

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Pursuant to Section 29,
Subsection(1)of the Parliamentary Commissioner(Ombudsman)
Act, the seventh annual report of the Parliamentary
Commissioner was received in my office a short while ago.
I now table the report and will arrange to have copies
distributed to all hon. members very shortly.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of
the hon. the Premier, who has not been in the House now
for going on three weeks -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: That is not so!

MR. NEARY: It is so! I am forced to direct -

MR. STAGG: The Leader of the Opposition
has not been in the House since April 6th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad we
do not have television in this House. It would be much
better than the Muppet Show.

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to direct
my questions to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).
I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the administration
have taken any new initiatives in the last week or so to
try to resolve the offshore dispute or to settle up their
differences with the Province of Quebec, or are they
waiting for this Province to sink to the depths of poverty

MR. NEARY: before they take any initiatives to try to get these big mega-projects going in this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot one-up the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) in his answer. As the hon. gentleman is forced to ask a question, unfortunately, I am forced to reply to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the situation on the offshore is as it was a couple of weeks ago. The position is that this government is ready, willing and able to negotiate at any given time. Unfortunately, the federal government is not disposed to negotiate with us; the federal government instead harps on what they perceive to be a precondition, which precondition

MR. W. MARSHALL: of this government is that ownership be set aside during the period of negotiations and permanently in the event that agreement was reached. In effect, Mr. Speaker, that precondition means that the Province of Newfoundland is saying, 'We will enter into negotiations with a view to entering into an agreement, if you will agree that afterwards you will not tear up that agreement.' And I do not think that is, Mr. Speaker, an unreasonable precondition. On the other hand, the federal government sets a precondition and that precondition is that ownership not be set aside. So in effect what they are saying when they say that, Mr. Speaker, is that we enter into negotiations provided we can reserve the right at any time thereafter to tear up the agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, we act and we hope we act in the interest of the people of Newfoundland. I think the people of Newfoundland perceived this to be so on April 6th when they returned forty-four members. And we feel that we would be breaking faith with the people of Newfoundland if we entered into negotiations with a view to consummating an agreement which gave either side, either this Province or the federal government, the right to tear it up after it has been entered into. So we are awaiting, Mr. Speaker, with anxious anticipation a statement from the federal government that they are prepared to negotiate, to negotiate in good faith, to negotiate on the basis that ownership be set aside, which was the basic foundations on which the negotiations were set up in the first place. In other words, what we are seeking from the federal government, Mr. Speaker, is a commitment that when we enter into an agreement they will not tear it up afterwards, as the Commonwealth of Australia did in respect to its agreement with the states of Australia. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that is unreasonable.

June 30, 1982

Tape No. 1822

MJ - 2

MR. W. MARSHALL: I do not think any government acting in the interest of the people of this Province could do anything otherwise.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the answer just given by the hon. gentleman is silly and just demonstrates further the hostile attitude of this Province, which is an impediment and a hindrance to ever getting a negotiated agreement with anybody, with that kind of an attitude. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what needs to be done in order to bring the parties back to the bargaining table so that they can attempt to resolve their differences and negotiate an agreement in good faith? What has to be done? Will this Province, for instance, withdraw its case presently before the Newfoundland Appeals Court if Ottawa agree to withdraw its case from the Supreme Court? Or even better again, will both parties agree to just ignore the court cases and sit down to the table and negotiate in good faith before Newfoundland goes down the economic political tube, before everything moves over to Nova Scotia?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two things that need to be done. The first thing that has to be done is the maintenance of confidence on the part of the government of this Province as to the future of this Province and the determination

MR. MARSHALL: as to the assertion of our rights. If we adopted the attitude exhibited by the hon. gentleman when he referred in his first questions to us sinking to the depths of poverty or going down the economic tube, that is the attitude that the hon. gentlemen exhibit time and time again, and it is the type of attitude that would lead to selling Newfoundland down the tube the same way as they sold them down the Churchill River, then the Hamilton River, when they entered into the Upper Churchill agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: It is precisely that psychology that led, Mr. Speaker, to the gigantic giveaway, the biggest giveaway in the history of the Canadian nation. That will not happen, Mr. Speaker, while this government is in power.

The next thing that needs to be done, Mr. Speaker, is an expression of sincerity by the Government of Canada indicating that it intends to negotiate in good faith. And they have not exhibited this sincerity in the past, and I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to three specific instances that occur to me with respect to this. First of all, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources can on the one hand look the people of Newfoundland straight in the face and say that they are not advocating or advancing in court the ownership matter when at the same time the lawyers for Ottawa were before the court, the Federal Court of Canada, advancing the ownership issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not so.

MR. MARSHALL: That is not a statement by me, Mr. Speaker, that is a statement that can be verified from the record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Another indication of the type of sincerity we require is the Minister of Justice of Canada (Mr. Chretien) gets up and indicates that there twelve other instances similar to the present one where the Supreme Court of Canada accepted a direct reference. When the Parliament of Canada's Library Assistants looked into this, they

found out that not one single instance of this had any credibility. That is not an indication of sincerity as well, Mr. Speaker. Imagine, the Minister of Justice for all Canada, it has to be from lack of confidence or for some other reason that the hon. gentleman could make such an amazing statement that could be so easily refuted and certainly reflects the lack of sincerity.

Another indication of the lack of sincerity, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of the transmission corridor, where we are denied our rights as a Province of Canada and as citizens of Canada where they say unequivocally that Bill C 108 has been deferred for six months when the last paragraph of Bill C 108 - and I will Table Bill C 108 tomorrow, I do not have it handy, but I will Table it for the hon. members so they can see it - and the last paragraph of Bill C 108 says -

MR. NEARY: We have it. I have it down in my office.

MR. MARSHALL: - "It will not be proclaimed until the federal government wishes it to be proclaimed".

So what we require are two things, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, we require from the federal government an indication of its sincerity, an

MR. MARSHALL:

indication it will not use its position to try to obscure the facts and mislead the people of the Province and mislead the people of Canada, a sincere indication on their part that they are prepared to negotiate and negotiate in good faith. So that is what we are looking for. And the other thing we need is an attitude - we do not have to look for this because I can guarantee it, Mr. Speaker - we have to have an attitude which is not the lap doggish attitude of the hon. gentlemen there opposite of getting down on their knees to Ottawa all the time and by taking such attitude that unless we give everything away we will be in the depths of poverty and we will go down the economic tube. The latter part we can guarantee to the people of this Province, that we will stand up for the rights and the legitimate rights of Newfoundlanders as Newfoundlanders and as Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL:

But what we require, Mr. Speaker,

in order to resume negotiations is an expression of sincerity on behalf of the Government of Canada which heretofore has not been forthcoming.

MR. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

In that answer, Mr. Speaker, we found out just how narrow-minded the hon. gentleman can be. They are approaching this thing with a buttoned-down mind, they are paranoid, Mr. Speaker, they have no confidence in themselves as negotiators. It is not us on this side of the House who are crying out for a negotiated settlement; all the heads of the churches in Newfoundland have urged the hon. gentlemen to get back to the bargaining table. The business community, business and industry is trying to

MR. NEARY: encourage the hon. gentleman to get back to the bargaining table. And even a former Minister of Energy, Mr. Barry, the member for Mount Scio, urged the hon. gentleman to get back to the bargaining table. Negotiations is a two-way street, The hon. gentleman is asking the Government of Canada to show some sincerity. Well is this administration prepared to show some sincerity in negotiations and get back to the bargaining table and negotiate in good faith? And will the Premier, while he is attending the First Ministers' Conference up in Ottawa now, will he take any new initiatives to try to get together with the Prime Minister and try to bring about a resolve, a settlement, of this matter before all the businesses in this Province go bankrupt?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there is no group that more earnestly desires to have this matter resolved through negotiations than this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But before this government can in good faith sit down and negotiate this particular issue, there obviously has to be a recognition on both sides that we are entering into an agreement which neither side can tear up, either one day, one year, five years or ten years later. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not too much to ask.

He asked whether the hon. the Premier and the Prime Minister would be getting together on this subject in Ottawa. The subject that they are getting together on is the economy, and the state of the economy - and I mean the 'state' in all its senses - the state of the economy of Canada that has been occasioned by the fiscal management of the federal government. But in connection with this business of get together, it has to be remembered that before the negotiations commenced it was the Premier of this Province who requested of the Prime Minister of Canada that they get together for the purpose of setting the parameters of the talks themselves in the hopes and in the expectation that this was necessary in order for there to be fruitful negotiations. And it was the Prime Minister of the country, Mr. Speaker, who refused to get together with the Premier. So I am quite sure, knowing the Premier and knowing the policy of his government, that this government is ready, willing and able, either in the person of the Premier, who is presently in Ottawa, myself who is the minister responsible for negotiation, or any other minister or any other member of caucus to get down and sit down

MR. MARSHALL: in earnest negotiations. But before, as I say, there can be negotiations surely there has to be agreement on the basic tenet that any agreement entered into has to be one which either side cannot reserve the right to tear up, because that is what the issue is all about. The federal government refers to preconditions. The hon. gentleman, who is the man servant - I cannot call him the maid servant- but he is certainly the servant of the federal government and exhibits all of their wishes and all

MR. MARSHALL:

of their comments, urges us to get together. So I say to him who is so close to the Mr. Lalonde who he would not trust as far as he could throw him, and to Mr. Trudeau, if he wants to do service to this Province, then what the hon. gentleman should do, since he is so close to the federal government, is to urge them to negotiate in good faith and to negotiate on the basis of an agreement which the federal government will undertake with the people of Newfoundland and the people of Canada that they will not tear up afterwards. We are prepared to give this undertaking and we have given it, and once it is given we will enter into negotiations. We will not only enter into negotiations but, as we have already indicated, we are prepared to withdraw all court action. We only took a court action because we were forced to as a result of the intervention of the federal government in the SIU case. And we took that action and the federal government in turn has taken another action. That action has been unprecedented in Canadian annals despite the attempts by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) of Canada, in a base way and in a way that requires explanation by him, to indicate was preceded in effect has been unprecedented. So they have taken an unprecedented action which has been accepted in an unprecedented manner by the Supreme Court of Canada to hear this issue before it has gone through the normal process. So we are prepared to withdraw, as the Premier has indicated, the court actions. All we want and we honestly desire is an expression of sincerity by the federal government, their indication that they will sit down and negotiate with us in good faith and will negotiate with us on the basis that we will both enter into an agreement which

MR. MARSHALL: we undertake and we expect them to undertake will not be torn up afterwards.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the answer just given by the hon. gentleman has all the logic of a Mad Hatter administration. Mr. Speaker, we represent nobody on this side of the House except the unemployed in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - businesses that are going bankrupt, young people who are looking for employment, senior citizens who have to pay more for their drugs - these are the people

MR. NEARY:

we represent on this side of the House and we are not servants of Ottawa or anybody else outside of this Province.

What I would like to know now, Mr. Speaker - the hon. gentleman has attached now another string to his bow. Instead of now talking about setting aside the ownership permanently, he is now using the excuse that somebody can tear up an agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman elaborate on that? Because my understanding is if there is an agreement negotiated, it has to have the approval of the Legislature of this Province, the Parliament of Canada, the signatures of both parties. How can it be torn up? I mean, surely the hon. gentleman is not that narrow-minded and not that suspicious, Mr. Speaker, to think that an agreement that is negotiated in good faith, signed by both parties, approved by the Legislature of this Province, approved by the Parliament of Canada, that the next day they are going to tear it up. I mean, what kind of logic is that?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not just logic, it happened. It happened in the case of Australia and it can happen here.

MR. NEARY: Oh, we are down in Australia now, are we?

MR. MARSHALL: What the hon. gentleman does not understand - and the hon. gentleman cannot understand anything because I think the hon. gentleman has little cupie dolls of the Prime Minister of Canada and Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chretien, Mr. Ouellet -

MR. SIMMS: Rompkey.

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Rompkey and all the rest of them, you know, that he venerates every morning so he cannot see beyond them. But let me try to explain to the hon. gentleman. If ownership is not set aside and the parties do not agree to set aside ownership, what happens through the instrument of the supremacy of Parliament is that notwithstanding the fact that an agreement is entered into, if ownership has not been set aside and set aside on the basis of a constitutional amendment, it can mean that either side, no matter what the agreement, no matter what the agreement, can bring in legislation which can cancel that agreement in the future. Now, this is not ordinarily available, Mr. Speaker, to individuals, but because of the principle of supremacy of Parliament, it is available to Parliaments. It is available to the House of Parliament and it is available to the Legislature, and if the hon. gentleman wants to see an example of it, I can give him one that is foursquare and that is the Reversion Act. The Reversion Act repeals a previous act, which in effect repeals an agreement, and we have no shame or we make no excuses because of it. We have taken that dramatic action because of the fact that that agreement we view to be completely unconscionable and one that was entered into on the basis of undue influence and many other instances.

