened to the bridge across the Codroy. The hon. gentleman - he may as well bask in the glory of being a minister for one term. Because that is all he will be, a one shop deal, one term.

Now, I could go on, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and I could name you twenty-nine seats, twenty-nine that we will win. That is the government. That is the government, Mr. Speaker. We will probably win more than twenty-nine, but at least twenty-nine that are sure bets. And the poll that was done recently, that frightened the life out of the Tories, that caused them to shiver in their shoes, is the real reason why the Premier has taken to the airwaves

MR. NEARY: so much in the last few weeks.
You forgot Naskaupi.

MR. TULK:

MR. NEARY: No, I mentioned Naskaupi.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier can

try all he wants -

MR. TULK: Gander, Trinity North?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not even listing the Trinity North one. I am not even listing it, although I am pretty sure it is a sure bed for us. I am not listing it. That is not one of the twenty-nine.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province can try all he wants to blame everything that is happening in Newfoundland today on Ottawa. It is not washing, it is wearing very thin. People are getting fed up with it and they are beginning to ask what this government is doing about matters that come under provincial jurisdiction. Like this morning I started out by asking the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) a simple, basic, elementary question, because, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we even have to re-educate the members of this House as to what is provincial jurisdiction and what is federal jurisdiction. I know. I know, Mr. Speaker, but to listen to hon. members, you would swear that everything comes under Ottawa, nothing comes under the provincial government, that you may as well shut down the provincial government and install federal representatives, turn it into a territory, put a federal representative in all the ministers' offices. You may as well do that the way they talk, Mr. Speaker. They have an opposition mentality, their opposition being to the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, what has this opposition mentality, what has this hostile attitude, what has this barrage of propaganda, this hatred for Ottawa

MR. NEARY: and the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister of this country - what is that costing Newfoundland? What is it costing Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker? Your Honour, I am sure, must have thought about that many times, lying in bed at night saying, 'Well, I wonder what my future is in politics in this Province?' I am sure that other hon. members have asked themselves, How much damage, what damage, what is it costing Newfoundland, this poor relationship between Newfoundland and the Government of Canada? What is it costing? Is it costing us anything? Would we be better off if we had a reasonable, common-sense working relationship with the Government of Canada? Would we be better off, Mr. Speaker? Your Honour cannot answer me. I am sure if he could he would say, Yes, we would be better off. We have lost in the last two years alone millions piled upon millions of dollars as a result of the attitude of this government towards Ottawa and the Government of Canada. Millions of dollars have been left on the Ottawa table, programmes have been ignored and not taken advantage of, contracts have been delayed. Procrastination has cost us a small fortune at a time in our history when we can least afford it. The construction industry is in a chaotic condition and yet, Mr. Speaker, millions of dollars, housing money, is being left in Ottawa as a result of this Province being unable to negotiate agreements with the Government of Canada.

It is terrible, Mr. Speaker, when you think of it. Every time I go up to Ottawa they tell me about this programme, that programme, the other programme where money is left on the table. And I would not mind it so badly, Mr. Speaker, but money is being left on the table in agreements that we already have signed; the agricultural agreement is an example. Every year,

MR. NEARY: even though the Government of Canada have signed an agreement with the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), they cannot spend the money. They cannot spend it. Last year there was something like \$6 million or \$7 million or \$8 million left that was not spent and this year it will be the same way.

MR. STIRLING: Ten million dollars for public housing.

MR. NEARY: Ten million dollars

MR. NEARY: for public housing. Industrial parks, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada are just waiting for the provincial government to come with a proposal on industrial parks throughout the Province. But here is the hitch, Mr. Speaker, just listen to this, because the industrial park which is 90 per cent - is it 90 per cent or 100 percent? -

MR. STIRLING: That is the word, boy. That is the word.

MR. NEARY: - well I think it is 100 per cent federal money. The Government of Canada says, We want to build an industrial park in Gander, we want to build an industrial park in Port aux Basques and we want to build an industrial park somewhere else and the Province says, 'Oh, no, no, Mr. Government of Canada, you may be paying the bill but we are going to tell you where to build the industrial parks'. And that has been the hang-up. Political game playing, Mr. Speaker, that is the hang-up on the industrial parks. This government is playing political games. There is another programme held up. I can tell this House right now and the people of this Province that we should have had an industrial parks programme several months ago. Ottawa is waiting to get the ink on the paper and this government, Mr. Speaker, is procrastinating. This is the sort of thing that the media of this Province should be delving into, should be looking into. The great CBC which is supposed to be the instrument of national purpose, instead of allowing the Premier to bamboozle them and to choose the topics that they will discuss and debate and investigate, they should go off on their own and be independent enough to develop their own issues, to develop their own topics, not just take the word of the Premier as being gospel. I talk about the CBC because they are being funded by the taxpayers of Canada, that is the only reason I mention that media.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a waste of taxpayers' money.

MR. NEARY:

Particular medium, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

at a time in our history when we have the greatest depression in our whole history. We have construction workers who are forced to go to Alberta or take unemployment insurance or welfare. The construction industry this year is a disaster. It is a disaster. And another thing, Mr. Speaker, I might say is that this criticism, this blaspheming and ridiculing of Ottawa has to stop, it has to stop, and I am not defending Ottawa. I will take Ottawa to task, Mr. Speaker, when it is necessary. When it is necessary I will quarrel and fight with Ottawa, and I have done it and I will continue to do it. But I am not going to just fight and argue and quarrel with Ottawa for the sake of playing little, narrow-minded political games. I am not going to have a buttoned-down mind as far as the Prime Minister of this country is concerned. Mr. Speaker, I think that is wrong. That is wrong for this government. They are doing a disservice to the people of this Province when they continuously, without justification, without reason, as we saw this morning - the Premier coming into this House this morning with a Ministerial Statement that I would submit, Mr. Speaker, was prepared before the federal budget came down.

MR. HANCOCK:

That is right. Right on!

MR. NEARY:

Because he was going to say this morning what he said immaterial of what was in the budget. It did not make any difference. He was going to twist and distort to suit himself and it really did not make any difference. Because this government through their mismanagement, Mr. Speaker, through their mismanagement of this Province, the economy of this Province, their blundering and their extravagance and waste have gotten this Province into a

MR. NEARY: terrible financial mess. We have a crisis in the fishery as a result, a direct result - it has nothing to do with Ottawa. I established this morning, at least I hope I did, that fish, when it goes ashore, is processed and is marketed, comes under provincial jurisdiction.

MR. TULK: : Now, if the minister would only realize that.

MR. NEARY: And where is the problem in the fishery, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TULK: Sitting over there.

MR. NEARY: It is in processing and marketing. What does Ottawa have to do with that? What do they have to do with it?