MR. MARSHALL: So the fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman does not understand. When we say the parties agree to set ownership aside, we mean that the parties agree to set ownership aside and they will not pursue that issue. We mean that they will engraft the agreement on joint management in a constitutional amendment which will preclude any one of them unilaterally from cancelling that agreement. We mean, in effect, that either side foregoes the right that they have by reason of parliamentary supremacy and the right to legislate, to unilaterally tear up the agreement. And that is what the issue is all about. So if the hon. gentleman thinks that this is based on bile and invective and hate for Ottawa and all the rest of the appellations that the hon. gentleman loves to dwell in, I draw to his attention the fact that the continent or the Commonwealth of Australia is governed by the same laws as Canada in this respect in that they have this principle of parliamentary government, of supremacy of parliament. The net result of that was a similar agreement was entered into which was in fact torn up by the Commonwealth of Australia, which is the counterpart of the federal government. Having seen an example like that we have seen two things. We have seen, number one, the theory, and we have seen the practice, and we have enough practice from our relationships with the federal government in relation to our hydro to realize that we are not going to subject the people of Newfoundland to further punishment and to further bitterness along this line. We want to negotiate, but in summary, Mr. Speaker, we insist that before we enter into an agreement it has to be one that cannot be torn up by either side. In order to do this I repeat so the hon. gentleman can get this through his silver cranium that ownership has to be set aside, it has to be set aside permanently or else, if that is not done, what can happen is either side can tear

MR. MARSHALL: up the agreement. And we are not by way of giving Ottawa the opportunity, under any government of any party, the possibility of tearing up any agreement that we enter into with respect to the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Energy, was absolutely 100 per cent correct last weekend when he said that the personalities in these negotiations should be changed, and there was an example of it right there. The hon. gentleman is so suspicious about somebody tearing up something, Mr. Speaker, that he will not get back to the bargaining table and negotiate a settlement to this dispute. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there is a stalemate, there is a dead-end. At the present time business is becoming discouraged, the unemployed in the Province are discouraged, the heads of the churches are discouraged, everybody in the Province is discouraged. They gave the administration a mandate, a mandate to negotiate a settlement and they are not carrying out their mandate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Let me ask the hon. gentleman once more what can be done, because it is going to take one to two years, if not longer, to settle this matter in the courts.

MR. WARREN: Right.

MR. NEARY: That means the offshore is delayed for another year or two. The development of the Lower Churchill will be delayed for another year or two. The cost is escalating. The cost of developing the Lower Churchill is now up around \$4 billion.

MR. MORGAN: Speech! Speech! Question!
Question! Question!

MR. NEARY: It would be soon uneconomical -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Why does not the hon. gentleman go back and finish his dance with Maggie?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it will soon be uneconomical to develop the Lower Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

The Question Period is only thirty minutes long, and maybe other hon. members to my right would like to ask some questions. So I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to be precise with his question, please.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we cannot wait much longer. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman again - in all sincerity, there is a stalemate, there is a dead-end. Nobody is talking at the moment - what can be done to overcome that situation -

MR. BARRETT: Get Trudeau out of office.

MR. NEARY: - so that negotiations can resume? Is there anything that anybody can do to get the parties back to the bargaining table? Or should we just throw up our arms in despair and say nothing can be done? This year will run out and there will be no move towards getting the offshore development going or the Lower Churchill developed? Is there anything at all that can be done showing good faith on both sides? Not just blaming Ottawa - the hon. gentleman has to take his share of the blame also. What can be done? Or who can do anything to try to get the parties back to the bargaining table to get these problems resolved?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman went ahead with a very interesting speech. Now one of the things he gets on with, you know, the usual thing, you always find when some one is afraid to meet reason that they get into personalities, and that applies to the hon. gentleman and anybody else who wants to talk about personalities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Personalities, Mr. Speaker, do not enter into this at all. I challenge the hon. gentleman to get up and answer what is being put to him, Mr. Speaker, because he cannot do it. And to get up and answer the fact that what is going to happen is if ownership is not set aside that the federal government and/or the provincial government is reserving the right to tear up the agreement. And does the hon. gentleman think that we should enter into an agreement which can be torn

June 30, 1982

Tape 1829

PK - 3

MR. MARSHALL: up by the federal government
at will? - be it a federal Liberal government, a Conservative
Government or an NDP Government, or Mr. Rompkev is party or
the Rhinoceros party or you name whatever party it may be,
Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that we would then be acting in the
interest of the people? Now let the hon. gentleman and the
other people talk, Mr. Speaker, not with respect to personalities,
but let them talk with respect to the reason that is being put
before them.

With respect to the stalemate.

I have said what has happened. This government is ready, willing,

MR. W. MARSHAL: able, anxious, open-armed to meet the federal government at any given time with respect to negotiations. We do not feel that this should be resolved in any event by court cases. We do not have this great sanctity of attitude towards judges in that this should be decided perhaps by one judge being a majority decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, although it would probably be more than a majority from what we have seen in the past, but regardless of that, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that this is a matter for judicial decision. This is a matter for political decision, for agreement in the Canadian way, and we are ready, willing and able to negotiate in the Canadian way. But in order to do it, when we are representing the people of this Province, we say again that it has to be an agreement that the other side is going to enter into on the firm understanding and undertaking that they will not tear up this agreement after it is entered into. And I ask the hon. member, instead of dealing with personalities, to address himself as to whether this is a reasonable, sensible, rational and responsible stand for the government of the people of this Province. And he can get on with all he likes about the matters of despair and the economic situation. Sure the economic situation is bad, A lot of the reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is the enormous \$20 billion deficit that has occurred in the national capital. A lot of this has resulted from the high interest rates that have occurred. A lot of this has resulted from the incapacity of the federal government to deal with the economic situation that not only affects the people of this Province but affects the people of all of Canada. And if the hon. gentleman there opposite or anybody else thinks that we are going to put this up on the pyre that we are going put our rights with respect to the development

MR. W. MARSHALL: of our resources on the offshore up to ease the mistakes under which this Province and the rest of Canada is labouring purely and simply because of the mistakes of the federal government, he has got another thought coming to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We are prepared to negotiate, we want to negotiate, and I challenge the hon. gentleman instead of getting into personalities to address himself to that. Do he and his party feel that this government should enter into an agreement that the federal government can tear up at will? Does he feel that we should enter into an agreement such as they did in Nova Scotia, where the federal government has all the say in the management of the offshore? Does he not realize if that occurs that all of benefits will flow, not to Nova Scotia exclusively but also in large measure to the Eastern Shore of the Province of Quebec, as we know? Does he feel, Mr. Speaker, that the benefits of the offshore should be tagged simply to equalization payments so that all we do is substitute equalization payments with our own resources? Or does he feel, as we proposed, Mr. Speaker, that the revenue and the benefit should be equated to average incomes, to average employment, to average taxes, to average infrastructure of health, and education?

MR. MARSHALL:

That is what he should address himself to, Mr. Speaker. Instead of on the one hand personalities, and on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, to this business of despair and, you know, because of the situation the federal government got us in that we should give it all away. It might interest the hon. gentleman, and perhaps he might like to remind this House, that a recent survey done by his own party, I understand with the financing of the Federal Liberal Party once again, has shown that this government on its offshore stand is in a stronger position than even it was on April 6th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, with that knowledge make no wonder the hon. gentleman's hair is white. It is a wonder he has got any hair at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be intimidated by the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: What we are asking the hon. gentleman to do, and the administration, is to use a little reason and a little common sense and try to resolve this matter before Newfoundland is ruined economically. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to this matter of tearing up an agreement. I am rather intrigued by the hon. gentleman's comments. This is a new concept now that they have introduced into the negotiations as what they see as a stumbling block. The first real issue they were hanging their hat on was that the Government of Canada would not agree to put aside the offshore ownership permanently. That was their first stumbling block. Now they are brushing that aside and now they are talking about somebody tearing up an agreement, and I am intrigued by that. Let the hon. gentleman tell this House what happens when an agreement

MR. NEARY: is negotiated. Mr. Speaker, no one will put a gun to the hon. gentleman's head or to the Premier's head to sign an agreement. They will only sign an agreement when it is in the best interest of the people of this Province and the people of Canada. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker? So before the signatures go on on the agreement, the agreement would have to be brought into this House and it would have to be debated in this House and approved in this House; the same way it would have to be brought into the Parliament of Canada, Mr. Speaker, brought into the Parliament of Canada and then, only then, will it be signed by hon. gentlemen opposite and signed by the Government of Canada. And Mr. Speaker, after going through that process and that procedure to negotiate a binding agreement,

MR. NEARY: then I fail to see how the hon. gentleman can even in his -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - wildest imagination figure that an agreement of that magnitude can be torn up.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. gentleman can fail to see the light. It is not a new concept. It might be a new revelation to the hon. gentleman, it might be the first time that we are getting through to the hon. gentleman. I hope it is because the hon. gentleman is so friendly with Messrs. Lalonde and Chretien and Trudeau that maybe he can get through to them, and Mr. Rompkey, where we cannot. Now let me explain it and let me explain it so the hon. gentleman can perhaps understand it, even though that might be an impossibility in itself.

Mr. Speaker, there is a principle of supremacy of parliament. Any law that this legislature makes, any agreement that this legislature makes, can be repealed. It can be repealed by an act of this legislature by bringing in another act cancelling it. The hon. gentleman knows this. He sat in the legislature for over twenty years, he has seen a lot of acts repealed and he has seen this happen. The same thing can happen with respect -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! I will permit the hon. President of the Council thirty seconds to finish up his answer. Then Question Period will be over.

MR. NEARY: Boy, you are finished anyway.

MR.MARSHALL: Thirty seconds is a long time, Mr. Speaker, to try to get over some thirty or forty or fifty years of ignorance.

MR.SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR.MARSHALL: Let me say this to the hon.gentleman that what applies here is the principle of the supremacy of parliament, and when you enter into an agreement the parliament of this Province, the legislature or the Commons can bring in an act cancelling that agreement, repealing the legislation. What we ask when we say that ownership be set aside is that it be set aside in a constitutional process so that neither side can change the agreement without the consent of the other. That is the true essence of an agreement between individuals and we want to make that apply to the two governments. And surely even in the hon. gentleman's estimation, surely that is not unreasonable.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of twenty-three residents of the community of Abrahams Cove in the district of Port au Port. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, says that 'We, the residents of Abrahams Cove and surrounding communities, petition the provincial government to upgrade our woods road. The road is located near the center of Abrahams Cove and is used by approximately fifteen families and is essential to our livelihood. The road needs ballast over a small bog measuring approximately 250 feet and would cost in the vicinity of \$1500. We ask the Department of Forestry to provide funds for this project.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the petition speaks for itself.

MR. HODDER: The woods road is very important to the community. It is a very small community which has not asked for a lot in the past years; I think this is probably one of the first things they have asked for. They are not millionaires in this little community; they are mostly small boat fishermen who try to make a living as best they can.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many people?

MR. HODDER: The hon. member asks how many people. I would say there are somewhere around perhaps thirty families.

MR. MORGAN: I am sorry.

I could not hear where it was.

MR. HODDER: Abrahams Cove, in the district of Port au Port, is near the crossroads where the road changes to go to Piccadilly or to go to the Cape St. George area. It is near that area.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the people in this area are dependent on the forest for their fuel. As I said, they are not rich people but hard working people who need this particular road. It is not a lot of money, and I would ask the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) to look into this matter - not just to take the petition and to file it away somewhere - to look into this particular case, to have some of his officials look at the road to see if the citizens cannot be helped, because this has caused some hardship for them during the months when they have to get the wood out to their homes.

I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly be glad to respond to the petition presented by the member. Certainly we have a system in Newfoundland of prioritizing woods roads and where roads shall be built, either for access to domestic cutting of timber or for pulpwood or for saw logs. Certainly in the Province over the last four or five years, through the assistance of a DREE agreement, this government has built a tremendous number of access roads. This year we will spend several millions of dollars in creating access roads in the Province to get access to wood and pulpwood and saw logs for the people of this Province. In the case of the community mentioned, we will certainly do the very best we possibly can, realizing, Mr. Speaker, that we have many, many requests for access roads around the Province and sometimes it is not practical to build a \$100,000 road to get to \$50,000 worth of wood. So we have a system of prioritizing our access roads in the Province and certainly we will take this petition in light of all of the other requests that we have in the Province and do the very best we can with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other petitions?

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon), I ask permission to table a petition from some 230 citizens, residents of the Millertown area, expressing their concerns about a proposed spray programme by Abitibi-Price under the supervision of the Department of Environment. In doing so, I appreciate the concerns of the citizens here. I have had discussions with the gentlemen who

June 30, 1982

Tape 1833

EC - 3

MR. ANDREWS: brought the petition to
St. John's, but I would also like to reassure the
citizens of our concerns and our intentions

MR. ANDREWS:

to very severely monitor the programme and remind this hon. House that permission has not been granted for the company to go ahead and carry out this small test project.

I would also like to say once again for the umpteenth time that this product that is being sprayed is safe for humans. It does not contain dioxons of any kind. It is not Agent Orange. I will say that again; it is not Agent Orange.

So with these things in our minds, Mr. Speaker, and if the company comes with a proper proposal that will guarantee to our benefit and under our monitoring that the programme will be monitored properly, we will permit this, but not if they will not follow our directions right down the line.

This test project offers us a possibility and a good possibility to learn something about the advantages or the disadvantages of such a project. We have been informed by forestry people that such a project on a large scale could greatly increase the yield of fibre in the Newfoundland forest, possibly. We do not know. We were also in some trepidation of the dangers of this type of programme affecting the whole environment, in particular the wildlife aspect. But it is with this in mind that if approval is given it will be to find out. We do not want to live constantly in ignorance. There is a possibility that it could be of some great benefit to our society in Newfoundland, there is also a possibility that down the road it could do us a lot of harm.

So this is a small test project and if it does go ahead I certainly think we will know a lot about our environment and about how chemicals work.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, certainly last night when the hon. gentleman appeared on television he did nothing to instill confidence in the minds of the people of Millertown, or any other part of Newfoundland, as far as this spray programme is concerned. The interviewer had the upper hand of the hon. gentleman all the way and I think most Newfoundlanders were shocked to learn, Mr. Speaker, that the Environmental Advisory Board was not allowed to consider this matter, and that one of the hon. gentleman's officials, one of the officials in the hon. gentleman's department -

MR. ANDREWS: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: No, but the interviewer had spoken to one of the officials in the hon. gentleman's department. The hon. gentleman could not answer it and that is what shocked me about it, how little the hon. gentleman knew about this subject. And you talk about living in ignorance, Mr. Speaker! There was an example last night right in living colour in your living-room of somebody living in ignorance.

DR. COLLINS: Is this debate?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not debate. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the petition.

DR. COLLINS: Oh good.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the petition, but I would warn the hon. gentleman that he should take all the steps under the Environmental Act, the legislation in this Province and allow the advisory board, the Environmental Advisory Board to take a look at this project before approval is given.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is a little confused. That is the next step in the environmental procedure, that before this goes any further, at this point in time, it goes to the Pesticide Advisory Board, the proposal by the company.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has not raised a valid point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman told us in the House last week that the company was pretty near getting the permit to go ahead with this project. Now, the hon. gentleman, now when he is backed up in a corner and the pressure comes on, now the hon. gentleman says it will be referred to the Environmental Advisory Board, and that is exactly the point -

MR. ANDREWS: You do not know how the plan works, boy. Read that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may. That was the point that was made last night by the interviewer.

And also, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman this question about the animals in the area. We understand from the people of Millertown, who are familiar with that area, that it is one of the areas of Newfoundland that has the highest moose population in the whole Province, and other animals, Mr. Speaker, a very high population. The hon. gentleman talks about monitoring; right now they do not know what the animal population is in the area, the hon. gentleman's department does not know, so how is he going to compare, if he does monitor the project, six months, a year down the road? What is he going to compare it with when they do not have the statistics in the hon. gentleman's department?

MR. ANDREWS: Do you want me to answer?

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity to answer it last night and he could not answer it.

MR. ANDREWS: That was because I had not given permission for the spray project. You are assuming that we have given permission.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there should be an assessment of that hundred acres they are going to spray to determine the number of animals, the kinds of animals in that area so that at least we would have something to compare the information that we are going to get six months or a year from now, we will be able to compare it with what is there at the present time.

June 30, 1982, Tape 1835, Page 3 -- apb

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this 2,4,D
was used in South Viet Nam, the hon. gentleman
admitted

MR. NEARY:

that last night, and that is enough to scare the people. Any kind of spraying, Mr. Speaker, is pretty scary business. And what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, the reason they are spraying is they want to destroy the hardwood because it is retarding the growth, so the hon. gentleman tells us, of the softwood. And, Mr. Speaker, if they want to destroy the hardwood, Ottawa just announced a big employment programme, why not employ Newfoundlanders and go out and cut the wood, or do some forest management in that area? Why is there a need to spray at all?

And so, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition which was circulated by the people of Millertown. I am very sympathetic to these people in that area. And I would hope that the hon. gentleman would go through all of the procedures and all the process before he comes down on the side of the company. This government, Mr. Speaker, this administration always seems to come down on the side of big business. And this is one time that I hope the hon. gentleman will resist that temptation and make sure that every avenue has been explored before any permit is given to the company to spray a hundred acres five or six miles from the community of Millertown.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Are there any other petitions?

Private Members Day.

The hon. President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I

may in the spirit of conciliation request, if it is possible at all the government would be amenable, it is a government private members motion that is coming up, but the

Opposition were agreeable to it, Mr. Speaker, we could dispense

MR. MARSHALL: with it today for the purpose of going on with government business. Of course, it is up to the House and the Opposition as well. But our side would be prepared to do it.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to dispensing with Private Members Day as long as the government will introduce measures that are meaningful to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what business the government intends to transact. We are satisfied to forego Private Members Day.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I can respond to the hon. member by saying, of course, the matter that is

MR. W. MARSHALL: before the House now on regular business, the appointment of parliamentary secretaries which I would not anticipate would have too much debate although it may well; it is a very dangerous thing for a person on the government's side to say. But it is just a non sequitur as it were, you can take it in that sense- and then we will follow with the Budget Speech and then afterwards, but not necessarily in this order, we have to deal with the Hydro Bill, which requires a certain amount of borrowing for the great works that we intend wrought in this Province, there is a matter of the Workers' Compensation Act, which is going to make certain accommodation particularly with respect to the Ocean Ranger situation, and one or two other bills, mainly around the financial provisions of the thing. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, without wishing to confrontationalist or that, that we will have a debate on the Budget.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have convinced us.

MR. MARSHALL: Convinced. Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Do we have unanimous consent to dispense with Private Members Day?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. MARSHALL: Order 45 Bill No. 45.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) adjourned the debate last night.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much more to say about this. Mr. Speaker, I used all the adjectives and all the hard language that I could muster up yesterday

June 30, 1982

Tape No. 1837

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY: afternoon to indicate to the
House and to the people of this Province what we thought of
these appointments where the administration is now in the
process of appointing four additional parliamentary secretaries
to ministers. We feel this is unnecessary, we feel it is

MR. NEARY: a waste of taxpayer money and, Mr. Speaker, it is another example of extravagance and political patronage on the part of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, they are going to ram this bill through the House whether we like it or not. This government in a very short time, since April 6th, has become very arrogant, very dictatorial and they are making decisions, Mr. Speaker, that are not logical.

MR. TULK: The Premier has to have his holidays.

MR. NEARY: It is not necessary for ministers to have parliamentary secretaries. We have one department that has already been devided and the Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle) who has only a budget of a hundred-and-some-odd thousand dollars, we have the Minister of Rural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) who has a very small department.

MR. TULK: You left out agriculture.

MR. NEARY: Is agriculture part of his responsibility?

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the number of political appointments that are being made by this administration are frightening.

MR. TOBIN: What?

MR. NEARY: Political appointments, straight political appointments. The hon. gentleman made one recently with the Chairman of the Agricultural Marketing Board. The hon. gentleman would not consider that a political appointment?

MR. TOBIN: No.

MR. NEARY: It is a political appointment.

AN HON. MEMBER: A political garbage bag.

MR. NEARY: I see.

But it is a political appointment.

MR. NEARY: But I am not talking exclusively about the hon. minister, I am talking about the administration as a whole, all the ministers, the number of political appointments they are making. They are by-passing the Public Service Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true. They are going on bended knee, they are going and genuflecting in front of the Premier and kissing his picture and saying, 'Mr. Premier, we do not want to accept number one on the list we want to accept number two or three. We do not want to accept the recommendation of the Public Service Commission.'

Mr. Speaker, the administration brought in a policy that is frightening. When the Premier wrote a memo to the ministers and said, 'You do not have to pick number one on the list, but if you do not pick number one you have to come and seek my permission in order to appoint anyone other than number one on the list.'

Mr. Speaker, they are so disgusted with the arrogance and the behavior of the government members that no wonder they are leaving the gallery. Mr. Speaker, that is a bad, bad policy. It leaves the hiring in the Public Service wide open for abuse. But we are not talking about that now, we are talking about

MR. NEARY:

parliamentary secretaries, which are an unnecessary evil. They are an unnecessary evil and all the Premier is trying to do is the Premier is trying to buy the loyalty of four members of his backbench who are disgruntled and disillusioned and discouraged because they did not get any recognition or because they did not get invited into the Cabinet. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

So the Premier decided he needed more lap dogs and more flunkies, Mr. Speaker, to use the hon. gentleman's term. These, Mr. Speaker, these are parliamentary lap dogs, or parliamentary flunkies, that is what they are. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province, the taxpayers who are struggling, will be disgusted when the word filters out from this House that what we are doing here is instead of debating a bill, or debating measures or policies that would help the unemployed in this Province, instead of debating measures that would help people pay their mortgages, or help people cope with the cost of living, or help young people who are getting married to go out and buy a new homes, instead of helping senior citizens to cope with the high cost of drugs, prescriptions, instead of helping young people get trained for employment, instead of helping the sick and the needy and the handicapped, and the halt and the lame, instead of bringing in these kind of policies and these kind of measures, in the dying days of this part of the session of the House, Mr. Speaker, they are bringing in a bill to appoint four of their buddies parliamentary assistants, parliamentary lap dogs and parliamentar flunkies, flunkies who will carry the suitcases and the briefcases for the ministers, and when they go off to the Super Bowl and

MR. NEARY:

when they go globe trotting and waltzing with Margaret they will have a lap dog or a flunkey to carry their briefcase or to carry their papers, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, that is enough to turn the stomachs of the taxpayers of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is anything else I can say about this.

MR. BUTT: Sit down. You are only making a fool of yourself.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman happens to be one of the lap dogs, Mr. Speaker, No wonder he is interrupting me over there. The hon. gentleman had great ambitions. When the election was over and he had increased his majority, his chest came out about six inches and he said, 'I am Cabinet material, I am going to be invited into the Cabinet.' And what a swift kick he got, Mr. Speaker, what a letdown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a letdown for the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) and what a letdown for all the other hon. gentleman who could not weasel their way into the Cabinet, who threatened a palace revolt. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that after the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who was the Minister of Energy, after he resigned-I would think that he had a pretty fair following in the Cabinet-and when the hon. gentleman resigned as Minister of Energy and he appeared to be very popular, a very popular minister throughout the Province, I would think that there was dissention in the ranks that we have not even heard about yet, and that the Cabinet was divided.

MR.NEARY: and there was a power struggle going on within the Cabinet. And I would think that the present Minister of Energy (Mr.Marshall)

MR.TULK: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has never supported the Premier.

MR.NEARY: That is right. And I would think that the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr.Stagg), who is now one of the parliamentary lap dogs, I would think that the hon. gentleman was a follower of the Minister of Energy at that time, the member for Mount Scio (Mr.Barry). But then the hon. gentleman had to denounce him.In order to get back into the good graces of the Premier and the Government House Leader,

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman had to denounce the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). So, Mr. Speaker, I would think at the time there were two factions -

MR. BUTT: Nobody wants your job.

MR. NEARY: I have one of the most responsible jobs in this Province. You have to have eyes in the back of your head. You have to have eyes in the back of your head, Mr. Speaker, to watch this honourable crowd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a responsibility this is, to try to keep this crowd straightened out and to try to keep them honest.

Mr. Speaker, I would think there were two factions in the Cabinet at that time, one led by the minister who resigned and one led by the Premier and his Siamese twin, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). So, Mr. Speaker, the election is over, the minister resigned -

MR. TOBIN: You only won by 21 votes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that when you win you win. It is not like the N.H.L., or it is not like the American Baseball League, there are no semi-finals, there are no play-offs, you either win or lose. And it does not make any difference, winning by one vote is just the same as winning by a million, the same thing. If you win you win.

And I am sure my friend, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) feels that he is a winner, and rightly so. The hon. gentleman had to go through a judicial recount to prove that he was a winner. The hon. gentleman is a winner.

MR. TOBIN: He doubled his majority.

MR. SIMMS: Here?

MR. NEARY: Right there, yes.

MR. SIMMS: He doubled his majority
sure.

MR. NEARY: Doubled his majority,
thirty-six.

MR. TOBIN: Talk about your majority
now.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Mine was even more
than the hon. gentleman's, but majorities do not mean
anything. You either win or lose in politics. You
either win or lose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have
these two factions in the Cabinet. As a result of the
resignation of the former Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry)
with his following, it looked like there may be a
number of people who were disgruntled in the Cabinet who
may do something drastic. And then you had the Siamese
twin, the Premier and the present Minister of Energy
(Mr. Marshall). So in order to win the support of the
followers of the member for Mount Scio, who is now
just a backbencher in this House, and the fact that they
had been overlooked when the Cabinet reshuffle was
taking place, these two things combined, Mr. Speaker,
made it look like there was going to be a palace revolt.
And so what did the hon. the Premier do? He called them
in, they genuflected and they kissed his picture

MR. NEARY: and he laid on the hands to make parliamentary flunkys or parliamentary lap dogs of the hon. gentlemen -

MR. STAGG: That is not fair

MR. TULK: What else are you? 'Neil says, 'Jump!' and you say, 'How high?'

MR. STAGG: It might be true but it is not nice to say it.

MR. NEARY: - with a promise -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, it was done with a promise of things to come. And hon. gentlemen are sitting over there now in wild anticipation, Mr. Speaker. They cannot wait. They were told by the hon. the Premier that within a matter -

MR. HODDER: Like dogs in heat.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they are just like dogs in heat over there now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - waiting to get invited into the Cabinet. And the Premier has told these hon. gentlemen that all they have to do is to wait five or six or seven months when there is a major Cabinet reshuffle, when some of the ministers who did not support the Premier will then be put out to pasture, and this would be a training ground and seven or eight months from now they would be invited into the Cabinet and all would be sweetness and light. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the hon. gentlemen, that I sat on the government side of the House for six and one-half years as a private member, as a backbencher, and there is nothing more frustrating, Mr. Speaker, as being a backbencher on the government side of the House, supporting -

MR. STAGG: There is one thing more frustrating, being a backbencher on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Oh, this is where the action is, over here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

And, Mr. Speaker, I would say this, to wind up my few remarks, that the hon. the Premier has only bought temporary peace. He has only quietened down his backbenchers for the time being. With forty-four members, Mr. Speaker, with the large number of backbenchers, I would say that there is an awful lot of discontent in the backbenchers on that side of the House, that they are awfully disillusioned, that members are getting awfully discouraged. They have to sit there day in and day out completely mute like dummies. When they see the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) get up and make a fool of himself as he did during the Question Period today and on other occasions, they hang their heads in shame. When they see the Premier blow his cool and become hysterical and manic in the House,

MR. NEARY: waving his arms, wild-eyed, ready to fight, and when they see the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) the mess that he has made of the fisheries in this Province, the chaotic condition of the fisheries, and to hear the hon. gentleman blame it on the CBC because they will not interview him, they hang their heads in shame. But, Mr. Speaker, they have to support that kind of philosophy, that kind of policy whether they like it or not. And if they want to get their little handout, if they want to stand in line and wait their turn, Mr. Speaker, they may be rewarded one of these days.