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: They have a lot to do with marketing. It is a provincial matter.

MR. TULK: The problem is sitting over there.

MR. MORGAN: Industry, Trade and Commerce.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Industry, Trade and Commerce my foot. It is the provincial government's responsibility -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. STIRLING: He does not even realize he has the authority already.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not know what authority he has. From the time the fish is landed on shore -

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why I am going (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - on the wharf, until it is processed and sent to the markets, it is a provincial

MR. NEARY: responsibility.

MR. TULK: The problem is over there.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman took off the other day for Los Angeles, took off to Los Angeles on Air Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. The hon. gentleman, the other day, with all kinds of fanfare and publicity, took off for Los Angeles, California, to find new markets for fish:

MR. MORGAN: San Francisco.

MR. NEARY: Five years ago, Mr. Speaker, down in my own district of LaPoile, Eric King Fisheries. Gabe Billard Fisheries shipped -

MR. MORGAN: A small amount (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Yes, small amounts. They could have shipped their whole production if they had gotten what I am leading up to. Mr. Speaker, They found markets in California on their own. They did not need any provincial or federal help. But what was the problem? What was the problem, Mr. Speaker, that they could not ship more fish to California? Well, I will tell the House what it was. This is five years ago now that I am talking about, and Eric King Fisheries is still sending fish to Boston and Billard's are still sending fish to Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. Here was the problem. Air Canada charged fifty-four cents a pound freight for the fish that was air lifted to California five years ago. Fifty-four cents they charged and it was not feasible. It was impractical because of the high freight rate to ship fish to California. Now five years later, five years later you would not know from listening to the Minister of Fisheries

November 13, 1981

Tape No. 3408

ah-4

MR. NEARY:
original idea.

and Air Canada that it was an

MR. MORGAN:

Co-operation.

MR. NEARY:

That it was a new idea.

MR. NEARY: The fish was airlifted from Stephenville. It could have been a big, big industry. It could have been a big market for Newfoundland fish. As a matter of fact, there was a private air company set up out there that went bankrupt.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Air.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Air.

MR. MORGAN: There were more markets for fish for last month than (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) something. Mr. Speaker, let me say something to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If I were the hon. minister, I would not open my mouth too wide. In Isle aux Morts, where Connors Brothers are operating, there are no problems with markets. In the other plants in my district, apart from T. J. Hardy, which is having problems with inventory, all the other plants have an unlimited market for fresh fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And they have had it for years.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the East Coast now selling fresh fish.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is telling us nothing.

MR. CALLAN: So what else is new.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) no problem with the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how easy can certain people be conned? Switch on your radio and you hear a press release being read. You would not know but what it was the first time it ever happened. They do not give equal time to the other side of the story. I told a couple of these people they had better get in touch with Eric King to find out what happened to his market in California.

MR. NEARY: What happened to it was Air Canada would not give him a freight rate that would enable him to ship his fish to California. Fifty-four cents a pound is what they wanted for it.

MR. MORGAN: Going to the West Coast this weekend to open a new plant.

MR. NEARY: I invited my hon. friend the same as I invited the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). I invited my hon. friend to tour the district of LaPoile. I have written him and I have asked him to come down. He will get a very warm and friendly welcome. We have the best inshore fishery in Newfoundland. It peaks in the Wintertime, it is year-round. It is the best inshore fishery in the Province and the one, Mr. Speaker, that has been ignored and neglected most by the -

MR. MORGAN: We are putting the funds in now and (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: In where?

MR. MORGAN: In LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Where? Where are the funds going?

MR. MORGAN: Read tomorrow's paper and see the contracts we awarded.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is welcome, and I will go with the hon. gentleman if he wants me to. I will take him to every community and the hon. gentleman will have to come back to this House and report that he was treated in a very courteous way - a very sensible people who have a few problems that they would like to tell the hon. gentleman about; they have a few solutions that they would like to offer. And I can tell the hon. gentleman now that he would get a very warm and friendly welcome. That is more than he can say about a lot of parts of Newfoundland. But I would see to it, and I would be glad to accompany him in the interest, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I would be glad to do it in

MR. NEARY: the interest of trying to resolve some of the problems of the fishery on the South West Coast.

MR. CALLAN: He will never go back to Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I got a bit sidetracked there on the fishery, but I want to come back to the relations between the provincial government and the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, negotiations are ongoing now for the offshore jurisdiction, the development of the offshore resources. I could make politics out of it. Mr. Speaker, I could if I wanted to, say to the Premier, We told you so two years ago. I could very easily say to the Premier, You have wasted two precious years that you will never get back, blaspheming Ottawa when you should have been sitting at the table negotiating an agreement on the offshore. We tried to get the message through in this House; we even presented a Private Members' Resolution. I believe it was voted on unanimously after a while - no, they voted against it, the government voted against it.

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. NEARY: They did not believe in joint management.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: They did not believe in it. Now what are they doing, Mr. Speaker? They are sitting around the table negotiating an agreement for joint management of the offshore resources, the ownership question being set aside.

I would suggest that the ownership question is going to be a very difficult question to deal with. Let us hope it will not. Let us hope a deal can be struck on the other matters involved in the management and

November 13, 1981

Tape 3409

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: development of the offshore resources and that the ownership question will be referred to another tribunal, to an independent tribunal. Let us

MR. NEARY: hope that will happen. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I fear though with the people who are involved in the negotiations, you could not if you combed the Province, you could not find two more nastier individuals to be key players in the negotiations. You could not find two more nasty people who have a chip on their shoulder, who have narrow minds, who have buttoned-down minds, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: The cocktail set.

MR. NEARY: One I took care of in LaPoile district in the last election, and the other one is seated across the House.

MR. WARREN: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: You could not, if you combed the face of this earth, you could not find two more nasty individuals to throw into the middle. It is like throwing a skunk into the middle of a Brownie picnic party, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is like.

MR. TULK: The Speaker agrees.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping - I know maybe I am hoping against hope - but I am hoping that they will be brushed aside, that their snide, nasty remarks will be ignored and that negotiations will go on until an agreement is struck on the offshore and, if necessary, the ownership question referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. That is the only way we are going to get an agreement.

I hope this government will not use the offshore as an issue in the election, that they will break off negotiations quickly, abruptly, and say, "We cannot get an agreement. The Government of Canada are trying to shaft us." I hope, Mr. Speaker, they are not playing that kind of a game, that they will say, "We could not get an agreement. We own it and we are going to take it over, we do not care what happens", and then go into an election and ask the people to give them a mandate. That is one possibility, Mr. Speaker, but

November 13, 1981

Tape No. 3410

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: that will not work. It will not work.
The people have had enough
of oil. I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, this is another
thing that irritates me, the way that this crowd have taken
over one of our projects as if it was their very own. Who
was the government? Who was in power? Who was the government
of this Province when SEDCO I arrived in Newfoundland waters
to drill for the first time offshore for oil and gas? Who
was in power?