MR. HODDER: Some of them may be.

MR. NEARY: Some of them may be rewarded with a parliamentary lap dog appointment, like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) or Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) or St. John's West (Mr. Barrett). The member for St. John's West was a born flunky. He has all the characteristics, Mr. Speaker, of a valet, a personal valet, a gentleman who can carry briefcases and carry suitcases and wash out the underwear of the hon. gentlemen when they are in their posh hotels. The member for St. John's West would be good at washing out their socks and hanging them up to dry, and giving their boxer shorts a rinse. The hon. gentleman is built for it, made for it, born for that kind of a position. The hon. gentleman never thought in his wildest imagination that he would ever be able to realize his ambition as a parliamentary valet or a parliamentary flunky. The hon. gentleman was born to that job.

So, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen would just be patient, line up, they may be rewarded in the end. They may be rewarded in the end, and I would suspect that is where some of them will be rewarded. Because six or seven months from now when the reshuffle does take

MR. NEARY: place and some of the old guard are turfed out or flicked out, you are still going to have discontent in the ranks of the backbenchers. There is no way you can overcome it. You cannot buy the members off. You will only buy them off in the short-term, on a temporary basis, and then the trouble will erupt again. One, they will become jealous, envious, and greedy, Mr. Speaker. And

MR. HODDER: Create their own little bureaucracies.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And they will form their own little cliques in the backbenches and in the Cabinet, and I would think that you are going to have trouble for a long time to come, Mr. Speaker.

So having made those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the House that we are going to vote against this bill. We are not in favour, we are not in favour of this kind of extravagance and waste.

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the taxpayers of this Province we will be voting against these appointments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: When the hon. the President of the Council speaks, he will close the debate.

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the hon. gentleman, I can only marvel at the consummate good taste and judgement of his Royal Highness Prince Charles and Lady Diana in refusing to call their first-born Stephen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, nothing that the hon. gentleman has said, you know, requires any reply. This bill has been introduced for the purpose of establishing parliamentary secretaries, which is another great step forward in this administration of involving people who are elected to this House in the affairs of government. We did this, as the hon. gentleman knows, by establishing committees, committees to examine into the estimates and all sorts of committees, committees coming out of your ears everywhere - the flag Committee, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), made one of his most distinguished contributions to it, the Election Committee, the Resource Committee, Government Services Committee and so on. We have done it by strengthening the House by the Question Period. For want of something better, the other day I happened to pick up the records of the House of Assembly in 1951 and reading through it. And do you know what they had to do in that day, Mr. Speaker? They were not allowed

MR. MARSHALL: to ask questions. Did you know that? They had to get up and give notice that in some time in the future they would be asking a question on such-and-such a topic. That is the way it was. But we changed all that. We put in a Question Period, and this is another part of the strenghtening of the fabric of government. The hon. gentleman calls them flunkeys and such other pejorative terms that he is very versed in using, but in point of fact the four or five members involved, and other members will be involved in the future, will make a considerable contribution to the workings of government and what this represents is yet another step of this government in the involving of elected members in the affairs of government and seeing that the very capable people on this side of the House can make an effective contribution. I would also point out at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that the bill touches upon the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder). Now there was no such thing as Opposition House Leader, I remember when the former Premier - created such a position. I happened to be in the elevator at the time with the late hon. Leslie Curtis, and he was at that time retired, but I remember him mentioning to me, he said, 'Opposition House Leader? I have never heard of it. I never heard of it in the annals of parliamentary democracy. There is no such thing exists.' The hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) does not exist.

MR. STAGG: Propose an amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: But we put it in and we have given the Opposition House Leader security.

So this is just another instance of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Delete it. Delete it.

MR. MARSHALL: We can delete if the hon. gentleman wishes to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Delete it. Delete it.

MR. MARSHALL: We have taken steps here to secure the Opposition House Leader in his position and we will continue to support it. The hon. the former Speaker here is too shy, he remembers his non-partisan times, he refers from time to time to the hon. gentlemen- I think it is very apt, and I think it is very appropriate - as Snow White and the seven dwarfs.

MR. SIMMS: Seven political dwarfs.

MR. MARSHALL: Seven political dwarfs. If I remember some of their names that come to mind that could appear to all of them, Sleepy and Dopey and Sneezy - I do not know which one -

MR. SIMMS: Winky, Sleepy -

MR. MARSHALL: - Winky, Weezy and Sleepy, I do not know which one we would call which. But, Mr. Speaker, from the speech -

MR. SIMMS: I hope the media gives me the credit for it.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, I do not want to steal the hon. gentleman's thunder, but every now and then he still thinks he is in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, and I still spy him talking to the members of the Opposition. Is that not disgraceful? You know, absolutely disgraceful.

MR. SIMMS: I apologize. I apologize.

MR. MARSHALL: So I thought he would be too reticent because he has had it written down and has been passing it to me and urging me on for the past five or six days.

MR. SIMMS: Because you are are nasty, see, boy.

MR. MARSHALL: That is it. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing to reply to in what the hon. gentleman said. We have great pride in introducing this bill which is going to involve government members in the affairs of government and we heartily commend it for second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Appointment Of Parliamentary Secretaries To Ministers Of The Crown," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 45).

MR. MARSHALL: We will get into first readings now. Motion 3. This is 'An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions.' I am sorry not to give you warning of that, Mr. Speaker, notice of it.

On motion, Bill No. 53, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 4.

On motion, Bill No. 54, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions For Transferred Employees," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1978," carried. (Bill No. 55).

On motion, Bill No. 55 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Budget Debate, Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Motion 1, Budget Debate.

The hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) adjourned the debate.

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking to the House and the Opposition for too long a period of time, who have been, I consider, subjected to enough of that punishment already today. But there are one or two points that I would like to bring out in the Budget debate. A long time ago, most of the stuff, I think most of the observations have already been made with respect to this budget because we have gone through extensive periods of reviews of the estimates by various committees. We have gone through Committee of the Whole and we have gone through certain expenditure bills. But I do recall that the principal speaker from the Opposition was the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and it is with a certain amount of regret that I find on reviewing his speech that the hon. gentleman chose, obviously by design, to overlook the positive parts with respect to the policies of this government in its financial matters. And specifically, I think the most important thing, Mr. Speaker, which

MR. MARSHALL: has been said over and over again, is that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has brought in a budget that is balanced on current account. The current account predicts a surplus of \$5,400,000. And that is no small feat, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that this, being the poorest province of Canada, is the only Province in Eastern Canada to have been able to bring in a budget which shows a surplus in current account. The Province of Quebec is borrowing this year just under \$3 billion. Just under \$2 billion of that is a deficit on current account, not a surplus but a deficit. And when provinces do that, what in effect they are doing is they are on a very dangerous and slippery slope because they are borrowing really in effect to pay their grocery bills, the current expenses. The Province of New Brunswick has come in with a deficit on current account to the tune of \$60 million or \$70 million. The Province of

MR. MARSHALL: Nova Scotia, despite the fact that the Province of Nova Scotia has raised its sales tax by 2 per cent, its personal income tax by 4 per cent and raised all other levels of taxes, still is coming in with a deficit of \$130 million. That is why the achievement, which is what it is, of this government in bringing in a balanced current account is a mammoth achievement and I think it is certainly very, very noteworthy and speaks well for the management of this Province.

At the same time we were doing that, Mr. Speaker, we were able to provide such other things as \$47 million being injected into capital expenditures for building and equipping of schools. We have managed to provide \$2.5 million extra to assist school boards in their financial difficulties. These are just some of the highlights.

The retail sales tax we are bringing in a measure as an incentive for capital investment where there is purchase of machinery and equipment for the provision of employment, a stimulative measure. Again retail sales tax exemptions will be provided for small sawmill operators. So that is a very positive move. Another positive move is we provided a 10 per cent increase for public service pensions and we have also provided a commensurate increase in social assistance rates effective May 1st, 1982.

We have been able to provide, and still provide a balance budget, Mr. Speaker, for chronic care beds in St. Patrick's Home, in the Harbour Lodge and in Springdale and in Grand Bank. You know, that in itself is a tremendous achievement. And along with that we have been able to provide health facilities for Channel - Port aux Basques. We hear the hon. gentlemen there opposite bleating and crying from time to time that we are not providing anything for Opposition districts, and Channel happens to be one, temporarily albeit and only by the skin of his teeth because he is a

MR. MARSHALL: skin-of-the-teeth member, the present member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). So we are building a hospital there. We are planning a new hospital for the Burin Peninsula. We are planning the expansion of phase two of the Bonavista hospital. We are starting in Clarenville, we commenced completion of planning and we are going to start the construction this year of a new hospital in Clarenville. We provided new community clinics in Labrador in Black Tickle and Fox Harbour.

MR. WARREN: Federal money.

MR. MARSHALL: And we are making major renovations to existing clinics in Cartwright and Mary's Harbour

MR. WARREN: Federal money Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Cartwright and Mary's Harbour, if the hon. getnleman's will permit. The last four places which we mentioned are not in areas that are represented by members. So this is a very, very positive budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I want to add to all of this is that good as it is and as much as it shows the management of this government, how much more it could be if we had the rightful revenue from our resources. And I will not speak any further with respect to that except to

MR. MARSHALL:

refer to the Question

Period this afternoon.

So in summary, Mr. Speaker, I commend this Budget. I commend the Opposition to vote for it. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) votes against it, he will be voting against the hospital in Channel Port aux Basques. If the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) votes against it, he will be voting against the community clinics in his district. It is a considerable achievement by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and by the government. If we could we would provide more. We will in the future when we are able to get control of our offshore resources and control of our future in the electrical power. Now that is yet to come. It is a subject that could be debated in the Budget debate, but it has been debated on and off in this session for the whole period of time, as was indicated in the Question Period today.

As I say, with a bit of sincerity by the federal government, and I mean sincerity, we could sit down and we could negotiate within a couple of months an agreement on the offshore which would be beneficial not only to Newfoundland but to all of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in commending the Budget and this tremendous Budget and this tremendous speech by the Minister of Finance to the House for passage by the House and quick passage by the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Mountains.

The hon. member for Torngat

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it is so long ago since the hon. Minister of Finance brought in a Budget that we have almost forgotten what was in it. However, just listening to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) a few minutes

MR. WARREN: ago, I was surprised when he started rhyming off the measures, in fact, about the hospital construction, how he said our government is doing this, and our government is doing that. Mr. Speaker, he did not even know where Black Tickle and Mary's Harbour are. To set the record straight they are not even in my district. So even the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) does not even know what geographical areas the fifty-two districts take in.

I might advise the hon. minister too that those community clinics in Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour and Cartwright come from money that has been given to this government by Mr. Rumpkey; they call him.

AN HON. MEMBER: 'Rumpkey?'

MR. WARREN: That is right, the man up in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: All of a sudden you fellows were saying that you do not get anything from Ottawa, but here is money for four new clinics along the Labrador Coast.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to say a few words on, as far as I am concerned, a fantastic display of camouflaging. This is what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collons) has done,

MR. WARREN: he has really done a good job in camouflaging the expenditures and the revenues of the Government of this Province. I think he tried to camouflage it on May 27th. When the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought down a budget, many people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador said, It appears to be a good budget. In fact, I said at that time that it appeared to be a good budget. But the minister did such a good job of camouflaging that we did not see the inner part of what is in this book.

Even the cover of the book, the lighthouse, the minister started off by using a camouflaged picture. As you know, with a lighthouse we only see the light once in a while when it circles around. So that is this government, we can only see the light of this government once in a while.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we turn to the first page of this budget - I think the Minister of Finance referred to it as a light of hope budget - one has to be impressed with the comments that this government has for the people of the Province. Now, I want to go on record as saying that I was extremely pleased with some of the initiatives. Now, here are some of the initiatives that I was pleased with: The capital expenditure for schools, \$47 million - in fact, only a drop in the bucket when I have schools in my district where they have to put up blankets for doors.

Land for a new Fisheries College - which should have been built five years ago. A student aid programme - which people cannot take advantage of because the government has no concern about the rural part of the Province.

MR. WARREN: Increase in social assistance - a 10 per cent increase in social assistance. What did the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) do just before the election? He made sure his department put a little blue card in every envelope that a social assistance cheque was going out in. In fact, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) made sure that every constituent in his district, as a former welfare officer -

MR. TOBIN: Social worker.

MR. WARREN: - Social worker,

MR. WARREN:

that is the proper name now, social worker - made sure that that blue slip would go into this district, blue in colour. Now, Mr. Speaker, on the first page it says providing construction for the Channel hospital, for Clarendville hospital. And what happened? We are closing down the Markland Cottage Hospital, we are closing down, in another year or so, the Come By Chance Cottage Hospital, we are closing down the Old Perlican Cottage Hospital.

MR. HOUSE: No.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes, we are. I would venture to say that by next year the Minister of Health (Mr. House) will come out and say the Come By Chance Hospital will be phasing out - I will take the minister's word on it - within the next two or three years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the above are good measures. Now, where are the increases coming from? The funniest thing about the former social worker is that he never told the people in his district where this ten per cent increase in social assistance is coming from. Nine-point-three per cent of that increase is coming from the federal government, that is where the ten per cent is coming from. Nine-point-three per cent of that ten per cent increase, where is it coming from? From Ottawa, from Mr. Rompkey and his crew. So it is amazing that point seven per cent, that is what this government is giving social assistant recipients, a point-seven per cent increase, not a ten per cent a point-seven per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the other concerns. The minister announced that

MR. WARREN: he expects to garner \$5.5 million from those people who drink, \$5.5 million from the people who like to have a drink of alcohol beverages, \$5.5 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that means this year the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is expecting to get \$55 million from the sale of alcoholic beverages. Now, you know, in this day and age when

MR. WARREN: we have such a problem in Newfoundland and Labrador, and in particular in my district where there is such a problem with alcohol consumption - there is a problem with alcohol and particularly in my district - and how much is this government spending out of that \$55 million, how much are they spending to curb the terrible disease of alcoholism? They are spending \$1,140,000. Mr. Speaker, \$1.14 million is what they are spending to curb the alcohol problem that is tormenting many Newfoundlanders. They are raising the tobacco tax \$4.5 million. Now, how much are they spending? As we know, the greatest cause of cancer, according to the medical experts, is smoking. How much are they spending on cancer research in this Province? \$143,000. They are going to gather \$4.5 million but they are only going to spend \$143,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just told you some good things, I named off the good things. Now, let us look at what the government is doing to those people who have to get loans. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that a Minister of Finance could be so two-faced that he would come in and try to camouflage the people with this budget and poke his hand right in their pockets and draw out every cent they have. That is what he is doing in this budget, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: Where do you expect him to get the money from?

MR. WARREN: Well, not off the sick people by charging them extra money per day in a hospital bed. This is how the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) expects to get the money is if anybody gets sick, 'Okay, let us charge them more because they are sick.' This is what the Minister of Finance and,

MR. WARREN: in fact, this is what the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has said in the Estimate Committee. In the Estimate Committee he said, 'We have to get our money somewhere.'

MR. HOUSE: .: Sure.

MR. WARREN: Right. 'We have to get our money off the backs of the sick people.'

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Right. That is right. If you get sick, you have to pay for getting sick. That is what is wrong with the Minister of Health. He has to be sick himself to even have that kind of a thought in his mind, to think that you have to raise the hospital beds from \$3 to \$5, a 60 per cent raise.

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: And the hon. the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) is sick now.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that is what is happening to this government. This budget should not be called a budget of hope, this should be called a budget for the sick because if you get sick - in fact, I am surprised that

MR. G. WARREN: the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) has not said to all the doctors throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, 'Now make sure you put people in hospital.' Why I am suprised he has not said that, he has said everything else. He said, 'We have got to get our money somewhere.' So it is a wonder he is not saying to the doctors now, 'Now, get people in hospital where we can charge them more.' So this is the impression that the minister is leaving, if you get sick we can charge you more so go into hospital. Why does he not tell all the doctors now to find the least little complaint about a person and get them in the hospital and we will get money from them. So this is the minister's attitude. That is the minister's attitude, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at another aspect, Mr. Speaker. We have the Fishery Loan Board, we have the Rural Development Farm Loan Board, and what happened? In last year's budget - or the year before last - it went from, I think it was, two per cent up to four per cent. Now it has gone from four per cent interest, the interest rate has now gone from four per cent up to eight percent is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Eight per cent to twelve per cent.

MR. WARREN: Eight to twelve, yes. Okay.

That is right it went from four to eight there about two years ago, and it has gone from eight to twelve now. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is much cheaper than you can get it from the bank today. Probably the bank rate now is eighteen to twenty per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, what initiative is there for a fisherman or a framer to go to those loan boards and expect to get reasonable satisfaction when the government is increasing the rate of interest a full fifty per cent?

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the people in our Province who are trying to conserve energy? Now, these are the people that I would like to talk about, the people who are trying to conserve energy. In fact everyone of us here, as well as everyone out in Wonderland, is trying to save a dollar on energy where they can. So what are most of the people doing? They are trying to get rid of the oil that they are using and they are trying to use wood in their stoves instead.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us about the wood.

MR. WARREN: Now, the member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) should be ashamed of himself that he has a fish plant in his district not even open. I mean, that is enough for that member already.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know, what is happening, the people are going now and trying to get wood to make sure that they would save on their fuel bill. So what happens? The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) drove out over the Trans-Canada Highway one time last Fall and he saw all the cars and the trucks stopped along the side of the road -

AN HON. MEMBER: Beyond the overpass?

MR. WARREN: Beyond the overpass, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. Alright, I will tell you how he got out there.

MR. WARREN: He used a road map to get out there. But he got out there all right. There was no problem. He got out there because he used a road map. He got out over the Overpass, he saw all the pick-up trucks parked on the side of the Trans-Canada Highway and there were people getting firewood to burn. So the minister came back and he spoke to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). He said, 'Look, here is another chance for us to get some money, here is another chance for the Government of Newfoundland to get some more money out of the back pockets of those poor fellows who are trying to save on energy. Let us tax them on their cutting permits'. So this is what happened, the cutting permits is increased in taxes. So this year anyone who needs to go out and needs to cut some firewood there is going to be increases in taxes. So actually what they are saving, but their saving is diminished.

Now what about those people who want to further their education, like some of the members on that side wish to further their education? What about those people? Now adult education courses - did they increase? If you want to get an education now, you never had the opportunity ten or twenty years ago, but if you want to get it now you blinking well have to pay for it. So it doubles the adult education course fees.

What about drivers fees, drivers licences. There is one thing that I agree with in the Budget about the driver's licence, and in fact it has not gone far enough, and I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) next year should improve on this one. And that is if anyone has their licence suspended because of impaired driving they have to pay an extra \$10 to get it reinstated. A measly \$10! And here was a chance for the government to gain some money, but ney a measly \$10 for getting your driver's licence reinstated. I think it should be ten times ten times ten.

MR. WALSH:
enough - never again.

I think you have some for

MR. WARREN:
person, if he has not got sense enough to drive his car with caution and control and care, he should not have the licence. And as far as I am concerned that person should be charged much more than \$10 to get his licence reinstated.

That is right. The individual

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN:
people in this Province there has been very little said about, very little this government has said about them and that is about the senior citizens, Mr. Speaker. What about their drugs? The Minister of Health (Mr. House) does not care. He told us in the Estimate Committee, you know, he does not care about the senior citizens.

There are another group of

MR. TOBIN:

No he did not.

MR. WARREN:
with the Committee. In fact the senior citizens in Gander about two weeks ago gave the minister a serious proposal. They said, 'Look, we want our drug subsidization raised'. And I think it is ridiculous that you see a senior citizen who needs four perscriptions,

He has left that impression

MR. WARREN: and instead of paying a prescription fee for one he has to pay for the four and it costs him \$20 instead of \$4.00. And, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) has not seen fit to bring in an amendment to the Health Act saying if the doctor prescribes a drug for a senior citizen for a ninety day period or an eighty-nine day period that that druggist is obligated to supply that drug for that period. But the druggist will not do it. The druggist will not do it because - do you know why he will not do it? - because a druggist can rip-off the senior citizens three months in a row. You know, Mr. Speaker, maybe if the Minister of Health would just recollect what he said, he said that the druggist is not obligated to follow a doctor's prescription of a ninety day prescription he can supply it for a thirty day period at a time although the doctor prescribes it for ninety days. Now what happens is the senior citizens have to pay the prescription fee or the druggist fee for three consecutive months, whereas he could have gotten it for one fee. . And what happens is he is ripped off, the druggist rips off the senior citizen because the Department of Health is ripping off the druggist. So this is what is happening here, Mr. Speaker.

So, you know, as we go through this Budget there is not all jolly good stuff in there, is there? Not all jolly good stuff. So this is what I am saying, he camouflaged the Budget so well that it needs - and I am surprised that this government has forty-four member on that side and not one of them have gotten up and talked about those things, those things that I am letting the people know about. Everyone is saying it is a good Budget, not saying anything about the drastic effects that it is causing.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go a little bit further.

MR. RIDEOUT: What do you think the Liberal backbenchers in Ottawa are saying about the Budget, anything bad?

MR. WARREN: Well, I know twelve that said something bad. In fact I remember twelve of them lobbied a while ago and they have said more bad things about the federal Budget in Ottawa than the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has said about this government since he crossed the floor on a principle that backfired in his face.

Now let us look at some other things, Mr. Speaker. I have so much paper here it is pretty hard to get through it. I want to go to my district for a little while and let us compare the electricity rates, let us compare the electricity rates. Okay, the electricity rates -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: I will take you up on that, I heard that, I will take you up on that. So will I get one from you, 'Peter'. Mr. Speaker, before the Muppet Show gets to the climax, I want to compare electricity rates

MR. WARREN: in three areas of the Province, and I am taking this on hydro rates for 1250 kilowatts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen opposite would just listen to what I am going to say for the next three or four minutes, I would think they would understand, Mr. Speaker, and I will just compare electricity rates for the three areas of the Province. Let us look at the Labrador coast, Happy Valley/Goose Bay and St. John's, three different electricity rates in the Province, and we will base it on the consumption of 1250 kilowatts.

Now here is what would happen, Mr. Speaker: In Happy Valley/Goose Bay where there is a direct hydro line from the Upper Churchill, the one that Joey Smallwood gave away, \$52.08 for 1250 kilowatts. That is not bad. That is very good! In St. John's for the same number of kilowatts, \$61.04. Not bad. Let us go to Hopedale, Cartwright, Mary's Harbour, Nain, anywhere like that. The same number of kilowatts \$95.25, an increase of 50 per cent over the St. John's price for supplying electricity to the lowest income people in this Province. Now, does this government really care? Why are the people along the Labrador coast -

MR. BARRETT: Why do they not move to Goose Bay?

MR. WARREN: The people living in Nain and Hopedale have too much dignity to move to Goose Bay. They have more dignity than the member for

June 30, 1982, Tape 1855, Page 2 -- apb

MR. WARREN:

St. John's West (Mr.

Barrett) does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the
people in Nain, Hopedale, Rigolet or Cartwright do
not intend to move to Goose Bay, but they

MR. WARREN: expect that this government would look after their well-being as well as they are with the people of Goose Bay or the people of St. John's. They are citizens of this Province and they should be treated as citizens of this Province. This government is not even giving them the courtesy of being citizens by charging them fifty per cent more for electricity rates. You know why, Mr. Speaker? Maybe it is because they have the eleven Tories in St. John's. That may be one reason, because there are eleven big Tories in St. John's like the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett). That may be a help, Mr. Speaker. But there will never be a Tory in the Torngat Mountains district, there will never be a Tory in there because I have already challenged the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) to come up to my district and take me on and the minister will find out that there will never be a Tory living up there.

MR. BARRETT: Where do you pay your rates?

MR. WARREN: I pay two rates, one here and one in Labrador. That is right.

Now let us see what happens here, Mr. Speaker. What about the dental -

MR. BARRETT: What do you pay down there?

MR. WARREN: I would like to be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: What about the child, Mr. Speaker, who needs a dental checkup? What about the child who needs a dental checkup? Last year he was permitted two fluoride treatments, but the Minister of Health (Mr. House) for some reason this year has become

MR. WARREN: the meat cleaver of this Budget, he really has. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) you know, has charged extra hospital admittance, he has now cut out a fluoride treatment for the children. You know, I am surprised that the Premier would keep the Minister of Health (Mr. House) in his portfolio as long as he has.

Mr. Speaker, I do now know why this government is intent upon separating areas of this Province, separating the rural and the urban parts of the Province. As I said about the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), he needs a road map to go outside the overpass. And like the Minister of Health (Mr. House) he can go to Deer Lake, and I believe he told me on one occasion he had the opportunity to go into Davis Inlet. He spent one half hour in Davis Inlet. That is how long he spent in Davis Inlet.

MR. HOUSE: I was there three times.

MR. WARREN: So three times, one half hour each, that is one and a half hours you have spent in Davis Inlet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I lived in Davis Inlet for twenty-two months without moving out of it, twenty-two months.

MR. HOUSE: What kind of an impact did you have?

MR. WARREN: The kind of vote I got in Davis Inlet in the last election assures me that I must have had a pretty good impact on Davis Inlet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is another thing that this government is doing.

June 30, 1982

Tape No. 1857

EC - 1

MR. STAGG: How much time do you have left?

MR. WARREN: I must have about an hour left yet, I hope so anyhow.

The Labrador Resources Advisory Council - now, who are those people? Those are the people of whom the Premier of the Province said two years ago at a public meeting in Happy Valley-Goose Bay - in a Ministerial Statement at a press conference that he had in Happy Vally/Goose Bay two years ago the Premier of the Province said, ' My government will be looking to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council for advice. For input on anything that is ongoing in Labrador, the body that we will be contacting will be the Labrador Resources Advisory Council.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said this. And I only wish I were prepared for this today, I would have brought down the press release in which the Premier said, 'They are the body that this government will look to.' Now what happened?

MR. STAGG: That was two years ago.

MR. WARREN: That was two years ago. As the Parliamentary Secretary said, that was two years ago. And what happens in this budget? Their funding, number one, is cut in half from \$150,000 to \$75,000. And, as of September 1st, as far as this government is concerned, the organization that the Premier said was going to be his Bible in Labrador, they are going to cut them off altogether from funding. Now, naturally, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WALSH: Are they going to be cut altogether?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. WALSH: Are they?

MR. NEARY:

Well, I do not know.

You fellows are the ones who have control.

MR. WARREN:

That is what I heard

from the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). And I have heard the comments. 'They have outlived their usefulness'. Now, Mr. Speaker, what a statement for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to make, they have outlived their usefulness!

Now, they cover every community from Nain to L'Anse-au-Clair. So I asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), why do we not give some money to the combined councils? And the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, 'We cannot fund the combined councils because we are funding the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. So one or the other. Probably, you know, the Parliamentary Secretary to the

MR. WARREN:

Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) could inform the House today if the funding they are taking away from LRAC will go to the combined councils of Labrador. Is this possible? If this is possible, then maybe I would say too that you cannot have two bodies functioning for the same reasons.

MR. WALSH: Is the member going to vote on the bill tomorrow to make parliamentary secretaries legal?