MR. MORGAN: And who was it who said, It is ours, it is ours. We own it.

MR. NEARY: And who was it, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: It was the former Premier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, who was it that paid -

MR. MORGAN: We own it. We own it. It is ours
out there.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And who was it, Mr. Speaker, who
paid the cost of two university professors going and laying a
plaque on the floor of the Grand Bank saying that the Grand
Banks belonged to Newfoundland? Who was it who did that?

MR. CARTER: Who?

MR. NEARY: Yes. Who? Does anybody know?

MR. MORGAN: It is ours. It is ours.

MR. YOUNG: The same fellow who told them
to burn their boats. The very same fellow who told them to
burn their boats.

MR. TULK: With that crowd in power they
might as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, who was it who
started the offshore oil development?

MR. WARREN: The good Liberal Government,
of course.

MR. NEARY: A good Liberal Government. And
it was a Liberal Government that paid the cost of putting two
plaques on the floor of the Atlantic Ocean, claiming that
territory in the name of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I know they do not want to hear this. I know they do not want to hear it. I know every time somebody accuses the Liberals and the Tories of stealing an NDP platform, or a policy from the NDP, they do not want to hear it. They do not want to hear that any more than they want to hear about stealing programmes and policies from the NDP, as the Liberals have done occasionally over the years. Nobody wants to hear that. Nobody wants to hear the truth. But it is true, Mr. Speaker. It is a fact. It is a matter of public record. It is history that it was the Liberals who started this great forward march in this Province back in 1967 or '68 -

MR. MORGAN:

Boy, your getting desperate

now?

MR. NEARY:

- when we brought SEDCO I into Newfoundland. This has to be said, Mr. Speaker. You have to put things in their proper perspective. You have to go back and look at the history and the background,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, But what has happened since then? Mr. Speaker, we started a development that may revolutionize the whole of Newfoundland and to hear the Premier talk sometimes - the Premier, Mr. Speaker, - glad to see Your Honour in the Chair, welcome. - the Premier, Mr. Speaker, what does he do? He writes me, he goes public, he is allowed to get away with it - he says the Opposition are against oil and gas, the Opposition are against ownership, when it was the Liberals that started it. That would be like being against one of your own children, would it not? Mr. Speaker, how do they get away with it? How?

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I believe was in the House when we - he may not agree with the permits we gave out, he may not agree with some other things that we did but, you can nit pick all you like. You can say we gave permits to the wrong people, but at least we gave permits. We gave a permit to a company from Calgary that started the first offshore oil development in this Province. And I am proud of it. I am proud, Sir, that I was part of an administration that did that.

But I am afraid, over the years, with this maniac that has been turned loose in this Province, this menace to Newfoundland, that they have made a proper shambles. Blunder after blunder, Mr. Speaker, blunder after blunder. Mr. Speaker, the average person in this Province - let me say this, and I hope this will be recorded for posterity - the average person, the average Newfoundlander does not believe that he will benefit from offshore oil. Let me put him in order, how the children and

MR. NEARY: how the people, especially in rural Newfoundland, think the benefits of offshore oil will be shared up. This is something we have to change, Mr. Speaker. Here is what people of this Province think. First of all they think that St. John's will get all the benefits. The people in Corner Brook, Labrador, the Southwest Coast, the Great Northern Peninsula, everybody, every ordinary person, thinks that St. John's will get the benefit. And only then a handful of people in St. John's, the moneybags. That is what they think.

Number two, most people think, apart from St. John's, the Avalon Peninsula will get the benefits. And then, Mr. Speaker, next in line, third in line are the multi-nationals.

MR. HISCOCK: What?

MR. NEARY: Yes, the multi-nationals. The average Newfoundlander thinks St. John's, a handful of people in St. John's will benefit, a handful of people on the Avalon Peninsula will benefit, third in line the multi-nationals, then Alberta and then the people of Newfoundland. The average persons in this Province, according to the surveys and polls that I have seen, feel and think, that they will be fifth in line. And why do they think that? Why do they think it? Because the Premier of this Province is putting all his eggs in one basket. He keeps talking about oil night and day, he eats it, he sleeps it, he drinks it. Oil is all he can think about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we feel, we, on this side of the House, that oil is important to the Newfoundland economy, but we think it should be a part of a mix, that

MR. NEARY: you should not put all your eggs in one basket, that there are other things in Newfoundland equally as important as oil. The Premier can only think about the big issues. Well, what about the small and medium issues in this Province? What about the fishery and what about the mining industry, and what about the forest industry, and what about the construction industry that are in one heck of a mess? He can only think about oil. And when he talks about oil, he is talking mainly about St. John's. It is St. John's-oriented. So can you blame the ordinary person out there for thinking that all the benefits are going to go to a handful of well-to-do

MR. NEARY: people in St. John's and on the Avalon Peninsula? Can you blame them for thinking that? They have been brainwashed day in and day out by the Premier of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, something else, too, is that the Premier has made so many blunders on this offshore issue, created such a bad climate, such a rotten atmosphere for development in this Province, that all the development now is going to Halifax in Nova Scotia.

MR. WINDSOR: That is not so.

MR. NEARY: It is so, Mr. Speaker. We are getting all the evils here, all the disadvantages of oil, and all the benefits are going to Halifax. Everybody knows that, anybody who has been in Halifax recently knows that. All of the big oil companies - Petro Canada - are all gravitating towards Halifax and towards Nova Scotia and poor old Newfoundland, if we do not watch ourselves, is going to be shafted again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is where the great battle has to take place. The battle is not with the Prime Minister of this country, with the Government of Canada, who have stated that they will give Newfoundland 100 per cent of the offshore revenue until we became a 'have' Province. So our argument is not with the Government of Canada, they are not the enemy. We should be carrying on friendly relations with the Government of Canada to try to get a swift settlement, to try to resolve this matter quickly - the matter of the development of the offshore - and then, Mr. Speaker, fight for our rights and not let the offshore development benefits, the spinoff benefits, go to Halifax by default. Because that is what is happening, Mr. Speaker. So the government, the Premier especially, has created a very, very confusing and frustrating atmosphere in this Province, a climate that is not conducive to development, is not the kind of political and economic climate that would attract industry to this Province. As a matter of fact, it is so hostile it would drive industry away. I have talked to representatives of the oil companies in

MR. NEARY: the last couple of years, and I am talking about well up in the oil companies, who think that the Premier of this Province is a menace. Now, I do not mind them thinking that, oil people are peculiar people, but when they are right, Mr. Speaker, that frightens me. They tell me, We could not care less about the provincial government or about their regulations. And that worries me, Mr. Speaker, because that means the credibility of the Premier of this Province and his ministers is gone, his credibility is shot, in the eyes of the business community. In the minds of the people who have the risk capital to invest in this Province, in the minds of people who should be flocking to Newfoundland to invest and to develop new industries, in their minds, Mr. Speaker, we have a Premier whom they consider to be a raving lunatic, and that is unfortunate. He has no credibility left.