MR. WARREN: I am doubtful at the present time.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened, this government has cut the feet from under the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. But I can tell the House today that they are determined that they will not give up the ghost, they will fight and fight and fight. In fact, it was the Labrador Resources Advisory Council two years ago, through the people in Labrador, which convinced this government that the uranium mines in Makkovik/Postville be stopped. The credit for that has to go to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council. Credit has to go to the Labrador Resources Advisory Council for the input into the fishery along the Labrador coast and not this government.

So this government has taken the initiative from the Labrador Resources Advisory Council and all of a sudden they are saying, Okay, we are finished with you now. We have forty-four seats, the heck with you we will do it on our own. But I will tell you this much, that Toby Anderson, a constituent of mine who is the chairman of that group, will not let this lie idle. And if there is any way at all to make this

MR. WARREN: government aware of
what - in fact, what we are doing is we are putting
Labrador years behind instead of helping it to progress,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time
has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: In closing, Mr. Speaker,
I should like to say that I cannot support this budget,
in its present format, unless the minister makes some
amendments to it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister
speaks he shall close debate.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
I would like to add a
few comments to this budget which was brought down on
May 27th., to deal with some of the highlights. I do
not think the hon. member for Torngat Mountains(Mr.
Warren) really dealt with the budget, he was rather
negative in everything that he did say, including some
of the good things in the budget for his colleague's
district in Eagle River.

Certainly one of the
main things that I see in this budget is the financing
of schools. Schools are very important, of course,
particularly in Conception Bay South. Because
Conception Bay South right now is the only district in
the Province which has an inclining enrollment.

MR. STAGG: Inclining?

MR. BUTT: An inclining enrollment.

MR. SIMMS: What is the difference?

MR. BUTT: That big school board, the

June 30, 1982, Tape 1858, Page 3 -- apb

MR. BUTT: Avalon Consolidated School
Board has a declining enrollment -

MR. SIMMS: The member has a reclining
one.

MR. BUTT: -inclining in some areas,
but overall declining. The Roman Catholic School Board
of St. John's has a declining enrollment, inclining in
some areas.

MR. BAIRD: The hon. member has new ones coming in.
MR. BUTT: And Newtown, Mount Pearl
of course. They are all coming in, yes. But Conception
Bay South Integrated School Board has an inclining enrollment.
And, of course, I am very pleased to see \$47 million high-
lighted in this budget for new schools.

We also have in this budget
\$1.5 million provided for business incentives which, once
again, is not a lot of money but certainly some of the
people in my district can take advantage of it. Because
right now I know that there is a new industry start-
ing up out there which will produce manholes, believe it
or not. They were always provided to this Province
by Halifax, but now, of course, they are going to be
made in Conception Bay South. Now, this budget is a very
realistic one and it is a common-sense budget. And I suppose
if we were living in Britain today, the hon. the Minister
of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. member for St. John's
South, would be called a prince. Because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BUTT: - this budget is a jewel in
his crown.

MR. SIMMS: Do you mean manholes or
manhole covers?

MR. BUTT: No, manholes themselves, will
be now made in that great district of Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Some of the other high-lights in the budget which really affect a lot of people in my area -

MR. SIMMS: The Opposition should be over talking to people instead of sending memos.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BUTT: - which really affect a lot of people in Conception Bay South is the 10 per cent increase for some of the unfortunate people, not because of their own initiative, who find themselves through sickness and other means relying on social services. And of course, these people will receive a 10 per cent increase, you know, that is very good.

MR. SIMMS: Very positive.

MR. BUTT: That is a very positive and progressive step forward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: We are always cognizant of the fact that we have some excellent people in this Province who are on pensions. They have done their own work, they have made their contribution, they are now on pensions, and, of course, once again we are giving these people an increase of 10 per cent.

MR. J. BUTT: One of the contentious issues, of course, in the past few weeks has been hospitals. And I might add that the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. House) has certainly addressed himself to that situation.

MR. SIMMS: Right on.

MR. BUTT: And I might add that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will have to support this budget, really, because if he does not he is turning his back on the people who voted him in.

MR. HOUSE: Marginally.

MR. BUTT: Yes.

MR. HOUSE: We are talking about marginally.

MR. BUTT: Well, with a very small minority. But, of course, if he rejects the budget, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be rejecting the people of Lapoile District in this hospital for Channel.

MR. NEARY: Go home and get some ring around the collar for the minister.

MR. BUTT: After making numerous presentations and representation, the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) has been successful in getting a hospital started in Clarenville, in that great district of Trinity North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: He is to be commended. A good member, he has worked very hard and we are now going to see a new hospital started in Clarenville. The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was not long making his mark here in the House. He was elected on April 6th. and already in this Budget we have a new hospital going in Burin.

MR. SIMMS: Already? He has only been a member for two months.

MR. BUTT: That is all, that is all.
That just shows what a dynamic young man was elected on April 6th.

MR. NEARY: They do not remember your
name. They do not know who they elected down there yet.

MR. TOBIN: Where?

MR. NEARY: Down in Burin.

MR. TOBIN: They are realizing that they
are getting a hospital out of it, that is worth it.

MR. BUTT: And, of course, we have that
great member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the hon. the
Minister of Fisheries, who has risen to the occasion and has put
a good case forward to government to get a hospital -

MR. TULK: Do not forget the member from
Labrador.

MR. BUTT: - a new hospital in Bonavista.
Now these are just a few of the highlights in the budget relating
to hospitals. I know that the member

MR. BUTT: for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) has been trying for quite some time to get the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary get a firm foundation in Labrador. And, of course, we will be spending a considerable amount of money in that area to bring our Constabulary into Wabush-Labrador City.

Now, how does this Budget affect people in my district of Conception Bay South? And if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, for just a brief period to speak about that great district of Conception Bay South -

MR. TULK: Do not forget the word 'historic'.

MR. BUTT: Not really historic, because it was only formed a few years ago. But, in the meantime - and I should add right here, since this is a rather broad-ranging debate, that one of the gentlemen in the press gallery, from The Evening Telegram, had it marked up in the paper - he had it posted as a swing district. Can you believe that, Conception Bay South a swing district? He drove my entire campaign crew mad, absolutely mad. They were infuriated that people would even think it could be a swing district.

MR. NEARY: Who ran against you anyhow?

MR. BUTT: I forget. I forget.

MR. HEARN: It was not a radio announcer, was it?

MR. BUTT: There was a gentleman Greenslade for the Liberals, and the other two I really do not recall.

MR. TULK: Did you get in by a generous majority or what?

MR. BUTT: Well, a fair majority. I do not wish to be boastful. But how does this budget affect the people of Conception Bay South? I have done reasonably well, as most members did, in this very progressive budget. Now, we have a very serious traffic problem out there. And I

MR. BUTT: am being quite serious about this, because it is a very large district, no question about it. So out of this budget I have approximately \$1 million for road improvements in the district. Of course, we really have not addressed in a very serious way the 4.8 miles of road which is very dear to my heart because it is going to solve a lot of the traffic problems we have in the interim.

MR. J. BUTT: But I think this budget addresses itself very well to the very basic and essential services of water and sewerage to the town of Conception Bay South and the town of Paradise.

MR. STAGG: We think you did very well.

MR. BUTT: We have just had tenders called for \$3 million in the town of Conception Bay South and \$1.4 million for the town of Paradise. So we are doing very well. And, of course, we have a problem with three bridges out there that are totally inadequate, and hopefully over the next two years we will renew these and bring them up to an acceptable standard. One, I might add, by St. Edwards church in Kelligrews, certainly I would think the one that takes the most traffic each day, will be renewed at a cost of some \$280,000.

MR. SIMMS: This year?

MR. BUTT: Yes, this year. We are going to see some road paving in the town of Paradise and the town of Conception Bay South. People of Conception Bay South are very sports minded and they like -

MR. BAIRD: To do their thing.

MR. BUTT: Yes. And they like recreation, of course, as I do myself, something that is very dear to my heart. And I might say that the two provincial parks in my district are enjoying a good year. Despite the bad weather conditions, Cochrane Pond is having an excellent year as well as Butter Pot. And Butter Pot park is into an expansionary process right now with some nature trails and so on, and it is good. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, I must say has risen to the occasion on every

MR. J. BUTT: request that I have made of him. And, of course, as well we have acquired all the properties now at Topsail beach. Now, I would say that most members in the House, most hon. members on one occasion have visited Topsail beach, a place with yet tremendous potential, very scenic. Looking across at Bell Island, across beautiful Conception Bay-the sun usually shines out there about fifty-five days more, by the way, than it does in St. John's even.

MR. TULK: You are a worse poet than you are a politician.

MR. TOBIN: Does it overlook your house too?

MR. BUTT: But this area of Conception Bay South has tremendous potential. And, of course, we have acquired the property there, over the past couple of years, at great cost I might add, some \$200,000. And next year I think that it is a good possibility that we will be able to get on with putting in a regulated park there at Topsail beach.

MR. BUTT: And just staying with Culture, Recreation and Youth for a little while longer, of course I am pleased to say a new sports complex in Topsail, housing a million dollar indoor swimming pool has been approved -

MR. STAGG: You have a potential gold medal athlete there.

MR. BUTT: Yes, we have several, as a matter of fact -

MR. STAGG: Is that right? Tell us about them.

MR. BUTT: - several gold medal athletes in Conception Bay South, the place is overrun with talent. I might add, in connection with this sports complex, I would like to give credit, a lot of credit to service clubs in the area.

MR. TULK: Go out and wash socks.

MR. BUTT: I think of the Lions Club, for example, who donated \$50,000. I mean, you know, it is no token amount, that is a lot of money for volunteers to raise, to put into that kind of complex. The Kinsmen, by the way, have risen to the occasion as well. As a matter of fact, I might add last night they made me an honorary member of their club.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: And, of course, we have an excellent business community in Conception Bay South which has risen to the occasion. So right now all we are waiting on it the town of Conception Bay South to call tenders and we are ready to go with this complex.

MR. TULK: How heavy a suitcase can you lift? Tell us.

MR. BUTT: Conception Bay South is not known as a fishing district, but there are some 70 to 80 fishermen full-time and part-time operating along the South shore of Conception Bay. And, I might add, these people have some problems.

MR. BUTT: No question about it, it has been neglected for years, it has been neglected for years, and it is only in the past couple of years that the needs of the fishermen have been really addressed by the provincial government. We have a small collector plant there in Foxtrap that is badly in need of repair, and some freezing equipment, and of course, the request has gone to the Department of Fisheries, to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to give some assistance to the plant. The

MR. BUTT: other resource people in Conception Bay South are the farmers, and there are a lot of farmers in Conception Bay South. Most people would not realize it, but there are a tremendous amount of people involved in farming in Conception Bay South. Not all that many full-time farmers, but a lot of people out there are supplementing their incomes with farming. Just recently we have had an expansion on the pasture land out there. We have a real good operation there with the Conception Bay South Agricultural Society, a great group of individuals who I meet with on a monthly basis to try to address some of the very serious problems that they are having. And while some funding has been available from government, there is certainly a lot more needed. Now I suppose that when you think of Conception Bay South, that great district that lies just on the outskirts of the city of St. John's you have to think about development because there is a large land mass out there. We enjoy the best climate on the Avalon Peninsula and it is an area with tremendous potential. When I think about the potential of offshore oil, of course, places that come to mind are Seal Cove, which has already been designated as a preferred site for an offshore oil supply port, and Long Pond in Manuels which will serve, and serve well I might add, as an auxiliary port to the city of St. John's. Long Pond has tremendous potential, an ice free harbour and it is an area, I am sure, that will be given a lot of recognition in the next couple of years, not to forget of course, the offshore heavy industry park at Octagon Pond. And I might add, in this budget of May 27, 1982, the hon. the minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) pointed out on page 7, I think it is, that there - yes we are going to proceed with phase 1 of the

MR. BUTT: Octagon Pond Industrial Park, it is an area of tremendous potential in Conception Bay South. We have done relatively well. Of course, I am not satisfied.

MS. VERGE: The fishery college is started.

MR. BUTT: Yes, that great Fisheries College we have started this year. Now, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was asked a question by, I believe the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) - something about his embarrassment of the Minister of National Revenue -

MR. STAGG: What is his name?

MR. BUTT: - the hon. Rompkey. And I know the hon. member will not stand in his place and say publicly what he is saying privately, but he is absolutely embarrassed by this gentleman and he should stand in his place and say that. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks now by saying that

MR. BUTT: in 1979, when I got involved in politics, there was a coming together which was a beginning, and on April 6, 1982, we were keeping together and we were staying together and progressing. And I would suggest to you that in the next twenty years or so we will be working together and have a great amount of success in the P.C. Party. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, and loathe as I am to launch forth into public debate on any occasion, I nevertheless must say a few words about this budget, this budget that the government was supposedly afraid to bring down before we had a provincial election in March and April of this year.

You will recall the call that went out. I think there were a few ads that were on television indicating that the reason the government is having an election at this time is because they are afraid to bring down the budget, the Province is bankrupt and the government is bankrupt of ideas and they have to do this in order to keep it from the public, the real state of the economy. And then after we won the election, 'Just wait for the budget. You are really going to get it in the budget.' Well, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition were wrong then. It was deliberate on their part, this misleading of the Newfoundland public. And I must say that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is to be commended. Of course, not only the Minister of Finance is to be commended, because he is the architect

MR. STAGG: of it in many senses, but the whole of government, the whole of the various ministries and the public service of the Province is to be commended for the fiscal management -

AN HON. MEMBER: Responsibility.

MR. STAGG: Yes, and the fiscal responsibility that has been exercised in the Newfoundland budget as opposed to the budgets of the other provinces of Canada. And in particular, Mr. Speaker, if we want to compare it to something, we would compare this budget to the Crosbie budget of December 1979, the great Crosbie budget, the one that is now standing the test of time, the great budget that, of course, hon, members opposite and their colleagues

MR. STAGG: in Ottawa, cohorts and all of the negative adjectives that one could think of, many of which would be unparliamentary, how they rejoiced at this slight of hand and the delight with which the Crosbie budget was defeated. Well, hon. members opposite can hardly get up and say anything about this Budget that is really critical. They have to lapse into generalities and a lot of foolishness in their debate. They do not even want to talk about it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think they want to close down the House so we can get out of here, because in the cut and thrust of debate and in the way that parliament works, this session of the House of Assembly has been a total victory for the government side. The Opposition shows no inclination -

MR. HOUSE: They were disappointed at the way things went.

MR. STAGG: Yes. The Opposition has shown themselves to be disinclined towards any kind of coherent, cohesive debate. They obviously do not work at their jobs and they hope by some strange miracle that this government is going to self destruct and then the general public would toss us out and put them in. That has been the general tenor of their total debate, both during the Question Period and in the Throne Speech Debate and the few things they have had to say on the various bills that have come before the House and in the Budget Debate. They have exercised no leadership. They have exercised nothing that would in the least indicate that they are ready for power or that they will ever be ready for power.

Now, this budget, Mr. Speaker, is to be contrasted to the budget brought down by Mr. MacEachen, to the last two budgets brought down by Mr. MacEachen. The first was flawed and the budget on Monday night, we were all ready and willing to give it a

MR. STAGG: break, but I guess the test of any of these budgets is how the financial world reacts to them. How did the financial world react to Mr. MacEachen's budget? Well, they looked at the bottom line, Mr. Speaker. What you do in budget, no matter how you dress it up or what rhetoric you put into it, you always look at the bottom line. And the bottom line on this budget is that there is going to be a surplus at the end. The bottom line in the federal budget is that we are going to raise in Canada through various means of taxation, both direct and indirect, \$56 billion, we are going to raise in Canada. And the government is going to spend \$76 billion. So you raise \$56 billion and you spend \$76 billion, billion now which is a figure, of course, that is almost incomprehensible.

MR. HOUSE: That \$56,000,000,000.

MR. STAGG:

And so it is \$56,000,000,000, as my colleague prompts me. So that is where the government of Canada is at this present time. And the government of Canada, of course, in their race, in attempting to make themselves look good and in the process make everybody else look bad - and the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) sits over there and hopes that by sneering and jeering and making comments that -

MR. TULK: I am trying to get you going.

MR. STAGG: - one would associate with a person of less intellectual capacity than he supposedly has -

MR. TULK: I know you do stand up for lawyers and do some lying too.

MR. STAGG: - that sort of thing ill-behooves him, but I would say that the electorate in Fogo is going to have another good crack at him in about 1986.

MR. TULK: And I will win it again without a doubt.

MR. STAGG: And whoever it is that runs against him will -

MR. TULK: He will be the Premier then, the member for LaPoile.

MR. SIMMS: He will be the Leader of the Liberals then.

MR. STAGG: He will be the Leader of the Liberals? Oh, yes.

MR. TULK: We will have the run of the House.

MR. STAGG: In that case, you know what happens to Leaders of Liberals, they end up in a scrap heap. So, this budget here is to be contrasted with the budgets that have been put out by Mr. MacEachen, and it is a tribute to the government of this Province that they have been able,

MR. STAGG: at a time when the government of Canada is trying their worst to extract from the Provinces concessions that are against the spirit of this nation -

MR. TULK: Get up for your Parliamentary assistant, Sir, and keep him under cover so he will not be making a fool of himself.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, one of the Cabinet Ministers just told me to sit down, what do you think of that? I must say that I feel crushed by that, but nevertheless I will persevere. Mr. Speaker, in September of 1980 I attended meetings in Corner Brook where I said that Hibernia and the prospect of Hibernia's coming on stream was keeping the Canadian dollar high, was keeping the Canadian dollar high and it was keeping it above 80 cents and if Hibernia fell on hard times, or if it were proved to be not economical, or if it was thwarted that we could run into the general vicinity of the 75 cent dollar. And I remember one of the liberal members of that Committee, a Mr. Dingwell his name was, he is from Cape Britain Island, who jumped me and heaped scorn on me and asked for my references and I said, Well, my reference was the Financial Post, because the Financial Post had said that some time before -

MR. TULK: Said what?

MR. STAGG: had said that the resources in Eastern Canada, particularly Hibernia, is one of the main ingredients in

MR. STAGG: maintaining investor confidence in Canada's future, which is what is keeping the dollar at a relatively high level. And, Mr. Speaker, what is happening now? What is happening now? The Canadian dollar is rapidly descending toward seventy-five cents, and it may even go lower, and where is Hibernia? Hibernia is tied up in the courts, and it is because of the illtimed and completely chauvinistic and parochial attitude of the federal Liberals who are afraid to allow this Province to contribute to Canada as it should. They want this Province, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, they want this Province to have it in the hierarchy of governments, if you were to compare this government to its municipal governments, they would like to have Newfoundland comparable to a local service district.

MR. HOUSE: Marc Lalonde said that, did he not?

MR. STAGG: Mr. Lalonde is certainly a person for whom we must have a great deal of contempt, and we must be wary of him. But Hibernia and the East Coast resources, both offshore resources and the hydro resources of the East Coast of North America, and the East Coast of Canada, which is i.e. Newfoundland, have kept the Canadian dollar and kept the Canadian economy buoyant for quite awhile. But, the federal government and the federal Liberals, and hon. members opposite have yet to denounce them adequately, to my satisfaction, they have brought -

MR. SIMMS: The hon. Snow White.

MR. STAGG: What is the hon. member saying? What is he, Snoopy or Snuffy?

MR. SIMMS: Drowsy.

MR. STAGG: Drowsy is it? Drowsy oh yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dopey.

MR. STAGG: Yes, dopey. Dopey oh yes. Where is Snow

MR. STAGG:

White, Dopey?

You are asking for it. Listen, if you are asking for it I can give it to you. I have the microphone, all you have is your big mouth.

MR. SIMMS:

There is Grumpy over there.

MR. TULK:

Animal of the muppet show.

MR. STAGG:

The things, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to deal with over the years, not the least of which is the caterwauling from hon. members opposite who think that noise is a substitute for content. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with some of the positive aspects of our budget. Many of us have stood up and talked in generalities and in general praise of the administration and so on, but, what are some of the positive characteristics of our budget?

MR. SIMMS:

What are some of the positive characteristics?

MR. STAGG:

Yes, hon. members have been so busy thinking that times are bad they have failed to recognize that there are certain good things in the budget. Well, I am going to deal with education. For instance, one of the major thrusts

MR. STAGG: and one of the major consistencies of this government was when, in 1978, it was indicated that we would go to Grade XII and this was in response to initiatives taken by the teachers in their concern for the quality of education in the Province and, parenthetically might I say, about their own job security as well. But, nevertheless, everybody has several axes to grind in this lifetime. And the government in 1978, when the member for Humber Valley was the Minister of Education, basically committed themselves to the Grade XII concept. And now, under the firm and constant and enlightened leadership of the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) the Minister of Education, education is moving ahead not gradually but it is moving ahead by leaps and bounds. And the catastrophe that was supposed to befall the education industry or the profession is not happening. I would say hon. members opposite are chagrined that teachers are not being laid off. As a matter of fact, I have some statistics somewhere or other that the Minister of Education kindly gave me recently as a result of one of my frequent enquiries into what the situation is.

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

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there are only four members on the government side. There is no quorum in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. STAGG: Disgusting, Mr. Speaker, disgusting. And I am making such a good speech too.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Clerk to count the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): There is a quorum present.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a favourite ploy of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the over paid House Leader for the Opposition, the most expensive House Leader that has ever been in the House of Assembly, and, I would say, is likely not to be seen again. There is certainly going to be parliamentary reform in that regard.

But I want to talk about education, Mr. Speaker, some of the things that the government is doing this year in education. School construction, \$22.8 million for new school buildings and extensions to existing facilities. Increased operating school grants for school boards, a \$2.5 million fund to be distributed to school boards

MS. VERGE: That is on top of the 12 per cent.

MR. STAGG: That is on top of the 12 per cent, my goodness! And the provision of salaries for more teachers in relation to the number of students. Government is implementing a three year plan to reduce the pupil/teacher ratio which, by 1983, will provide 460 new teaching positions and retain 295 additional positions that would have been dropped in proportion to the decline in student enrollment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite should be very pleased with that, because most of the hon. members opposite are school teachers and by the time they get fed up in the House of Assembly and losing all the battles in the House of Assembly, they will be able to resign with dignity from the House of Assembly and get

MR. STAGG: one of these 460 new teaching jobs, because their tenure would have been gone by that time. So hon. members opposite, we are looking after them. And let us see who they are. There is the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), he is an ex-teacher, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is an ex-teacher, although

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the student population of the school that he was employed in are delighted that he is no longer in the school. Hopefully, when he goes back to the classroom he will have a lot more to add than he had when he came here.

MR. BUTT: He will not get a job as dog catcher down there.

MR. STAGG: Because he came here as a rustic, Mr. Speaker, and we are attempting to give him a little bit of couth for when he goes back. So we are providing jobs for defeated Liberals in this Province, Mr. Speaker, because an awful lot of them are members of the teaching profession. So do not think that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is not thinking about you when she getting these jobs.

MR. BUTT: A good minister.

MR. STAGG: We are putting a million dollars into something that is very important, if I can find it here, it is the Credit Union Stabilization Fund.

We are putting a million dollars into it so that people who put there money into the Credit Unions, and if they happen to fail -

MR. SIMMS: It is a good programme.

MR. STAGG: It is a good programme, yes.

- there will be money there to cover it. It is a most useful programme.

MR. TULK: We would not want that to happen.

MR. STAGG: We would not want it to happen.

No, I guess you would not. The hon. member wished that I would -

MR. TULK: No, I would not want that to happen.

MR. STAGG: - the hon.member only wishes he were capable of stopping me from talking.

MR. STAGG: The social assistance recipients in the Province had a raise of 10 per cent in an attempt to keep pace with inflation, Mr. Speaker, something that is very helpful. The retail sales tax is exempted from capital acquisitions for equipment related to the sawmill industry. These are matters which are very important. And, Mr. Speaker, we did have to raise some extra money, we did have to raise some extra money. That is something that usually governments have to do. So, what did we do? What did the government do? Did they sneak into the back door by raising the retail sales tax or taking the exemption off certain articles? No, they met it head on, or we met it head on, up front, raised the income tax, which is the only progressive tax, or one of the few progressive taxes that anybody can levy, we raised it by 2 per cent as compared to the federal tax. And I expect now, because the federal budget has raised taxes again, there will probably be extra money although I am not sure of it. That is the up-front way to do things, Mr. Speaker, the personal income tax raised by 2 per cent. We also stuck it to the people who drink alcoholic beverages, they have to pay more for liquor and beer now. These are luxuries, nobody needs them. And the tobacco tax; All these smokers, all these offensive people who insist on smoking, well, we are putting a tax on them to make sure that they pay for their pleasure, so-called. And we have raised certain fees on motor vehicles and matters of that type. Well, that is a responsible method of handling an economy, you have to raise money and you do it up front. And that is the sort of thing that this government has done and I am quite proud to be associated with it. So, Mr.

MR. STAGG:

Speaker, in conclusion we can say that this is a budget that is put together by a group of professionals who are coping with the problems of the moment, many of them, most of them not brought about by their own lack of abilities but are imposed upon us by our Canadian friends who are temporarily occupying the halls of power in Ottawa. And, of course, these are the people that we have come to know, and I can not say appreciate, but we have come to know them quite well,

MR. STAGG: the trio, Mr. Lalonde, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien, because these are the people who are running the country. Mr. MacEachen is only their mouthpiece and unfortunately -

MR. NEARY: What about Mr. Rompkey?

MR. STAGG: Well, unfortunately, Mr. Rompkey, our representative in the federal Cabinet appears not to understand the issues that are really vital to Newfoundland. And if I may make an aside here, Mr. Speaker, in a recent debate in the House of Commons where Mr. Crosbie gave what I would consider to be the definitive word on the offshore question - and I commend it to the reading of any hon. member. It was on June 8th. and June 9th., 1982, anybody who can get their hands on it, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has it there now, it puts forward in clear, concise and relatively brief terms where Newfoundland stands and where Ottawa should stand and where the federal P.C. Party stands vis-a-vis Newfoundland and its offshore resources. After Mr. Crosbie finished who should get up to speak but Mr. Rompkey.

Now, there is one thing I have learned in my time in the courtroom, there are times when you should not cross-examine, there are times when you should just sit down and keep your mouth shut because the other person has either won or lost the case, the case has not been presented. Now this was a case in which Mr. Rompkey, would have been an awful lot better if he had just sat down and kept his mouth shut. Unfortunately he was not about to do so and he got up and he began to attempt to refute the logic of Mr. Crosbie. And in doing so he attempted to refer to the Nova Scotian agreement. You know, the infamous Nova Scotian agreement that that group of Liberals, led by Mr. Buchanan in Nova Scotia, signed some time ago. The Liberals in Nova Scotia signed

MR. STAGG: with the Liberals in Ottawa,
the Nova Scotia offshore agreement where the -

MR. SIMMS: Where they gave it away to the
feds, is that the one?

MR. STAGG: Where they gave it away to the
feds. Yes, that is the one.

Well, Mr. Rompkey was of the
opinion that the Nova Scotia government had a veto, v-e-t-o,
over any arrangement or any agreement or any question that
might be handled by that five member board that is going
to administer the offshore. Now the situation is there
are five people to be appointed to the board that is going
to manage Nova Scotia's offshore resources if, in fact, they
have any.