MR. MORGAN: What about Prime Minister Trudeau?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, at least Prime Minister Trudeau, the other day, got one of the most prestigious worldwide awards when he was presented with the - what was the award?

MR. WARREN: In New York

MR. NEARY: New York - something about man.

MR. WARREN: The Man of the Year award.

MR. NEARY: The Man of the Year award for something - but, anyway, it is a very prestigious thing.

Mr. Speaker, the only award that our Premier will get will be for being about the biggest chaw-bag in the whole of Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: So his credibility is gone. His credibility with Ottawa is gone. His credibility with the rest of Canada is shot. His credibility in the money markets is gone. His credibility with the international business world does not exist. His credibility, Mr. Speaker, he has no credibility left. And all he is doing most of the time is ranting and raving and talking to himself and his ministers, because nobody else is paying any attention to him.

But coming back to this bill, Mr. Speaker - Do I only have five minutes left? I thought I had unlimited, unlimited time.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird): Five minutes.

MR. S. NEARY: It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, after listening to the Premier this morning when we were talking about this bill and what it will mean to the Public Treasury - I have here in front of me a little brochure that shows that 51.2 per cent of the revenue of this Province comes from Ottawa, 51.2 per cent. This year \$1,296,000 for every man, woman and child in Newfoundland will come into the Public Treasury from Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our total this year from Ottawa will be \$753 million in equalization grants and in transfer payments alone. Just two items, \$753 million. And next year it will be \$782.4 million in equalization grants and transfer payments, not talking about unemployment insurance benefits, the family allowance, the old age pension, Canada pension, veteran's allowances, Fisheries spending, Public Works spending. I am merely talking about transfer payments.

MR. W. MARSHALL: What would you want to give it all away for?

MR. S. NEARY: Give all what away for?

MR. W. MARSHALL: You are giving everything away.

MR. S. NEARY: What are we giving away?

MR. W. MARSHALL: You want to give everything away.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we were the ones who took control of it. Mr. Speaker, the only reason the hon. gentleman can make a statement like that is because we put two plagues on the floor of the Grand Banks that said that the offshore belongs to Newfoundland. And the hon. gentleman can get up and be as devious and as treacherous as he likes, but he is not going to change that fact. That is a fact of history. They may try to walk away with the offshore development as if it were their very own, but history, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this Province know that that is not so.

MR. MARSHALL: Who did that?

MR. NEARY: Two university professors. The cost of it was paid for by the Liberal Government, one of them was killed in a traffic accident after, I forget his name now.

MR. STAGG: Professor Lilly.

MR. S. NEARY: Professor Lilly is right.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome this bill and I do hope that it is a forerunner to improving relations between the provincial government and the Government of Canada. We cannot function as a Province, Mr. Speaker, we cannot carry on if relations deteriorate any further with the Prime Minister or with the government of this country. We cannot do it. It is virtually impossible! We will lose too much. Maybe five, ten years down the road we can tell the whole world to kiss our rears, but at the moment, Mr. Speaker, when we have so much poverty, when we have a very serious depression in this Province, I think it is far better - we do not have to give anything away. You do not give anything away in common-sense negotiations. The hon.

MR. S. NEARY: gentleman can twist or turn all he wants. You do not give anything away in hard bargaining. You sit down and you bargain in good faith, Common sense will prevail, right will win out in the end, Mr. Speaker. And I hope this is a forerunner of improved relations between this Province and the Government of Canada, because we need it very badly at the present time.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak for a few minutes on this bill. It is interesting to note that Bill No. 106 is an act

MR. WARREN: to ratify, confirm and adopt an agreement between the two governments. This morning you would not believe that, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier came in and gave a Ministerial Statement condemning the federal government, when we had a bill coming into the House about an hour or so later asking for an act to ratify an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, if we all listened last night to the famous MacEachen budget -

MR. WINDSOR: Famous. Him?

MR. WARREN: He will become famous, Mr. Speaker. I agree with a lot of comments that were made across Canada last night, that there was not too much in the budget to be excited about.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Stirling was excited about it.

MR. WARREN: However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) should be one of the few who probably should be showing a little bit of excitement because, as far as we can read at the present time, there are still going to be payments towards education in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should think about something positive that was in that budget, that this government will not only believe but will not act in the same manner, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the Northern allowance paid to employees in the North. Northern allowance paid to employees in the North will continue at least for another year to be tax free. Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is a fantastic move on the part of the federal government for employees living in the North. I remember the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), only about two or three weeks ago, coming back from B.C. and making a

MR. WARREN: Ministerial Statement saying, 'I am going to contact the federal government. I am going to make sure that the federal government do not tax employees living in the North.'

AN HON. MEMBER: It did not do any good, did it?

MR. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, at least for another year they are not going to be taxed. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is alright, but he is a minister of a government which has over 600 provincial employees living in the North who are paying tax on the Northern allowance. Now, how could that minister come back from B.C. and demand of the federal government by saying, Look, you take care of your federal employees without taking care of his own provincial employees? And there are over 600, including the nurses, the teachers and so on, living in Northern Labrador who are not only paying taxes on their Northern allowance, but who are receiving the lowest Northern allowance anywhere in Canada, from the government in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, how on the one hand can he ask the federal government to help alleviate the tax burden on those people living in the North, to give them encouragement to work in the North, when this government on the other hand, with their own provincial employees, are just taking away any initiative that those employees have for working in the North? At the present time they are payed something like \$1,770 a year for a married person compared to about \$4,000 that the federal government is paying their employees. And that \$1,770 is presently taxable and the lowest across Canada, Mr. Speaker. So at least that was one positive thing that was in the MacEachen budget last night when he brought it down, that at least for another twelve months this Northern allowance will not be taxable.

MR. STAGG: Name another one.

MR. WARREN: Yes. I can name another one, that there is some relief for homeowners who have an extraordinary burden on their mortgages. There is some relief in that respect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: Yes, some relief that is.

MR. STAGG: Name another one.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that is two more than this government can boast about at the present time. Because this government have taxed the car drivers, the people who drive cars in this Province, by upping their licences. They have taxed the hunters, the rabbit catchers. They increased their licence. They taxed anybody who is getting married. They are paying more for a marriage licence. This is the kind of government, Mr. Speaker, that we are speaking about here.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! if I may interrupt the hon. member, while he is collecting his thoughts I would like to, on behalf of

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): all hon. members of the House, welcome to the Speaker's Gallery today Imperial Sir Richard Olfene who is the Imperial Chief Ruban of the Shriners of North America. He is the former State Senator of the State of Maine and to attest to his good stock, his mother was born and raised in Heart's Content.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And he is here presently to help celebrate the silver anniversary of the St. John's Shrine Club. We welcome you, Sir, to our Galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: We do not have a member over there now in that area, Heart's Content, we are waiting for a by-election.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that was one example of this government's showing that they want to continue with any agreements with the federal government and have the Premier of this Province come in and make a Ministerial Statement, saying, Look, the federal government is no help to us.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the things that the federal government, Mr. Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau have done for Newfoundland. Let us look in my district alone. A \$38 million native agreement was signed this year. Mr. Speaker, that agreement was 75 per cent to 90 per cent funded by the federal government and 10 per cent, or a little better, by the provincial government. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was over 75 per cent or, we will say, \$33 million of that \$38 million coming from the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, what I find ironic about this agreement is it was signed in July. It was signed on the second day of July and this government refused to release any money to the community councils in my district

MR. WARREN: until mid-October. In mid- October when the construction season was practically well over, then this government decided to release some of this money. Now, I wonder what was behind that, Mr. Speaker? What was behind it, I wonder? They now will come up now to the next fiscal year, next year, and this government will have excess money lying over from the native agreement. It is just another way of trying to cover up some of the spending in other parts of the department.

Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree in part with my hon. colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and also with the comments that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) made with respect to the CBC. I believe that CBC is one of the best, probably the best reporting station in the Province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that only for CBC, in particular, the Labrador Coast and all of Labrador would be practically well back in the Dark Ages. Because no other television or radio station, other than a small outlet in Labrador City and Goose Bay, has considered setting up any stations at all in Labrador. And I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that in my district in particular, now that we have live television in Nain, in Hopedale, Makkovik and Postville - and this is only just one channel and it is a CBC channel - I am quite pleased, at least, to know that we do have a Crown Corporation, a television and radio network that is sponsored by the taxpayers of this Province, that does go into the remote areas of this Province, and of Canada, and brings not the word of gospel, I suppose, but at least the voice of the politicians and what is going on further down South to those people.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we can go on and on.

I think this government, in many cases, is ignoring the people up North.

To give you an example, Mr. Speaker, the Torngat Fishermen's Co-op had a market for 400,000 pounds of turbot in September month. At this time they sent a telegram to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) asking if they could release the fish plant that is owned by this government so that they could market this turbot. It took three weeks, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: The minister first said no. The minister's officials said no. A second telegram went out. I sent two telegrams myself and the Co-op sent two telegrams. Both times the minister said, 'No, we need more information.' Meanwhile, all the information was given. The federal government, through Canada Manpower, decided to give thirty-three people on-the-job training in the processing of turbot.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about agreements between the federal and provincial governments and this will tie in, Mr. Speaker, we need agreement between both governments. Here was Canada Manpower, which is part of the federal government, willing and able to go into Makkovik and train thirty-three people in the processing of turbot and the provincial government said, 'No, you cannot use our provincially-owned fish plant . Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what you call co-operation. And it took three weeks, and the best part of that fishery was over . Finally, after so much pressure - and the minister was gone down to California - after so much pressure, word came down from the Premier's Office, 'Okay, Torngat Co-op, we will open the fish plant. That was three weeks later. Now, that is what you call co-operation, Mr. Speaker, to the fullest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we will only just look - not too long ago, talking about co-operation, there was a DREE agreement in the making. However, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Premier said, 'Look, we are not going to sign that agreement, which includes eight airstrips to be built in Labrador, unless we get more for our Trans-Canada Highway. Now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government had money allocated for eight extra airstrips along the Labrador Coast but because there was not extra

MR. WARREN: money for making the Trans-Canada Highway a four lane highway, or something to that effect, the Premier and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) would have nothing to do with the signing of that agreement.

The people in Hopedale or the people in Makkovik, Mr. Speaker, do not have any paved highways; in fact they do not have any highways at all, all they have are basic cow paths and they are quite satisfied with that if they could have airstrips. There is only one way, Mr. Speaker, of getting in and out of Makkovik in the Wintertime, and that is by aircraft; in the Summertime, Mr. Speaker, by another federal government arm, by CN Marine. That is the only way of getting back and forth. And, Mr. Speaker, this government could not see the rationale of the people on the Labrador Coast having a means of transportation. So it is a little bit disgusting when you see a government where all they want is something for the Island, paved highways all over the Island, but do not even have the decency to put their signature to an agreement that would give vital, essential airstrips to Coastal Labrador. Mr. Speaker, you talk about co-operation! I am surprised that the federal government have the know-how to continue to negotiate, continue to carry on business with this government when they are so naive, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have any priorities at all. All the priorities they have are concentrated in and around the St. John's area.

The people in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, are so upset with the way the provincial government have been treating them, that I would expect any day - in fact in the next provincial election the Progressive Conservative Party of this Province will be ashamed to run any candidates

MR. WARREN: up there. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, there will not be any Progressive Conservative candidates in any of the four Labrador seats the next time around. Because I am sure that they are going to get the shock of their lives, they are going to be entirely annihilated, wiped out completely, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what has the provincial government put into Goose Bay in finances in the last five years? Take away the federal contributions to Goose Bay - Happy Valley, and take away the Native agreement and the federal fisheries and the DREE agreements along the Labrador Coast, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has more money in the bank than the provincial government have put into Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I think this government have to take on a new attitude. I think this government have to show more positiveness. This government have to take the bull by the horns and stand up and say, Look, we will treat all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians alike. We will make sure that if there is any funding coming down from Ottawa, and if it is for any particular area, that we will make sure that we will put our signature to it.

This is Friday the 13th, Mr. Speaker, and after MacEachen's Budget last night, people will probably say it was a dark day for all of Canada,

MR. WARREN: but Mr. Speaker, I think the way this government is acting, that today, on Friday the 13th., they should change their attitude. It is a good day to change their attitude because I think that the people out there, the people out there who are going to cast votes in the next election, the people who will cast the votes in the next election, can make a decision as to what kind of government they want in this Province. We all know now, because the Premier has been challenged for the last five or six months to call an election. And we have to challenge him continuously to call an election, because we know, and the Premier knows, that once he calls an election then the few members who are going to be left, the few members who are going to be left, they will just be transferred to this side as soon as the House reconvenes.

MR. HODDER: Immediately. Immediately
(inaudible) a new leader.

MR. WARREN: You can see, Mr. Speaker, that this government has to change its attitude and it has to change it fast, because the people out there, the public people, are so concerned with the confrontation attitude, the confrontation attitude that this government is taking towards Ottawa. And the bread and butter issues that come down from Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, this government has not got the decency of passing that along to the consumers.

Thank you, very much. X

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

X
MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on Bill 106 concerning the adoption of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of our Province respecting reciprocal taxation.

MR. HISCOCK: The question is when one government pays taxes to the other government, what is done with the money? What is done with the money that Canada pays on goods and their buildings and services in Newfoundland here and what is also done by our own Province? What is done with this revenue? And I would like to just pick up on a few things, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), said.

Yesterday I presented a petition in this House that asked the people - and I am rather surprised that the Bay of Islands also, that district, they have a one room school infested with rats. But I presented a petition yesterday from Cape Charles concerning the reduction of their teachers.

The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) made a tour of the district and after she made a tour of the district she gave a press release saying that the schools in the Southern area and Eastern Labrador were sub-standard. When they asked the minister what she was going to do about it, "Oh, it is not our responsibility. We give \$12 million to the school boards and it is up to the school boards to do the building."

The school boards have said that they need \$200 million to bring facilities up to standard, and then they need another \$200 million to get onto expansion. That was, Mr. Speaker, last year, before we had the increase in high interest rates. So I would like to know now what school boards would need. So the \$12 million is not going to go very far.

But what is happening to the Southern area of Labrador? And I would like for the minister to pay particular attention to this because it is going to happen in other areas. We have seen a reduction in Port Hope Simpson of students in the integrated school there, and now they only

MR. HISCOCK: offer grade nine in that school. The other schools - they go to the Pentecostal School in Port Hope Simpson.

In Charlottetown, for the first time, you only have one teacher teaching from Kindergarten to Grade IX. In Pinsent Arm you have one teacher teaching from Kindergarten to Grade IX. In Norman Bay you have one teacher teaching from Kindergarten to Grade IX. And the question I want to ask the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and the government, and our people in this Province, is what equality are we providing to these students? What opportunity are they going to have to have their dreams, hopes and aspirations met in the future? And I would say, Mr. Speaker, when the integrated school board said that there was a thirty per cent

MR. E. HISCOCK: drop-out rate in this Province, that I can easily take all these communities and say some of them have not even had one person from those schools ever reach Grade XI. And many of the reasons are that there are no extra-curricular activities in the school, They do not have any library facilities, they do not have any gyms, they do not have any science equipment, they also do not have any music or any other extra-curricular activities that we, in larger urban areas, take for granted. So how is the interest going to be kept by these students? It is not very much.

Okay, let us take it a step further. After Grade IX and VIII in the communities of Paradise River, Black Tickle, in Port Hope Simpson and in Pinsent Arm and in Charlottetown and in Cape Charles and in Williams Harbour, after six or seven of these communities get the students out of Grade VII, where do they go then? The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) says, We have a bursary programme, they can go to some other area, They can go to West St. Modeste if they are from Black Tickle, or they can go to Port Hope Simpson if they are from Williams Harbour, or they can go to St. Anthony. Or if they are from Red Bay, with regard to Grade X and XI, they can go to Mountain Field Central High in Forteau. Is the bursary that is offered by this provincial government enough to pay the ever rising costs of accommodations for these students? The answer is no. We have seen this government, the Cabinet, vote itself a raise in secrecy. The Minister of Education got a 17 per cent increase this year. We have seen the teachers in this Province jump to at least 60 or 70 per cent from what it was ten years ago. Every bit that! When I was teaching we got a 40 per cent raise. And so if you take the amount of increase

MR. E. HISCOCK: that has gone to the government's salaries, to the teachers' salaries, to the school boards' salaries, it has been phenomenal. And there is no question about it, it is continually rising. But with regard to the bursary, have we seen that rise? No, we have not seen it rise. We have not seen it rise and, yet, now we are expecting people to take students in from other parts of the coast and almost feed them for nothing. And over and above that, how do they get home? Do they get home for Christmas, Mr. Speaker?

With regard to this taxation, reciprocal agreement, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill, I am saying what is going to be done with this money? And hopefully the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) will make sure that she speaks up in the Cabinet and she says to Cabinet that this money that Canada and Ottawa are going to be spending in this Province, in an reciprocal arrangement, that we are going to take some of this money and put it in schools, we are going to take some of this money and put it in bursaries. People in Black Tickle can only afford to go home Christmas, they cannot afford to go home during the Easter break, they cannot afford to go home during let us say, the mid-term breaks.

Another thing that I am also concerned with is let us say they reach Grade XI and Grade XII, then what is available? Well, if you are a Grade XI - a Grade XII student now, in a few years - you are a Grade XI student and you want to go to trades school or fisheries college, the only way you can go is as a provincial student because you are coming right out of school. And as a result of that, what is the amount of money that is given by the provincial government in its bursaries to the students after they get their Grade XI or their Grade XII? Twenty-five dollars per week, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HISCOCK:

And again you cannot go to Port Hope Simpson or Cartwright or Forteau or West St. Modeste on that, you have to go to St. Anthony, you have to go to Gander, you have to go to St. John's, you have to go to Corner Brook or you have to go to Goose Bay. And there is no way that you are going to be able to exist in this Province on twenty-five dollars, so what happens, Mr. Speaker? The classical things happen as happen when the students are in Grade VIII, Grade IX. They cannot afford to go, so they do not go on to post-secondary education. And again what happens to our students in rural, remote areas? We are again putting them back

MR. HISCOCK: into the labour force, putting them in with the idea that they have to be loggers, they have to be miners, they have to be fishermen. There is nothing wrong with being loggers or miners or fishermen, but at least they should have the opportunity to make the conscious choice. We have a government here now that for the past ten years has been delegating and regulating people into the work force. There will be no question in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that we will have to import immigrants from Pakistan or from Jamaica or from some of the third world countries to come in and become garbage collectors or become sanitary engineers, if they want to be called that, or to look after our subways or to look after picking our crops on the Niagara Peninsula. We here in Newfoundland and Labrador, if we need some people to work in the fish plants, will not have to have the third world countries come in because of cheap labour, we have enough of our own people relegated to the back seats of our society so that we will always be able to say, 'Okay, we can get a few people from the Labrador Coast or the Northeast Coast or the South Coast of Newfoundland, in these small remote areas, because they will not be able to get their Grade XII, or their Grade XI, and they will not be able to go on to post-secondary education on twenty-five dollars a week.

So I say to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), if he increases his own salary by 17 per cent, why does he not increase the bursary of twenty-five dollars to students so they can at least pay their rent? Why does he not increase the transportation allowance so they are able to go home on the Easter break or their mid-term break? Not all the students - and you know another crime is a lot of the students stay out a year and the danger is that many of them never get back into the educational forces again. They stay out a year so they can qualify for Manpower, and Manpower only buys so many seats. And here we have a government

Mr. Hiscock: which claims that 1,100 people are on the offshore and here are our young, potential Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have to stay home because they cannot afford to go to Trades School or Fisheries College or university on twenty-five dollars a week that is given by this provincial government. And we are a Province that basically now are lauding ourselves and patting ourselves on the back because we have 1,100 jobs in the offshore. What do we have? Roughnecks and roustabouts and people like that instead of taking our university students here and sending them off to Yale and off to Harvard and off to Cambridge and getting them into petrochemicals, getting them into chemical engineering, getting them into other things and then basically bringing them back, in five or ten years time. And if they do not want to come back then good riddance. But we should compliment ourselves on educating our people to go to other parts of the world. I would rather have a chemical engineer born and bred in Newfoundland who finally goes to Toronto or Halifax or New York, instead of having somebody go and take a labour job in the factories. And, Mr. Speaker, this government is renegeing on its responsibility, one of the most important responsibilities that they have, and that is providing a future of education in this Province. The former President of the University, Mr. Morgan, has said that this government and this administration, for the past ten years, have neglected the university. They do not even know it exists there any more, Mr. Speaker. And I am saying, how could we ever permit this in our society? If we are going to continue to designate schools down on the Labrador Coast to only one teacher with up to nine grades, how are we going to do it? How are we going to get them into university or even into a community college in Stephenville? If they want to go to the community college in Stephenville, which some of them do, how can they afford to go there, Mr. Speaker?

November 13, 1981

Tape No. 3419

SD - 3

MR. HISCOCK: The answer they cannot. So I am saying,
Mr. Speaker,

MR. HISCOCK: all this money that is taken from Ottawa on the reciprocal taxation revenue - what I would like to ask is , if we are going to have all this taxation, what type of society do we want to build? What type of society do we want to build? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is the development of our number one resource, and that is not oil, that is not fish, that is not a mining resource or the woods resource, it is our people. And this government, Mr. Speaker, and members of this House, is neglecting its greatest responsibility and that is developing the resource of our younger people. We are not doing it, and I am surprised the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is not getting up and supporting me on this one, because he also has many people in his district who want to go on and become first-class citizens in this Province and in this country and world. There is no question about it, they are never going to become number one people in this Province or country if we do not - how did Senator Forcey ever become the number one Canadian constitutional expert in this country, or Archbishop Carew or E.J. Pratt or a number of other people? It was because of economic conditions and also because of educational advantages. That is why. And even the president of the university and other people in this Province. We no longer have a government that is caring about the people. One time, if you wanted a grant or a scholarship you could go, and for the most cases those who wanted - When Mr. Smallwood - and the greatest testimony to Mr. Smallwood, the former Premier of this Province, is that the university students became so educated that they put him out after twenty-one years. They became disillusioned -

MR. WARREN: Twenty-three.

MR. HISCOCK: They became disillusioned by various things -

MR. NEARY: In two years this crowd accomplished what it took us twenty-three years to accomplish.

MR. HISCOCK: But with regard to the idealism of our youth, always, and it should always be, the idealism of youth should always rebel against the establishment. And after awhile, when the university was established, they did, but they also rebelled against the PC administration. And with regard to this administration, I do not even think they know the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) exists. And when they did do that, they went in and had a political meeting with regard to cutting back on health, on Medicare and on post-secondary education. How much is this Province spending on the university? I know that the federal government just the other day ended up putting \$50 million into a C-core development, the worldwide institute that will be developed there. I do know that we developed the College of Trades and Technology as well as the Fisheries College. I know that we have advocated a petrochemical institute. And what of this government? For the past ten years it has been in the budget but it has never materialized. I also know that the federal government, for the most cases, built the engineering department and built the medical department. And what are we doing? We are quite content to say twenty-five dollars is enough for these students in this Province. And as for the university, well, when Mr. Crosbie got elected here, with Mr. Moores, he turned around and said to the people of this Province, to the young people, 'I paid my way through university and you can pay your own way too. We are getting rid of these grants and bursaries that were available and

MR. HISCOCK: if you want to get through, go and get a Canada Student Loan.' And who is providing the Canada Student Loans at low interest rates? Again our own government. So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would hope that our Premier will realize that our resource is not the oil, it is not the fish, it is not the mines or the woods operation, it is our younger people -

MR. NEARY: Oil, oil (inaudible)

MR. HISCOCK: - and that he will increase the grants from twenty-five dollars a week to fifty dollars a week and that he will also increase the bursaries to students in this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ~~X~~

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

~~X~~ MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close off the debate on this side by referring to the statement that the Premier made this morning. In my response to the statement that he made this morning, I expressed our concern that he had rushed into print, so delighted to be able to kick Ottawa in the head, that he had not checked out his facts. And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that he used turned out to be, as I had expected. In his hurried fashion, in his method of dashing into print with his basic philosophy that he does not trust anyone, believes that man is dishonest. He was so eager to kick Ottawa in the head that he grabbed at it and rushed into print. Now, Mr. Speaker, he talked about the established programme funding.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: All morning long there has been

MR. MARSHALL: debate which has not been relevant at all to the principle of the bill . This bill is to ratify an agreement with respect to reciprocal taxation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is just using this purpose right now for talking about a Ministerial Statement that was made this morning for which he had quite adequate opportunity to respond and did.

I cannot help it, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a slow thinker, which he obviously is, and it takes him two or three hours to get the import of the statement. But he cannot delay the House and interfere with the rules of this House. It has to be conducted. The principle of this bill relates to reciprocal tax agreement and not to what the hon. member is referring.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is a taxation bill which, as Your Honour knows, gives the members an opportunity for wide-ranging debate. It is a money bill and, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that all the hon. gentleman is trying to do is to stop the Leader of the Opposition from bringing out the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to the point of order let me say that the Chair has allowed a fair degree of

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

latitude in debating this bill and if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is referring to a Ministerial Statement as a brief preamble to debating the bill which is before the floor, of course the Chair will allow a brief preamble because we are in second reading. And I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he would do just that. It certainly appears to the Chair that there is a legitimate point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, the point of the bill, reciprocal tax agreement, includes specifically equalization, That is in the bill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I had to read the bill I could not be more pertinent. This is what this bill is all about and this is what the Ministerial Statement was all about this morning, reciprocal agreement

Mr. Speaker, that is what I want to talk about, the reciprocal agreements in this bill, the equalization payments, the established programme funding. And I am talking about the tendency of the Premier, with his public relations against Ottawa, so anxious that he dashed into print - and I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that he was intentionally trying to distort it, it would be unparliamentary to say it here in this House. Somebody is going to have to come to that conclusion after they look at the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that I am referring to the same thing that the Premier is so I am going to quote him exactly. He said "this cutback" - he talks about it - "the federal government's own figures and because one part is based on provincial revenues which are falling, it is probable the cutbacks will even be greater.

MR. STIRLING:

This cutback will have a severe impact upon Newfoundland. This programme is dedicated to two areas, post-secondary education, and health care. At a time of high inflation generally and most particularly in this area, reduction of money is difficult to contemplate."

Mr. Speaker, to put it plain and simple, in language that even the other side might understand, that is not true. What was said this morning in this statement is not true. I have been talking to the minister's office, Mr. MacEachen's Office, and the table which was used to distort the situation earlier today was taken out of context. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I had thought to get health and post-secondary education continued. Facts, Mr. Speaker, facts. Number one, fact, 1980 the amount of money that came to this Province under that agreement was \$214 million. Fact, \$214 million. Fact, 1981, the amount that will come to this Province will be \$221 million, Mr. Speaker, Not a cutback, Not a cutback, Mr. Speaker, I would have been happy if it had stayed the same, not a cutback, an increase of \$7 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter in putting it in context, health and education are both provincial government responsibilities. This government in 1980/81 cut back, not slowed down the increase, cut back the university's budget, cut them back by \$3.5 million over what they had intended and what they had asked for.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us put it into

MR. L. STIRLING:

proper context. The Premier of this Province had his speech made up and he intended to give it regardless of the facts because his central theme, Mr. Speaker, is 'That poor little welfare officer, That poor welfare officer who cannot run the Province'. All of Canada is against him, seven or eight or ten provinces were all going to gang up and he goes back to that same under-dog position. Poor little arrogant guy who lives in an estate, the most expensive welfare recipient that we have in this Province, getting his estate paid for by the people of this Province. But he goes back to what he feels comfortable with. It seems that this small Province and his government, with an overtaxed population, is left, as it so often is, alone to solve economic and financial problems that it did not create and for which it is not responsible. Their total theme, Mr. Speaker, 'Attack Ottawa, They are all alone, they cannot do anything about it, the world is coming down around their ears. Let us get back to something that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. Let us deal with facts. The fact of the matter is, the Premier, in this, said it, they were cutting back on education and health over 1980. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, there has been no cutback and it will increase to over \$221 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what they are talking about in this table is the total concept of what they would have received if nothing had changed. And it includes all of the total concept including a tax collection fee that this Province has been collecting since 1972. It does not change education, does not change health. But this

MR. L. STIRLING: is a savings, a table that shows the savings to the federal government. In other words, if they had used the old formula and continued to project it, it would have had an increase in there of much more than is in there now. But under this system the rate of increase has been cut back so that the federal government will save. And the reason—the anti-Quebec position that they took in this document that they released this morning, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the difference is Quebec collects its own taxes and is not paid to collect its taxes. That is the reason for the difference. But when it suits them they can agree with René Levesque. René Levesque's concept of Canada fitted better the Premier's concept of Canada than the Canadian concept. When it suits them they can attack Quebec, when it gets to the point where they say, 'Oh, let us kick Quebec again. It looks like Quebec is getting more money.'

The fact of the matter is that this Premier has said that it was cutback in those two areas. We on this side joined with the students in this Province and said there should be no cutback. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no cutback. There is an actual increase coming for post-secondary education and if this government wants to siphon it off and use it somewhere else, use it somewhere else, maybe another fence around the fence, another pavement, another \$100,000 to be spent on the welfare recipients residence, then, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to get away with it. The people of this Province have had enough of the attempt to gloss over, confuse, attack Ottawa because, Mr. Speaker, whichever way you look at it the federal budget - and I would have liked a lot of things different in the federal budget if we had a provincial government here who were going to try to make recommendations, try to put up proposals. They talked in terms of the federal budget. They have not put a proposal to deal with any special projects for employment, not a project in the fishery, not a project in

Nov. 13, 1981

Tape No. 3422

DW - 3

MR. L. STIRLING: housing, no projects in construction.

They just sit and complain and complain and criticize.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am doing

MR. STIRLING:

is defending the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. I am defending the people of Newfoundland and Labrador against a government that does not want to govern. They do not want to tell the truth. They are trying to create a phony target. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility is here in this Province to manage the affairs of this economy. This government was given a mandate to govern, not sit on your hands and look like a worried bunch of children and say, Oh, Ottawa is all at fault. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is they have not given the people the full story, the full truth, and I am dealing only with those two specific things. There is no cutback in post-secondary education grants or in health grants, so do not use that as an excuse to take away the right to strike from the people in the hospitals. Do not use that as an excuse. Face up to it and come up with some imaginative programmes to manage this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the President of the

Council.

If the hon. the President of the Council speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not intend to close the debate immediately, Mr. Speaker. Having heard the Opposition go on on this relatively minor bill - not minor bill, but a bill whose subject is much more constricted than we heard this morning - I intend to answer most of the items that were raised.

I would, in the few moments that remain to me, though, like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that yesterday when we walked into the House, the Opposition wanted a debate on the economy of this Province. Today when we brought in this bill, debate on

MR. MARSHALL: second reading of the bill was very wide-ranging and we heard, Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition was about to say about the economy. And make no wonder that there was no urgency of the debate, because I do not think anybody, Mr. Speaker, listening to the Opposition this morning, could answer any way at all affirmatively that there would be one iota of contribution or benefit to the people of this Province and to the economy of this Province by the words and by the debate which they gave.

Now, the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker, relates to reciprocal tax agreements, but they have chosen to use the period of time to talk about the relationships with Ottawa and what have you. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, they are crying in their soup right now because significantly they did not mention one single word about the triumph of the Premier and the government in the constitutional debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: They did not do that. They want to talk about anti-Canadianism, they want to talk about not co-operating with Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, who pulled the irons out of the fire in Ottawa last week?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And they cannot stand it, Mr. Speaker. The whimpering, simpering 'Steve' over there, he just cannot stand it. He has to get up, and he is just motivated, Mr. Speaker, then to, you know, blast off against the - look, at one period of time he either hates Premiers or he is a lap dog to them. But, Mr. Speaker, I will get into that on Monday. I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Debate is adjourned by the hon. the President of the Council. X

The hon. the President of the Council.

November 12³, 1981

Tape 3423

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising, adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, November 16, 1981 at 3:00 P.M.