MR. STAGG: We are hearing a lot about gas over there recently, but a lot of that gas may be just guck.

But I hope for their sake that they do have some gas.

MR. HODDER: This is boring.

MR. STAGG: Yes, the member from Port au Port says it is boring. Well, the member from Port au Port is going to hear a little bit more about this, about how his Liberal friends in Nova Scotia and his Liberal friends in Ottawa and his great Liberal friend in Grand Falls/White Bay/Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), what he knows about the Nova Scotian agreement. He said that Nova Scotia had a veto and when Mr. Crosbie got up and exposed him for the ignoramus that he was, he tried to retract. But, Mr. Speaker,

one thing you cannot do when you have Hansard, when you have the ubiquitous microphone in front of you, once you have said it, you cannot -

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot change it.

MR. STAGG: That is right - you cannot call it back. He should have kept his mouth shut, because words unexpressed may sometimes fall back dead, but God himself cannot kill them when they are said. A great poet said that, I do not know who he was, his name may be anonymous, but it is being repeated by me at this time, I think it is appropriate. Mr. Rompkey tried to say what Nova Scotia had was an option, and then he tried to scurry on to other matters. But that is where Mr. Rompkey stands on a matter so vital to the Newfoundland economy and to the Newfoundland issue.

MR. BUTT: He does not know the war is over.

MR. STAGG: The member for Fogo, in his usual carping style, is attempting to divert me from this. Well, I suggest to hon. members opposite, if they were to

MR. STAGG: do anything, if they were to accomplish anything in this House of Assembly other than to be rag tag artillery remnants of the Liberal Party in this Province, if they were to accomplish anything in this House of Assembly, I would ask one particular member of the opposition, for whom many of us have a certain amount of respect in certain categories, and that is he is purported to be well equipped with grey matter, not on the top of his head but in the inside of his head - we have one member opposite who has a great deal of grey matter on the top of his head, but there is another one of the hon. members opposite, the former, former, former Leader of the Opposition once removed, who is reputed to be quite a clever fellow. Of course I speak about the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). And what I would like for him to do, and I requested him to do it recently- Mr. Speaker, if only there were television cameras here now.

MR. F. STAGG: I hold up the proposal for settlement, Canada/Newfoundland offshore negotiations, presented by Newfoundland on January 25th. 1982. I would like for that gentleman to have the political sagacity, and the hon. member attempts to tell me how to pronounce words.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you know any jokes or is that something you learned on channel 13?

MR. STAGG: I am correct. Of course I am correct. I would ask that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), who is not here today as is his wont, I would ask him to analyze this document and to say where it is deficient so far as the protecting of Newfoundland is concerned. I challenge him especially, and if he does not do it, I would challenge any other member of the Opposition who thinks he has a political future in this Province to analyze this document and to say where is it deficient as it pertains to the guarding of Newfoundland's future. And I would suggest, what they will find -

AN HON. MEMBER: They will have to read it first.

MR. STAGG: Yes, they have to read it first. They have not read it. They went through the whole election and did not read it. And what they will find is that this is a document which is a blueprint for the Economic Development of Newfoundland, because it has in it the great prospect for the fiscal rehabilitation of Newfoundland, indeed the fiscal rehabilitation of Canada. So it is something that the hon. members opposite should be familiar with, and if hon. members opposite would say - Mr. Speaker, I am going to take one more minute - if hon. members opposite after reading this document were to hold a press conference and say, 'We agree that the proposal for settlement of January 25th, 1982, is a reasonable

MR. STAGG: proposal, or we disagree with these particulars; then they would be on their way into power. But, Mr. Speaker, I would tell you right now I predict that they will avoid it like the plague. They will avoid it like the plague because they are afraid of it, they know that it is the document that the people of Newfoundland voted on on April 6th. And they do not want to be reminded of it. They do not want to be reminded of it. Well, hon. gentleman, let me tell you, let me tell you because I feel for you, I feel for you because I realized that you are over there and you think that you are there for the rest of your lives, if you can get re-elected. You are over there and you will be out of power and you will have the Opposition mentality. You are slouching around, half dressed, that sort of thing. You know what happens when you are too long in Opposition, you lose respect for everything. Well, I would ask hon. gentleman if they wish to get back into power, and only one of them was ever in power, two of them were in power, if they ever wish to get into power that they must address themselves to these major issues as outlined in this proposal for settlement in the Canada offshore negotiations. It is a suggestion, it is only a suggestion, I think it is the same kind of suggestion that Mr. Bennett out in Corner Brook - Mr. Jim Bennett is saying that the Liberal Party needs to be revived,

MR. STAGG: it needs to be stabbed in the back perhaps, even, who knows? He seems to have the right idea, that they are all a group of people who are living in the past. And the Liberal Party in the Province wants to be vibrant and look forward and to be at least comparable to the Peckford administration.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. STAGG: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I was just getting into the good stuff too.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the budget, as the member for Stepenville (Mr. Stagg) was saying, there is no doubt that we have to increase revenue in order to look after the economy. I was just going through the 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982 budgets, Mr. Speaker. I was just looking at them. In the 1979 budget we increased tobacco tax by five cents; tax on insurance companies from 2 per cent to 3 per cent; vehicle registration, \$10.00 per vehicle; tax on aviation fuel from seven-tenths to one per cent per litre and a 4 per cent tax being introduced on media advertising. That was in 1979.

Back in 1980, \$7.5 million was raised through taxes; another eight cents on a pack of cigarettes; corporation income tax up by 1 per cent, insurance company tax being extended to non-profit organizations and interest rates on government loans being increased from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. That was back in 1980, increases on these fishermen loans, farmer loans and so on.

Now it has gone up - within two years it has doubled - it is up to 12 per cent now.

MR. HISCOCK: the various increases being applied to wildlife and park permits, they never even said how much they were increased.

In 1981 we had a tobacco tax again, another ten cents on a package; drivers licence \$2.00 per year registration. And then, of course, it breaks it down, \$8.00 for vehicles under a certain weight and \$15.00 for others; gasoline tax being increased immediately by an amount of one cent per litre and two cents per litre on diesel fuel. In future the tax will be changed from a fixed rate to a percentage rate. That was back in 1981.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Then, of course, the Liquor Commission was asked to raise an extra \$4 million. In the 1982 budget we saw that there was a ceiling of 5 per cent on Senior Public Servants wage increases, as well as an income tax increase raised by another 2 per cent, a tobacco tax, another ten cents on a package, the Newfoundland Liquor Commission asked to raise another \$5.5 million, corporation tax went up from 1 per cent to 16 per cent effective January 1st, a new capital tax of 1.5 per cent will be imposed on banks, loan and trust companies, and various government fees are to be increased another \$1 million. Interest rates on new loans by the Fisheries Loan Board, the Farm Development Loan Board, the Rural Development Authority are increased from 8 per cent to 12 per cent. Back in 1980 they were only 6 per cent, now they are up to 12 per cent. Hospital charges, our medicare system that we hear so much about, ward charges from \$3.00 to \$5.00 a day, semi-private rooms from \$12.00 to \$20.00 a day and private rooms from \$18.00 to \$30.00 a day, as well as other taxes. We have 11 per cent sales tax in the Province, we have the highest income tax in the Province. With regard to the economy, the Parliamentary Assistant held up a document and said, 'Deal with that'. I ask this House, Mr. Speaker, and the people of our Province, we are overtaxed, very, very overtaxed and what are we getting for it? The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) get up and says, 'We are spending so much on education and so much on hospitals'. Surely we need to modernize our schools and get new schools and that is what government is there for. But one of the things that

MR. HISCOCK: I cannot understand, with only eight of us over here, is why the government, that is the government and will be the government for the next four years, and with the attitude the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has, he thinks they will be there for a long time, why is it that they do not in actual fact get on with the job of governing? Why are they more concerned with the Opposition, eight members over here, than getting on with the job of trying to tackle the -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - problems of the mining industry in Labrador City, Wabush and down in Baie de Verte, trying to solve the educational problems that we have as a result of Grade XII, trying to solve our fishing problems that we have. Why is it they spend so much time being concerned with the eight members here? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, more of their energy is going into that field than in trying to come up with concrete solutions. What we are expecting in this Province and what we are not getting is good government. We are paying enough for it, we are paying the highest rates in Canada in regard to taxation. But are we getting good government? Are we getting a fair return on our dollar? Obviously, the answer is no.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to winning forty -four seats in the last election, obviously our people felt for various reasons they wanted that type of government. It is often said we get what we deserve and obviously we deserve what we got. But good government, Mr. Speaker, are we getting good government? Can we expect it? With regard to tomorrow tomorrow is Memorial Day as well as a national holiday, Canada Day. And I am sure the people, our war veterans of the First and Second World Wars who fought for freedom and justice, I am sure when they look at this government with regard to the direction that government is taking us in the economy, I am sure they are not very pleased, and not very pleased about the way they have handled the economy for the past 10 years. And as I said, with the Peckford administration in the past four years, again we have not really seen much leadership. We have seen everything being blamed on the national government, particularly in the past four years of the Peckford administration. That is their approach those are the tactics they have decided to use. But with regard to -

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A point of order.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, there are certain rules in the House with regard to attire, the way hon. members are supposed to dress. Now, the hon. member has been in the House for the second or third day with a despicable tie. I am not sure what colour it is, I am colour blind, but I believe it is not appropriate for this House of Assembly. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that he be asked to remove the tie or remove himself from the House of Assembly and wear something appropriate.

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

MR. NEARY: How silly can you get, Mr. Speaker?

Everybody knows that is not a point of order and I would ask

Your Honour -

MR HODDER: He is an embarrassment to the House.

MR. NEARY: Yes. - to direct the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, not to be deliberately interrupting my hon. colleague who is making an excellent speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

The hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) did not raise a valid point of order.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, that only reenforces what I just said. Here we have a parliamentary secretary, hopefully Cabinet material, who would like to get into the Cabinet and instead of being down in his office doing some work and actually trying to solve some of the problems in this Province, he gets up on a Point of Order questioning one's tie. The Member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) asked the question whether you were wearing a Labatts tie? Maybe you are wearing a Labatts tie. We noticed the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was wearing an E.P.A. tie today, and the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) of course, has a Bulgarian tie on today. But, anyway, we could get into various things in that way. But with regard to the other point that I would like to get into, Mr. Speaker, good government, we are celebrating our National Holiday tomorrow. After one hundred and fifteen years we are seeing the nation probably at its worst time, with a

MR. HISCOCK: \$20 million deficit. And I do not really care, Mr. Speaker, who we blame it on, but this government and all the governments of the provinces have to accept the blame, at least part of the blame, of not trying to find some solutions to our problems today. We have the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) up criticizing Nova Scotia, and criticizing of one of our sister provinces, instead of being pleased with them. At least they have an agreement, and they probably will have some type of development before us. Instead of being pleased for them, what are we doing? Here we are cutting up one of the other parts of our confederation. So, no wonder this nation has the problems that it has today, and that is why confederation is in trouble. Nobody wants to be a net contributor these days, everybody wants everything from the confederation, and nobody wants to turn around and co-operate, and make sure that we get a fair share in developing this great country of ours. Are we getting that, Mr. Speaker? The answer is no. We are not seeing any leadership from the provinces. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - we were talking the other day and the member from LaPoile was saying with regard to the economy; are there any businessmen in this Province looking towards the Premier of this Province for a solution to the problems with our economy? Obviously, the answer is no. Is anybody looking to the Premiers of Nova Scotia, or Ontario, or B.C., and looking for solutions there? The answer is no. They all go to the federal government for the solutions, so much so that we are finding ourselves trying to keep the country going with a \$20 billion deficit. And here is the government criticizing the deficit, but yet the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is asking for another \$30 million for a Fisheries College, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) is asking for X number of other things. Here are DREE agreements and X

MR. HISCOCK: number of other things, and of course, we want it, we want everything. The same is true for Quebec, the same is true for Ontario, and the same is true for Nova Scotia and all of the other provinces, we want everything, and what we have is a \$20 billion deficit. But are we seeing any direction from the provinces to solve some of our problems, Mr. Speaker.

No, we are not. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, when our historians look back upon this decade, the 70s to the 80s, whatever criticism they give the national government, one of the greatest failings is obviously the lack of foresight on the part of the Premier's and the provinces to contribute to the national good, and try to solve some of our problems on the national level. But what we have seen is a period in Canada, for whatever reason, where the provinces have reverted back themselves, thinking only of themselves, putting up more barriers instead of trying to

MR. HISCOCK: reach the potential that we have. As I said, tomorrow is our national holiday and Memorial Day, and is this House being closed? Are we giving the Nation the respect that it deserves? No. We are going to open as usual. Even the banks are going to be closed tomorrow and other things. And I, for one, Mr. Speaker, find it a bit despicable that here we are in a great country and we cannot even observe the day. The same was also true of our own holiday of June 24th. Did we observe that after so many years and say, let us go forward and build a great province and a great country? No, we are not seeing that, Mr. Speaker. We are getting up and making points of order on members' ties in the House. That is the leadership, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province. And there are a lot of members in the provincial governments across this country who are like the parliamentary secretary from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate. Thank you.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member has spoken.

MR. NEARY: I was on my feet before the hon. gentleman came back to his seat, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member has spoken.

MR. NEARY: I certainly have not spoken.

DR. COLLINS: You have spoken in the debate.

MR. NEARY: No, I have not spoken in the debate.

MR. TULK: Not in this debate.

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would like to yield, I would be willing to

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is getting near six, could I move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow. Would the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: I am talking to the Government House Leader. Would the hon. gentleman agree to move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow. It is getting near six o'clock.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, you can call it six o'clock if you like, Mr. Speaker. This is Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER: I will call it six of the clock. I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock.