

VOL. 1

NO. 50

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder there are no Statements by Ministers? I believe there are nine absent from their seats. This is the Oral Question Period and we do not have any ministers to ask questions of, Mr. Speaker.

Could the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. BAIRD: The other half are on their way back.

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. gentleman, I would go out and tell my constituents all he knows about the situation with Bowaters in Corner Brook.

Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he has notified the RCMP to start a search for the Premier and the ministers who are missing from the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I do not think that question is very pertinent to the Question Period and is ruled out of order.

MR. NEARY: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that EMO should be notified, Mr. Speaker, that all the ministers are missing.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. the Government House Leader, the Minister of Energy, if

MR. NEARY: with this new added dimension now thrown out by the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) in connection with their ambition to have a negotiated settlement on the offshore, where the federal Minister of Energy has suggested publicly that if the Province is not happy, if the reason they are not sitting down at the negotiating table and staying in a room and negotiating an offshore agreement is because they are afraid of a long-term agreement, Mr. Chretien has recommended a short-term agreement, five years, and if either side does not like the agreement after five years, tear it up. Now would that new factor now being injected into the negotiations or into the mix that we have, would

MR. S. NEARY: the hon. the Minister of Energy (Mr. Wm. Marshall) tell the House if on the basis of negotiating a five year agreement would it not be to the advantage of the Province in these poor economic times to sit down to the bargaining table and continue negotiations with the Government of Canada until an agreement is reached, even if it is a short-term agreement?

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there has been nothing official communicated to us from the federal government indicating that the federal government is taking any kind of a different stance than it has heretofore in the offshore negotiations. I would like to repeat that our position, which remains crystal clear, has been communicated to the federal government on many occasions and very recently as well. This is to the effect that this government is ready, willing and able at any time to sit down and talk about the offshore, to resume negotiations - as a matter of fact, in our opinion it would be to commence negotiations for the first time on the basis in which they were originally entered into, provided - and I do not think that this is unreasonable - provided the federal government indicates that it is prepared to address itself to the concepts to joint management and revenue sharing in accordance with the principles that were set out so clearly in our proposal of January 25, 1982, which proposal, I might point out, Mr. Speaker, is almost now a year old and the government of this Province has not even had the courtesy of a response to it. So my answer to the hon. gentleman is that if the federal government is

MR. WM. MARSHALL: prepared to address itself to the principles of joint management and reasonable revenue sharing and what I mean by that is this: With respect to joint management, we have proposed three/three with one independent Chairman, a joint set of regulations so that it is true joint management. Newfoundland does not claim sole management, neither would the federal government gain it. On the other side of the coin, all they have been talking about are three/two with the federal government having control. They regard joint management as the federal government having control. We simply do not accept that joint management consists of either government having complete control. If the federal government is prepared to sit down and talk about revenue sharing on a realistic basis - instead of equating it to equalization payments, equate it to the welfare of the people of this Province - so the people of the Province, for instance, can look forward to enjoying a per capita income equal to the average of Canadians rather than 49 per cent of the per capita income as it is today, so that the people of this Province can look forward to the time from their offshore resources where they will have an employment rate equal to that in Canada rather

MR. MARSHALL: than, infinitesimally, about 50 per cent of the rate in Canada, so that we can look forward to taxation rates equal to the average of Canada and so on. In other words, if it is prepared to sit down and negotiate on that basis, we are quite prepared to sit down, Mr. Speaker, and resume negotiations. To date, regrettably, we have not received this invitation. To date the situation stands that there was a meeting between the Prime Minister and the Premier of this Province where the Premier was trying to press upon the Prime Minister the justice and equity of our proposal and earnestly entreating the Prime Minister to address himself to these principles. And as everyone knows, the Prime Minister's response to it was, 'We have agreed to disagree. The matter must go to court. You take the Nova Scotia proposal or nothing.' Now if the federal government wished to say to us that they are prepared to enter into negotiations embracing and addressing the concepts of joint management and revenue sharing in accordance with the principles set down by our negotiations, and are prepared to realize that this Province will never accept the Nova Scotian agreement as it was dressed up and delivered to us in the federal proposal, that this agreement had been discredited insofar as it applies to the Province of Newfoundland and will never be accepted by this Province, Mr. Speaker. And if they will listen not only to the people in Newfoundland but to the Liberal Leader in Nova Scotia, who points out that that agreement itself is discredited for the purposes of Nova Scotia, if they will read the Central Canadian press such as the Globe and Mail which only last Friday had an indication as to the justice and equity of our proposal, then we will sit down, Mr. Speaker, if they want to address our proposal, if they want to address the principles of joint management and revenue sharing in a meaningful way, this Province is ready, willing and able at any time to sit down. But until

MR. MARSHALL: that time, Mr. Speaker, we cannot give away and we will not give away the birthright and the resources of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder with that kind of attitude and that kind of answer that we just heard from the hon. gentleman that there are no negotiations going on at the present time? My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that the two points that the hon. gentleman raised, revenue sharing and management or control of the resource, are both negotiable items.

The hon. gentleman did not address himself to this situation, he just merely squirted out his usual little bit of poison and venom against Ottawa and against the Government of Canada, so would the hon. gentleman address himself to the question that I put to the hon. gentleman about a short-term agreement, about a five year agreement? If the hon. gentleman is worried about a long-term agreement, about giving something away, if they do not have enough faith and confidence in themselves to be able to sit down and negotiate an agreement that is ironclad, then would they agree to sit down and negotiate a five year agreement and, after five years, if it does not work out to the satisfaction of either party, tear up the agreement and throw it away?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman knows that a five year agreement can be negotiated. Mr. Chretien has said he is prepared to entertain a short-term agreement, a five year agreement. Now would the hon. gentleman address that question? Also he could tell the House at the same time that there are signals coming from Ottawa, not from the Province, because the minister just laid down a number of pre-conditions in public and I do not think the minister should be negotiating in public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

The fact of the matter is,

Mr. Speaker, that there are two proposals on the table. There is the federal proposal and the provincial proposal. There are two proposals on the table and somewhere in between there is a common ground for an agreement, a common ground - that is what negotiations are all about. But, Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to believe the people out there who are saying the government is deliberately stalling an agreement, they do not want an agreement, they want to carry on the next federal election campaign on the fishery and on the offshore. And if they negotiated an agreement on the offshore -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition appears to the Chair to be getting into the realm of debate and maybe he could be more precise with his question.

MR. NEARY:

I think, Mr. Speaker, the message is getting out. If they negotiated an agreement on the offshore the issue for the next federal election would be gone.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman again. There are signals and messages coming from Mr. Chretien that he would like to sit down around the table in a room and negotiate, stay there until an agreement is negotiated. Now, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell this House how the parties will get together if somebody does not make a move? How will they get together? Mr. Chretien has made his move. Now the hon. gentleman answered today by being nasty about the whole thing. Could the hon. gentleman be a little more sensible and use common sense and tell us how the parties can get back to the bargaining table? How can this standoff be resolved?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, a series of questions the hon. gentleman asked. How can this be resolved, Mr. Speaker? I have already indicated how we can get back to the negotiating table - if the federal government is prepared to indicate that it is prepared to negotiate. Negotiations presume, Mr. Speaker, that people are talking on subjects that are going to come to an agreement, not on two separate parallel lines that will never meet. The parallel line in management is the fact that the federal government want all control and we want joint management. If they are prepared to come up to our level and say that they will talk about joint management, we will negotiate.

Now specifically as to some of the questions of

MR. MARSHALL:

the hon. gentleman, he said that 'my understanding is that they are now prepared to talk about revenue sharing and management.'

MR. NEARY:

Always were.

MR. MARSHALL:

And if the hon. gentleman heard the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada (Mr. Chretien) yesterday on the CBC programme, he would have seen quite clearly that what appeared to be - now what appeared to be the situation; I hope it is not so, I hope they will reconsider - when they talk about joint management is controlled by the federal government. The federal minister has sole control.

MR. STAGG:

Right on!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now it is very difficult to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, if somebody has a concept that joint management is that you have the sole control.

As to the five year contract, he says, you know, 'You do not want to give it away in the long-term'. Well, I say to the hon. gentleman, we are not going to give it away for five years and we are not going to give it away forever, we are not going to give away for one second the resources of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

He should well recognize that. And the proposal for a five-year agreement: Now how practical can that be, how workable can that possibly be? How can there be any development, Mr. Speaker, on merely a five-year agreement without there being security with respect to the continuance? And what we would do and perhaps what would be convenient for the hon. gentleman, who apologizes day by day for the federal government and the way it is trampling on the interests -

MR. SIMMS:

And the rights of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL:

- and the rights of the people of this Province, sure he would love a five year deal! It would

MR. MARSHALL: take the heat off the Liberal Party in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But what would happen would consign the people of this Province to a faith worse than they were consigned to under the Churchill Falls agreement. And that is what we are not going to do, M. Speaker. We have no intention of doing that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: As to the signals and messages I say this sincerely to the federal government, we have asked for signals and messages. But it is not that signals and messages are coming, is what are these signals and what are these messages and what are these signs? And they are signs that so far, and I thought the interview last night showed a certain amount of what appeared to be, and I say, 'appeared to be' and I believe is, confusion on the part of the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) as to their proposal. Now I say that is what it appeared to be. So we want signals and messages, but we want them crystal clear, not the message that appeared to be there that the federal minister was thinking that joint management was sole federal control, that he was thinking that meaningful revenue sharing meant getting Newfoundland away from the equalization payment and taking everything else away from them forever and a day so that their taxes could not come down, their employment rates could not go up, their per capita income could not go up, so that their schools and their hospitals and what have you could not come up to the level of other Canadians.

MR. MARSHALL: So we want signals and messages, but the quality and the nature of the signals and messages matter as well. And, number one, we cannot negotiate on the basis of signals and messages which are unclear; and, number two, I do not think it is fair to expect the people of this Province to negotiate on a basis other than the basis of embracing the principles and the concept of joint management and reasonable revenue sharing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now the hon. gentleman

MR. MARSHALL:

talks about pre-conditions, again parroting what his masters have said in Ottawa from time to time when, with the aid of the Liberal Party in this Province they had temporarily succeeded in giving the impression that we were stubborn, greedy and nasty and wanted everything it would be a great disappointment to the hon. gentlemen, I know, to see the way the central Canadian press and the Globe and Mail last Friday and in other instances have condemned roundly the federal government and their stand and the way that they have trampled the people of this Province. But as to pre-conditions and negotiating Mr. Speaker, he has some gall. He comes in here and he asks these questions which force me to answer and which I come out publicly and answer. If he wants to talk about negotiating in public, what about Mr. Chretien last night on T.V.? That is what he was doing.

I am not going to be entrapped by the hon. member so that he can get up and say that we are confronting the federal government. I am saying very calmly and coolly to the hon. gentleman that if the federal government will address itself in a meaningful fashion to the principles of joint management and meaningful revenue sharing along the principles and the concepts that were set out in our unanswered proposal and will realize that this Province, no matter how much they may try to hammer us into the ground, will never bend to the anvil of the Nova Scotian agreement or anything like it but insist on managing that resource on a joint basis, on a revenue sharing basis meaningful to us, meaningful to the rest of Canada, if he can get that through the cranium in Ottawa, then as far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, with a heart and a half we will sit down

MR. MARSHALL: and negotiate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But until then, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the Leader of the Government of Canada has indicated that 'we have agreed to disagree,' in his words, 'the matter has to go to the Court,' it has rejected the plea eloquently given by the Premier asking him to embrace and talk about the items of revenue sharing and joint management; if they change, we would be the happiest people in the world and sit down with them. But until they do, we are not going to get the hopes of the people of this Province up once again, only to see them dashed in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if you examine the words just uttered by the hon. gentleman, you will detect that there is not a conciliatory note in what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is the biggest obstruction we have in this Province in getting a negotiated agreement. I do not believe this Province will get anywhere -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - as long as the hon. gentleman, with that attitude, Mr. Speaker, is making the kinds of statements he just made in this House, you will never get a

MR. NEARY: negotiated agreement, and I do not believe the hon. gentleman wants one, I think they deliberately want to keep this an issue for the next federal election. The hon. gentleman knows that you cannot have equalization grants and have your revenue from the offshore besides. You cannot have both. You cannot have your welfare and a job too, the hon. gentleman knows that. And that is unfair. That is very unfair to make a statement like that.

Now, the hon. gentleman also knows that under the Constitution of Canada you can declare the oil and gas off our shores in the national interest; the Government of Canada could do that if they wanted to and take it over. And the hon. gentleman also knows that Mr. Lougheed signed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please?

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen do not like to hear the truth, I know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Maybe it is time I referred hon. members to my right and left to Beauchesne, page 132, which says: "It must be a question, not an expression of an opinion, representation, argumentation, nor debate. The question must be brief. A preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble."

MR. WARREN: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman are that Mr. Lougheed, their buddy, their Tory friend out in Western Canada -

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: If the former Speaker will just allow me, I said is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Lougheed has a short-term agreement?

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not.

MR. NEARY: He does not? The hon. gentleman shakes his head. The hon. gentleman better check it out, because Mr. Lougheed does have a short-term agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Alberta oil.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is a good question. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? And, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware that it is a fact that we do not have an agreement on the offshore that is causing our economy to sag and to deteriorate at the moment? Is the hon. gentleman aware that the fishery is suffering because of no offshore agreement, that the forestry is suffering because of no offshore agreement, that the construction industry is suffering because of no offshore agreement? And is the hon. gentleman aware that the iron ore industry in this Province is suffering because of no offshore agreement? Is the hon. gentleman aware that the economy of this Province is collapsing down around our ears?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has raised a large number of supplementary questions in one sentence.

MR. HODDER: What about the answers?

MR. NEARY: With brief answers, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Is that not a shame, Mr.

Speaker? I mean, what a disgrace not just to Newfoundland
but to humanity itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WM. MARSHALL:

The hon. the gentleman talks about Mr. Lougheed having a short term agreement. He does not realize that Mr. Lougheed's agreement is with respect to pricing. Mr. Lougheed has no worries whatsoever with respect to issues of joint management, no worries at all with respect to revenue sharing apart from the pricing which would affect our offshore as well as Alberta, and Saskatchewan. He does not understand the differences and, Mr. Speaker, it is a consummate disgrace that any person who is elected to represent Newfoundlanders would get up in a public forum and ask such uninformed questions as that.

He asked, Mr. Speaker, 'Do we know that the forestry is suffering, the fishery is suffering?' Certainly we know that we have, Mr. Speaker, a very fragile economy that suffers worse than anywhere else in Canada where we have a recession nationally and internationally, and such, Mr. Speaker, is the make-up and such is the mien of people like the hon. gentleman that that is the kind of philosophy that would lead them to give away the birthright of Newfoundlanders yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And, Mr. Speaker, we are not about to give away the birthright of Newfoundlanders now and Newfoundlanders yet to come just for the short period of time that we are in now and the position we are in now. That is what the hon. gentlemen would do. They would feed themselves on the public trough, as they were so used to doing, at the expense of generations yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

They got re-elected over and over again. We saw that happen in the Upper Churchill when they did it in the Upper Churchill; they gave that away so that they could get re-elected over and over and over

MR. WM. MARSHALL: again, and what has happened today?
There would be no increase in taxes today if they had not taken that route.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you know, he gets up and the little weasel words that he uses and he says, 'Do we not realize, Mr. Speaker, that they can take it over? Do we not realize the power that the federal government has?' Such is the measurement of the gentleman over there. He might think that they can take it over, but if they think that they can take it over they will take it over over our dead bodies and of the dead bodies of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for people to stand up for Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rise up in arms.

MR. MARSHALL: Before April 8, 1982 we were faced with some - what was it? - with some sixteen gentlemen on the opposite side, now we only have eight quislings, and if they keep on going there will be nothing left over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question, question!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is amazing how hon. gentleman can applaud such a low, rotten response from the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: It could only come from a buttoned-down, narrow-minded individual. That kind of an answer, Mr. Speaker, could only come from a low down, rotten minded, buttoned-down, narrow-minded individual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

There is approximately five minutes left in the Question Period and there has been really about three questions asked in Question Period. I think we should use the rest of the time to the best advantage.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate on such an important matter that we should have to get down and roll in the mud with the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware that Senator Doody, a former Finance Minister of this Province, made a public statement this morning that the economy and the finances of this Province are in such a mess that the MacDonald Commission's number one priority should be to look at Newfoundland? Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman aware that that condition, which is much worse in Newfoundland than it should be - we realize there are bad conditions, poor times, all over the world - but in Newfoundland the situation is worse than it should be as a result of the kind of attitude and the kind of answer we just heard from the hon. gentleman. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? And is the hon. gentleman aware, Mr. Speaker, if he is not aware he will be aware in another day or so when the Youth Commission tables their report on unemployment amongst youth in this Province, that it will knock the hon. gentleman's eyeballs out, is the hon. gentleman aware that all of this is brought about because of a very poor political climate and atmosphere brought about because of poor relations between

MR. NEARY: this Province and the Government of Canada and the lack of a negotiated agreement on the offshore?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, now that I have beaten the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) into calm submission -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - I would assume, knowing Senator Doody, that he is aware of the fragile economy we have in this Province, but knowing Senator Doody I know he shares with us the reasons for it.

MR. SIMMS: What are the reasons?

MR. MARSHALL: And the reasons for it are twelve years of Trudeau rule in Canada which has very much affected this Province because, even though we are in a recession, it has seen Canada plunged as one of the trading nations in the world.

MR. SIMMS: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: And we, as one of the exporters of primary resources in Canada, are suffering as a result of it.

MR. SIMMS: Right on.

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, we realize the fragileness of the economy but this fragileness of the economy, despite what the hon. gentleman there opposite urge us to do, it is not going to result in us giving away the resources which belong to the people of this Province for generations yet to come.

MR. MARSHALL: So I say that, and I also want to repeat - because we are coming near the end of the Question Period - very calmly to the hon. gentleman, and he can copy it down and give the message, if he wishes, to his federal counterparts and colleagues, that this government is willing to negotiate, at any given time, provided the federal government indicates that it is prepared to address itself to real joint management and meaningful revenue sharing in accordance with the principles as set down in our agreement of January 25th which, Mr. Speaker, represents the only joint management and revenue regime, realistic one, that has been advanced.

MR. SIMMS: Right on!

MR. MARSHALL: And once he convinces the hon. gentlemen that the proposals that they are attempting to foist on the people of Newfoundland just will not wash, because it is not joint management, it is total federal control, it is not, Mr. Speaker, meaningful revenue sharing at all, because it does nothing for the people of Newfoundland in any meaningful way by way of giving them the right to attain equality with their average fellow Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I will make this one a double-barrelled one.

Is the hon. gentleman aware that an oil drilling rig that was destined for the Grand Banks a couple of weeks ago was diverted

MR. NEARY: to Sable Island off Nova Scotia because we have no agreement on the offshore? And now that I have the hon. gentleman calmed down, Mr. Speaker - I have him calmed down a little bit and he is no longer hysterical - I will go back to a question that I asked earlier. Now that he is calmed down, could he tell us how the parties now get back - it seems to me in that last answer that the hon. gentleman gave that it is possible for the Province to get back to the bargaining table and Ottawa get back to the bargaining table. But how can this be brought about now? I mean, you just cannot do it through the media or just taking pot shots at each other, Mr. Chretien and the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chretien, by the way, has been a thorough gentleman about all of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. the member for Labrador West should go down and try to save that bank down there, never mind sneering and jeering in this House about a serious matter.

MR. NEARY:

How now do they get back to the bargaining table? Somebody has to pick up a telephone or Telex a message or write a letter. How can they be brought about? Will the hon. gentleman go down to his office, pick up his telephone, say, "Look, Mr. Chretien, come down and let us spend a couple of days at this and see if we can make any progress"? Would that not be the proper attitude, responsible attitude for the hon. gentleman to take?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my attempt not to let any questions of the Opposition go unanswered, I would say first of all with respect to the oil rig, it is a matter of common knowledge, it was in the paper, that it has not been diverted to Nova Scotia because there is no agreement. It has always been intended that it would go to Nova Scotia for a period of about four or five months. Originally it was to have come to the Hibernia structure and then it was to go to Nova Scotia for some four or five months. But instead of that it went to Nova Scotia first for four or five months, and then it is coming here. So the rig in effect has been consigned to Newfoundland.

I might say to the hon. gentleman too, he might be interested in this - although I do not think he is too interested in it because he is only interested in other things - the Newfoundland regulations are applying in large measure to that rig. Many young Newfoundlanders are employed on it and will continue to be employed on it, purely and simply because of the foresight of this government in bringing in the regulations requiring Newfoundland content. So I know he will be glad and/or maybe disappointed. I do not know. I could

MR. MARSHALL: care less what his perception is to hear it. But it is a fact that the oil rig has not, as he misrepresents, been diverted from here because there was no agreement. In fact it is coming here.

How do the parties get back together? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that everything that I have said to the hon. gentleman, I might say it probably in a briefer message, has gone to Mr. Chretien. Mr. Chretien is fully aware of the situation of this Province and the Province's position with respect to the matter, that we are prepared to negotiate if they are prepared to address themselves to the principles of joint management and revenue sharing and that it has to be understood, when we talk about joint management, we do not mean federal control. When we talk about revenue sharing, we just do not mean that we take our equalization from our own resource out there and Ottawa takes everything else, forever and a day thereafter.

As far as Mr. Chretien goes, you know, Mr. Chretien is a very easy person to talk to. Mr. Lalonde was a very easy person to talk to. Everybody is a very easy person to talk to when one sits down and talks to them. But at the same time that does not mean that we can in any way recant from the position which is really a minimal position, that this government has taken to protect the interests of the people of this Province, and that is the position that we will continue to take forever and a day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell :
expired.

The Question Period has

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for the C. A. Pippy Park Commission for the year 1981-82. A lot of good information there too, Sir.

MR. CALLAN: Could we have the roads programme too?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. That is the roads programme.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Permit The Continuance In The Province Of Carino Company Limited".

ORDER; OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, Mr. Speaker, you came on Orders of the Day quicker than I thought you would.

Motion 2, Bill No. 74.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the imposition of a tax on insurance premiums, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

We are discussing a resolution concerning Bill No. 74, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Premiums Act, 1978".

RESOLUTION

"That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Insurance Premiums Tax Act, 1978."

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were debating this bill I raised a few matters such as before the government started increasing taxes they should have been cutting expenditure, and that seems to be a very popular item with the general public. Because everywhere I go, and I think my colleagues can verify this, it is brought to our attention, and through phone calls and letters and brown envelopes that are dropped in the mail, unsigned and signed, and all the information that is coming to us is that there are all kinds of examples of extravagance and waste, all kinds of examples where government could have cut expenditure before they started increasing taxes.

MR. NEARY:

And this is true, Mr. Chairman.

I indicated yesterday that anybody with a sharp pencil and a sharp eye can go through the estimates and they can whip out \$20 million, \$25 million, or \$30 million, no sweat, that would not hurt a single person

MR. NEARY: in this Province except, of course, the rich. It might hurt the rich.

But yesterday, when the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) was speaking, I think he indicated the government's position as far as the increases in taxes are concerned, when the hon. gentleman told us that poor people are not allowed to buy refrigerators or motor cars or flat irons or toilets for their houses or toilet paper. They are not allowed to buy ironing boards, they are not allowed to buy electric bulbs and electric fixtures for their houses. They are not allowed to have any of that, all they are allowed to do is spend their money on food, the hon. gentleman told us. They are not allowed to have television sets, they are not allowed to get second-hand pianos or anything like that. You have two classes of people in this Province, according to the hon. gentleman, you have his class of people, that he was talking about, who can afford to pay the tax, and you have the other class of people who only buy food anyway, buy food and children's clothes, that is all they spend their money on, the hon. gentleman told us.

I sent for Hansard today and I have it here in front of me, and I am going to have it Xeroxed and widely distributed in this Province; the hon. gentleman, who was speaking for the administration, propping up the administration and supporting the administration, telling the people of this Province on behalf of the government that he supports, that poor people are not allowed to have anything out of their money except food and children's clothing, that is all. And that is typical of the attitude of this administration. And I challenged backbenchers on the government side of the House yesterday to get up and repeat what the hon. gentleman had said. Or are they too ashamed to get up and repeat

MR. NEARY: what the hon. gentleman said about the two classes of people in this Province? And where are the majority? I would think the majority are in the class of ordinary people, Mr. Chairman. So I think it was disgusting. What we heard in this House yesterday was absolutely disgusting and typical of the attitude of this government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this, that we have a pretty serious situation in this Province at the present time. Our economy is in a mess, the finances of the Province are in a mess, and I do not believe, really, that hon. members on the opposite side realize how serious the situation is in this Province.

We have children going to school today in this Province with no lunches and no money to buy a lunch.

MR. HICKEY: Produce the facts.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can produce the facts. I heard a sermon in church on Sunday morning in the hon. gentleman's own district; he should have been there if he wanted to get the facts.

MR. HICKEY: I cannot help it if I do not go to the same church the hon. gentleman goes to.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman asked me to produce the facts.

MR. HICKEY: There are two or three down there, I am not the kind to go to church to be seen.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see! Is that so? Is that so?

MR. HICKEY: I go to church when I want to go.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should have been there to hear what that priest had to say -

MR. HICKEY: I do not need any priest to tell me about the poor.

MR. NEARY: That there are children going to school hungry.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: If the hon. gentleman knows of children in this Province who are going to school hungry, without any lunch, he should produce the names, the addresses, and we will look into it. If not, he should keep his mouth shut and stop spreading the gloom and doom and untruths.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HICKEY: He has gotten away with that for too many years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I rule there is no point of order. It is merely a difference of opinion between hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is funny how the hon. gentleman takes everything as a personal affront. The hon. gentleman much have his head buried in

MR. NEARY:

the sand, like the rest of his colleagues, if he does not realize that there are children going to school today in this Province, there are children been kept home today because there is no food in the house.

MR. HICKEY: If it is it is neglect.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is neglect. Oh, I see.

They do not know how to manage now. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman just whipped \$35 a month off the assistance of people who -

MR. HICKEY: Off the people who can afford it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see! They can afford it.

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, I wish -

MR. HICKEY: Look at their incomes!

MR. NEARY: - I had some of the letters here with me from people that the hon. gentleman says can afford it. I wrote the hon. gentleman two letters this morning about -

MR. HICKEY: Is that right?

MR. NEARY: - cases. And when he reads these letters, let him come up here and make a statement in the House that people can afford it.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that I am inclined to believe that priest. I think he should know when the school comes under his jurisdiction. He is also a member of the St. John's School Board, and categorically made the statement, overright 300 or 400 people, that children are going to school hungry, children are going to school poorly clad, children are going to school with nothing on their feet, that is how serious the situation is in this Province. And only a government and a minister who is insensitive to the needs of the people would say otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the midst of a very serious depression in this Province brought about

MR. NEARY: The figures are alarming.

MR. HICKEY: If you had not given away the Churchill we would be better off.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Chairman -

MR. HICKEY: If we had a better deal on the fishery we would be better off.

MR. NEARY: - remember the old saying about if your aunt had something or other she would be your uncle.

MR. TOBIN: You cannot take what the minister is saying.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should not take it as a personal affront because what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is general knowledge in this Province. And we have children going to school hungry. We have children who are kept home because there is no money for lunch, there is no bread in the house to give them a lunch. And the hon. gentleman can deny it all he wants. And the hon. gentleman's thirteen policy changes that he made - now I think there are ten or eleven, he whipped off three or four - are cruel and callous and are creating a tremendous hardship on people.

MR. HICKEY: Wrong! Wrong!

MR. NEARY: I am wrong, I see. The people who write us are wrong.

MR. HICKEY: I am a former social worker.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, he knows. He knows as much about social work now as my little dog and that is not very much.

MR. HICKEY: I know as much as the hon. gentleman does.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should not take it as a personal affront. The statements that I am making are about the general condition, the general condition of the economy. And, Mr. Chairman, people in authority, who are the administration, are not lifting a finger

MR. NEARY: to do anything about it. And during the Question Period today when I asked some pretty penetrating questions, some hard-hitting questions of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), it is too bad we did not have television in this House or we would have seen why we are in such a mess that we are in when we saw the answers given by the minister. If you examine the words, Mr. Chairman, they were words that could only bring on a war. There was not a conciliatory remark, note, air in what the hon. gentleman had to say. So I can only assume that it is a deliberate policy on the part of the government to continue warring with Ottawa. They are not interested in an offshore agreement, they want to have it for an issue in the next election. They want to downgrade the fisheries, they do not want an offshore agreement, they want to use these issues in the next federal election. And that is the game they are playing, Mr. Chairman, because the lack of an offshore agreement is what is creating the poor industrial climate in this Province at the present time. A poor political climate is what is driving business and industry away from Newfoundland over to Halifax, Nova Scotia, Mr. Chairman. And why do they continue to bury their heads in the sand?

Mr. Chairman, this crowd were elected to govern this Province and they are

MR. NEARY: not doing it. They were given a mandate to negotiate an offshore agreement - they are not doing it, and they are dragging down every industry in Newfoundland. The fishery is gone.

MR. TOBIN: You said 'Let the fish companies go.'

MR. NEARY: I wish somebody would let the hon. gentleman go.

MR. TOBIN: The people will keep me here for a long time.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should get himself a little hearing aid too and perhaps he might hear what is being said.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman should be careful because one of his legs tomorrow might drop off. He should not be making fun of the disabled.

MR. NEARY: Well, I realize I should not be making fun of the member for Burn. I realize that, Mr. Chairman. I realize he is disabled, but I would not say he is physically disabled, I would say it is something else.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that it is the lack of an offshore agreement that is causing -

MR. TOBIN: Is that what you said?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could I have silence?

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

MR. NEARY: Thank you. I will have another go as soon as one of my colleagues has spoken.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to delay the House. I just want to have a couple of words.

The hon. gentleman is usually easy to listen to because one takes him with two grains of salt, except today it is a bit difficult to listen to him. And, of course, when one offers any opposition at all or disagreement to what the hon. gentleman says, his usual cop-out is that the hon. minister is taking it personally. Well, I want to assure him that I do not take anything the hon. gentleman says personally because really I do not think the hon. gentleman knows what he is saying most of the time. So it would be awfully unfair for me to take personally or seriously anything he says. The hon. gentleman forgets the things that he utters from day to day.

Just last week or the week before, I think it was the week before, the hon. gentleman said that his best advice to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was to let the companies go bottom up and pick up the pieces and then try to sort it out. Today he is concerned because some companies are going bottom up. Now, the hon. gentleman should make up his mind on what he wants. And, as Leader of the Opposition for the Province, he should have his policies a little more firm and better established than that.

He talks about the poor.

My advice to the hon. gentleman is that anyone who attempts to stay in this House

MR. HICKEY: or to achieve success in public life on the backs of the poor usually gets their message loud and clear. They do not usually last too long.

Now the hon. gentleman has been around a long time. If he plans on staying around much longer I suggest he change his tune. Because he is not the only one, Mr. Chairman, with compassion for the poor. He is not the only one who cares about the poor. As a matter of fact, the track record of former administrations, with which the hon. gentleman was so closely connected, demonstrated clearly their lack of concern for the poor. And the hon. gentleman should not forget that. When he talked about children going to school hungry, or ill-clad, it is a fact of life, Mr. Chairman, that in the most prosperous society children go to school ill-clad. Indeed children probably go to school hungry. But it is not to be assumed that assistance is not provided or there to be had. That is what I meant when I said neglect.

It is not anything new that some children in our society in this Province, no different than any other, are neglected even under the best conditions. When there is plenty of employment, when there are prosperous times, unfortunately little children are neglected and not properly cared for.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the vein in which the hon. gentleman talked about children being hungry and ill-clad. He talked about them as though this administration was turning its back on the little children of the Province and the poor of the Province. And we all know such is not the case.

MR. HICKEY: My remarks, Mr. Chairman, were simply to mean that any family in need of assistance knows full well, there are fifty-two Social Services offices spanning this Province, and notwithstanding their means, their income, their circumstances, or anything else, there has never been a policy and there never will, I suspect, as long as this administration stays in office, where no matter what the income, what the circumstances, when need is established, when need is shown, that need will be met, notwithstanding rules, regulations or laws. And that happens to be the policy of this department and this government. So the hon. gentleman really, as I said when I started, is playing on words, and is attempting to create something out of nothing which really does not exist. If he is talking about taxes, which this bill is all about, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman also should be well acquainted with the fact that, as some people say, the poor we will always have with us, and maybe we will.

MR. STAGG: Not the hon. gentleman though.

MR. NEARY: There is also another saying that there are two things we are all sure of, death and taxes.

MR. T. HICKEY:

trying to be so hypocritical of saying one thing when he knows the difference, and indeed when he means something else. The least he can be in these troubled times is to be forthright with our people and level with them and not try to hoodwink them by mixing his words.

Mr. Chairman, no one is happy about bringing in a measure of taxation in this Province, least of all myself. I am too well acquainted with how the poor of this Province are finding it difficult to manage. What are we to do? Our every effort to create employment, our every effort to find agreement with the federal government fails because we have a government that is insensitive or indifferent, to be charitable to them, to our needs, our rights and our potential. The federal government seems hellbent on not giving us a chance in this Province to find our way and to become a have province, too interested in having it all, and yet the hon. gentleman, as leader of his party at the moment, would try to convince our people that we on this side, we in the government, are the greedy ones.

Mr. Chairman, he does not have to have to look too far to find out who the greedy ones are. The greedy ones are in Ottawa, who want their cake and they want to eat it too.

MR. S. NEARY:

Shame, shame!

MR. HICKEY:

Oh, the hon. gentleman is saying, 'Shame', Mr. Chairman because of the hand-outs that they give us.

MR. J. DINN:

He is defending his buddies.

MR. HICKEY:

The hon. gentleman is shouting, 'Shame', because I suppose they will tell us about the equalization payments and the transfer payments. The people

MR. T. HICKEY: in this Province do not want handouts, not when they have resources to develop to become independent and self-reliant on their own terms. They do not want the handouts at all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I suggest the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) should at least consider making a New Year's resolution when it comes New Year time. He should maybe resolve it in his own mind to level with the people of the Province while he holds that important position of Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HICKEY: I read last week that he has some aspirations of becoming Premier, and the only thing I can say to him is that we are improving day by day, month by month the whole situation for senior citizens. I assure the hon. gentleman, if he is going to be Premier of this Province he is going to be long gone beyond the age of being a senior citizen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I have to say a few words on this bill, especially after the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) just finished giving the Leader of the Opposition a tongue-lashing. I am surprised that he is leaving, because he is the same minister who in a day or so is going to close down the Social Services office in Bay Bulls.

MR. TULK: That is not right!

MR. WARREN: The minister who is planning to close down the Social Services office in Bay Bulls is the same minister who is talking about caring about the people on social welfare. Well, where is the minister now?

In his comments, the minister was saying that he has fifty-two offices scattered throughout the Province and all of a sudden, after he gets up and makes his ten minute spiel about how this government is treating the people, he is planning to close down an office and the people in Bay Bulls, Petty Harbour and all along the Southern Shore are going to have to go either to Trepassy or to St. John's if they want to visit a social welfare office.

MR. WARREN: Now, this is where the minister has decided to cut. If anyone wants to go and see a social worker, if anyone wants to go and pick up his monthly income from the Social Services Department, where he does not have any work, has no alternative, he has to get a car, a taxi and drive from Petty Harbour or Bay Bulls and either go to Trepassey or come down here on Harvey Road in St. John's, I would venture to say thirty miles one way or the other, and it is going to cost individuals getting social assistance at least \$15 or \$20 in taxi fares.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the same minister who just got up and defended his department. If the minister is so concerned about his department, has he called for an inquiry into this case?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I did not listen, because I was not in the House when the minister was speaking but my understanding of the bill now before the Committee is one that concerns the Insurance Tax Act and this bit seems to be concerning now the minister's office and has nothing to do with the bill.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, no wonder the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would smile when he took his seat. He noticed that anybody who knows the rules of this House was outside,

MR. NEARY: the experienced people were outside when he made his point of order. He thought he could sneak it through, Your Honour. We are debating a money bill, Mr. Chairman, and under a money bill it is almost the same as bringing a budget into the House. Under money bills you have a wide-ranging debate, especially when you are increasing taxes. The hon. gentleman can yawn and smile because he knows, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MARSHALL: It is a money bill.

MR. NEARY: - it is a money bill, that is right. Now he admits it, so there is no point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of the other things that the hon. minister said; he said, 'The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is attacking the poor'. Well, Mr. Chairman, where was the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) yesterday - I will quote from Hansard what the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) said about the poor. I will quote, Mr. Chairman, here on Tape No. 2856, the hon. member says: "On goods that are taxable, hardware, furniture, etc., how many television sets, cars, refrigerators, etc. do people on fixed incomes buy? Very, very few." Now listen to the next part. "Consequently, little or no effect. Adult clothing, anybody who is getting \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year or less does not spend much money on adult clothing." Now, Mr. Chairman, what do all the people in this Province do, the 63 per cent who are below the poverty line in this Province, what do those 63 per cent do for adult clothing? Do they go and steal? Do they go and borrow and beg and everything else? They have to go and buy it, Mr. Chairman. So if you are talking about the poor people, if you are talking about below the average income, they are 63 per cent of the people, Mr. Speaker. So let us not attack

MR. WARREN: the poor, let us look at the comment from your hon. colleague. It is the minister who is attacking the poor by closing down an office in Bay Bulls.

MR. WALSH: Has that office been closed down yet?

MR. WARREN: It is going to be closed down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: But hold on now, Here is the reason why it is not going to be closed down. It is because we are letting the people know - here is another example of the minister trying to use his restraint programme, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, where was the minister when the Supreme Court and the Newfoundland Court of Appeal handed down a decision about a foster child in Gander? Where was the minister then? Has the minister let the Director of Child Welfare go unscathed, Mr. Chairman? Has there been a public inquiry called into this whole case? No, Mr. Chairman, the minister is more concerned about getting up in the House of Assembly and saying that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is attacking the poor.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this government has attacked the poor; this government has really brought in those bills to attack the poor. As the hon. member said yesterday - I agree with part of his statement - the rich people can afford it.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: I do not want the people in the community the hon. gentleman referred to to be alarmed. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to take great pride out of alarming people unnecessarily. There is no decision made on the office the hon. gentleman refers to. Whatever kind of a source of information he has, or what sources he has, he should fire them like the people who write his questions, as I suggested to him a couple of weeks ago. They are about as accurate as his questions.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that is just a deliberate attempt by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) to harass the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) when he is trying to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, I rule there is not point of order. The hon. minister just took the opportunity to explain the situation in his department.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, on October 1 - talk about a minister attacking the poor - the Director

MR. WARREN: of Social Assistance brought in a policy, No.53-82, and made thirteen changes in the Social Assistance Act. And, Mr. Chairman, the minister got up in the House the following day and, in fact, Hansard can verify this, said three of those policy changes would not come into effect. In actual fact the minister misled the House because they are in effect. I have been talking to social workers in this Province and they are in effect.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman cannot give erroneous information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. Chair heard references by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that the hon. minister misled the House. I believe that is unparliamentary. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if it is agreeable to the House, I withdraw these remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: However, the minister did not tell the whole truth in the House, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I have to insist that the hon. gentleman withdraw, retract without qualification that comment. I am an expert on what happens to people who call people liars in the House. Let him check Hansard on that.

MR. WARREN: No, my son! No, no, no!

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order -

MR. HICKEY: Withdraw it without qualification.

MR. WARREN: No, no, I will not withdraw for you.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I stand on my rights, I insist the hon. gentleman withdraw his remark without qualification. I did not tell half the truth, I told the whole truth, nothing but the truth, so help me God.

MR. WALSH: Withdraw!

MR. HICKEY: Now, is that enough for the hon. gentleman?

MR. WARREN: No, I am not going to withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward) Order, please!

The hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) withdrew the unparliamentary statement that the Chair heard, and I rule that the point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is merely a difference of opinion.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, those policy changes -

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

MR. WARREN: Oh my goodness gracious!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Well, since I only have ten minutes I might as well get into this very quickly. This is a money bill and as we all know the debate on money bills is wide-ranging, and I will return to a familiar theme that I have developed with some success in the House of Assembly, at least it usually succeeds in getting under the skin of the hon. members opposite, whose skins are notoriously thin, when the type of representation that they are giving this Province is pointed out.

Now I will just say in my opening remarks, why do we have this bill before the House? Obviously any government that is concerned about re-election and is concerned generally about its longevity is not going to willy-nilly bring in bills that tax people and get money from them, especially when times are bad. So it is not something that is done without some provocation.

Now what is the provocation in this case? Well, the provocation is there is a general economic downturn in the economy of Canada and of the world, and Newfoundland has not been insulated from it. Need that be so, Mr. Chairman? Need that be so? No. The answer to that question is no, it need not be so.

You recall that back in the middle 1970s when there was a recession in Canada, one province in Canada rode high, wide, and handsome over that recession, that province, of course, being the Province of Alberta, at a time when other provinces in Canada were struggling along, raising taxes, and having deficit budgets or having restrictions on their ability to spend. The Province of Alberta was building up a heritage fund. Why was it building up a heritage fund?

MR. STAGG:

Because it had access to, it had control over, and was wisely developing its resources, primarily its oil resources. What is the situation here in Newfoundland? Well, the situation here in Newfoundland is that in 1949 when we joined Confederation our per capita was 46 per cent of the national average, and some thirty-two or thirty-three years later we are struggling around 50 per cent of the national average.

So we have decided that we need a better deal from the Canadian Government. They are the only people who can give us the better deal. And unfortunately all we have been subjected to is some long range propaganda type argumentation from a couple of gentlemen who obviously know better but have very little feeling for the intellect and the intelligence of Newfoundlander.

When you see Mr. Chretien coming down

MR. F. STAGG:

Halifax and making these obnoxious statements to Newfoundlanders - he is not coming down to talk to Nova Scotians, Mr. Chairman, he is coming down to talk to Newfoundlanders - and how do the Liberals in Nova Scotia react? Well, Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, the Liberals in Nova Scotia are lead by one John Buchanan, that is the Liberals in Nova Scotia, I have said it before and I will say it again that they have a party in Nova Scotia that ostensibly goes by the Progressive Conservative or Tory label but they are not Tories, Mr. Chairman, they are Liberals. And what do the Tories or the PCs in Nova Scotia say? Well, unfortunately, they go by a Liberal stripe. I was not prepared to say that the Liberals in Nova Scotia were akin to ourselves here in Newfoundland because I do not know very much about them. But you only have to look at yesterdays Evening Telegram and see that Mr. Cameron, Mr. A. M. Sandy Cameron, who I predict one day will be Premier of Nova Scotia, he says that the Liberals in Nova Scotia, masquerading as Tories, 'are giving away the farm.' It may be an unfortunate choice of words, but they are giving away their natural resources. The Liberals in Nova Scotia, led by Mr. Buchanan, have their soul mates across the floor. There used to be twenty-one of them, thereabouts, back in 1978-79, then they took a small plunge down to eighteen, and then they hit the abyss in April of this year when they went down to eight. And why have they gone down, Mr. Chairman? Because they are the party who believe that by subterfuge, sleight of hand and by insulting the intelligence of people that they can get elected. Well, I do not know when they are going to learn. I would ask hon. gentleman opposite, especially the member for Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) who I think is going to leap to his feet after I speak - he said if I would speak, he would speak -

MR. B. TULK: Oh, I should not have told you.

MR. F. STAGG: - well, I would like to ask him to do two things.

MR. L. SIMMS: When you talk they tend to leave.

MR. STAGG: Well, that is true, they have taken an early exit. I do not want to digress to divert myself. Here is something that I wish the hon. member would read - I know he has not read it - it is an analysis of the impact of a Nova Scotia type offshore agreement on Newfoundland. I would say that he has not read it because he does not want to read it, but I would like for him to read that, the analysis of it, and also read perhaps for the first time the proposal that Newfoundland put forward on January 25, 1982, almost a year ago, which hon. gentlemen opposite have never said whether they agree with it or not. They have never said whether they agree with it or not, and it is a most Canadian proposal. It is the proposal that the Premier waved around on the night of the debate, that Mr. Stirling had not read and did not want to read. Mr. Stirling paid the price. Mr. Stirling is now back selling insurance. Maybe the insurance bill is apropos of this kind of argument - Mr. Stirling is back selling insurance, we are in here dealing with an insurance tax. Mr. Stirling is selling insurance again, largely because he felt that he did not have to read proposals of that type.

MR. STAGG: Hon. gentlemen opposite have never said whether they agree with it or not. And I would submit that if hon. gentlemen opposite were to come foursquare at our side, stand with us, not behind us with knives to the back, but stand foursquare and say without equivocation that they agree wholeheartedly with this most Canadian proposal put forward on January 25th., or, alternatively, if they might say that it does not go far enough. Perhaps it does not go far enough. Perhaps they might say that the Premier and the government are giving away the resources. That would be a tactic that I would use if I were over there, gentlemen. I would say that the Premier has been far too lenient and is willing to give away far far too much. That is a tactic hon. gentlemen should develop. But you cannot develop something if you do not read it. If you do not know what is there you cannot develop it. And hon. gentlemen feel, they feel that because the people are suffering - and people are suffering, no one denies that they are suffering at this time going into one of the worst winters that we will have, that we are raising taxes, make no mistake about it, it is not something that we want to do - but hon. gentlemen think that by pointing that out, and stating it and restating it that perversely that the people will vote for them. Well, hon. gentlemen have put nothing forward, zilch forward to the people of this Province that would indicate that they are in any way ready for power. The only way they are ready for power is because they would like to get on airplanes and travel around the world and do that kind of thing that is associated with power. But they are not ready for the matters of principle that are involved with the taking of power.

MR. STAGG:

So I would suggest to hon. gentlemen that they should address themselves to the big issues in this Province, and the big issue at the present time is the offshore. It is there. It is something that they have to discuss.

I would like for the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to address himself to the minister as defined in the Nova Scotia agreement. Do you know who the minister is? In acts you have the minister defined in such-and-such a way. Well, here is who the minister is,

MR. STAGG: "The Board shall be responsible to and shall act under the authority of the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, hereinafter called the minister." You know the minister who never appears in the Nova Scotia agreement, the minister whose name is never mentioned, he does not exist, it is the Minister of Energy, if they have one in Nova Scotia. He does not exist as far as the Nova Scotia agreement is concerned.

Now, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we had an agreement signed along the lines of our January 25th., 1982 proposal, number one, it is unlikely that we would have had an election this year. It is quite possible that we would not have had an election. That issue would not have presented itself and the people would not have been asked to make a decision as they were asked. And they responded, of course, in the way that they did, And, from the purely political, partisan point of view it was a good thing for the party. But it was a most unnecessary thing, because if there had been an agreement we could have merrily gone along and defeated hon. gentlemen in a year or so's time. I mean, it was inevitable that hon. gentlemen were going to be defeated, we just would have delayed it somewhat more, and they would have had a little bit more money into their pensions and so on.

So I would like for hon. gentlemen opposite to address themselves to the real question, Why are taxes being raised? Why are taxes being raised? Not the fact that it is going to hurt people. We all know it is going to hurt people. But to get right down at the grass roots level and say, Why is it being done? It is being done because

MR. STAGG: of the dillydallying and the inflexibility and the outright contempt that the Liberals in Ottawa - and make no mistake about it, the PCs in Nova Scotia are Liberals, but the Liberals in Ottawa are Liberals, and hon. gentlemen opposite identify with them.

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

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will have another go at it a little while later.
Are you going to talk about this, or what?

MR. TULK: Sit down. Sit down. Sit down now and be good. Sit down and behave yourself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. STAGG: Are you going to talk about this?

MR. WARREN: Sit down, boy.

MR. STAGG: Give the hon. gentleman a copy of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. BUTT: You are getting uptight.

MR. TULK: No, I am not.

MR. TOBIN: He is like the world according to Garfield, he is getting uptight.

MR. WARREN: Sit down and listen, boy.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to this bill -

MR. STAGG: If it had a tongue it would speak back at you.

November 30, 1982

Tape 2891

NM - 3

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I listened to the challenge, would the Chairman ask him to listen to the answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

I am waiting with bated breath.

MR. TULK: I am surprised that he is breathing, he is not usually unless the Premier tells him to. Mr. Chairman, on matters of principle - we are asked over on this side to speak on matters of principle.

On this bill we have been challenged to speak and to state what our position is on the offshore. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I look at the present position -

MR. STAGG: What is your position on the proposal?

MR. TULK: As I look at the present position -

MR. HODDER: Do not listen to him!

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, can I have the hon. Yahoo for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) be quiet?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: As I look at the present position of the provincial government, of the P.C. Tories, I want to inform the hon. member for Stephenville that they have changed their position. Their position is not the same as it was before - there is a newspaper that the P.C. Party put out dated August 28, 1980, a piece of propaganda, in which they changed, they changed their position, Mr. Chairman, they changed their position from one of outright ownership, outright control to whose position?

MR. WARREN: The member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) changed their minds.

MR. TULK: Whose position, Mr. Chairman? Whose position did they change to? Let me ask them that question? It is not an unknown position that the gentleman is putting out of him over there, it is our position.

MR. STAGG: It is?

MR. TULK: The Liberal position.

MR. STAGG: Why do you not read it?

MR. TULK: Joint management and revenue sharing that is our position. It was before August 28, 1980, is now and always has been. So would the hon. gentleman get that clear.

But, Mr. Chairman, he has a problem. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has a problem and his problem is this, that he is trying to worm his way into the Cabinet on that side, he wants to be in power. He wants to be in Cabinet, so what is he doing? If the Premier acts like a yo-yo and is up and down, changes his position for political purposes, then the member for Stephenville is going to follow. He is acting blind in this, Mr. Chairman. He is like a fountain spouting forth all of the time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he asked why taxes are being raised. And that is what the principle is in this bill, to raise taxes. It is the same bill, basically, the same principle as yesterday's, 1 per cent increase, to 12 per cent, in the SSA in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), let us deal with what he said, the man who should be terribly concerned about the poor in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is only what you read into it.

MR. TULK: Well, he said the taxes he stated an obvious reason why the government has raised taxes. There are terrible economic conditions in this Province, he said.

MR. TULK: And he asked for some facts, he asked the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to produce facts that people are hungry in this Province. Well, I will take the minister, at my expense, any time he wants to go, and show him two families in this Province, in the same community, that this year had to have something done that has not happened in the Fogo district since the Great Depression, and that, Mr. Chairman, was simply this: Two families, I can show him two families, at least two and probably more, where their neighbours, because the minister's department, because of that little directive that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) read out, because of that directive, where their neighbours had to bring them food so that they could survive from one week to the next. Now, Mr. Chairman, he wants the facts, let me take him. He says he is too well acquainted with the problems of poor people in this Province. Well indeed he should be. But what does he do, Mr. Chairman? He stands up over there and he says: 'Oh, do not blame us. We have nothing to do with this, nothing at all to do with the economic conditions in this Province, it is international.' Mr. Chairman, we know it is international. It is the federal government. We know part of the blame for the economic conditions in this country is the blame of the federal government, to be laid at their doorstep.

MR. NEARY: And the Government of the United States.

MR. TULK: And the Government of the United States. But what about this crew? No, not them. He says, 'We have done everything we can do, we have cut everything we can cut, there is nothing else left'. Does he really believe that? Does he really believe that he has to go out and cut widows \$35 a month for every person who is living in their homes? Does he really believe that?

MR. TOBIN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. TULK: Does he really believe that?

MR. TOBIN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: Do not be silly, you do not know what you are talking about.

MR. TULK: Do you want a trip too.

MR. NEARY: Go back to your seat.

MR. TULK: Would you like to take a trip?
I will take you with the minister, You are a former social worker, so I will take you with him and I will show you the conditions in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is so true.

MR. TULK: Do you want to come?

MR. TOBIN: Be honest. Be honest.

MR. TULK: I am being honest. Do you want to come? Are you going to be honest?

MR. TOBIN: With you?

MR. TULK: Yes, I will show them to you, I will introduce you to them, the poor people of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Do not pay any attention to him he was more interested in playing politics instead of looking after his job.

DR. COLLINS: There are some politics being played here alright.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, where else could they cut? 'Where else? he says. 'What else could we do? says the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

Mr. Chairman, I do not know. We have thirty or forty things here that he could have done. I am not going to name them all.

MR. WARREN: Read some of them out.

MR. NEARY: Give him some examples.

MR. TULK: Alright, let me give you an example.
What about that work being done to the fountain at the old

MR. TULK: Colonial Building -

MR. NEARY: And removing trees.

MR. TULK: - removing trees and so on? Is that so critical that he has to do it now, that he has to tax people - well, I suppose, in my books they are the ordinary people. The member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) says, 'No, they are not ordinary people. The ordinary people are not paying.' Does that have to be done at the cost of taxing them, at the cost of raising the SSA, the insurance tax and tobacco tax and every other kind of tax in this Province that this government can lay its hands on?

MR. TULK: What about the \$30 million extension to Confederation Building? As the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said yesterday evening, that needs to be done somewhere in the future, but does it have to be done now?

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. TULK: Can we afford that at a time - I think it was yesterday I heard a person, another ordinary person in this Province, on an Open Line show, say that when he becomes sick he intends to phone Confederation Building and see when he can get a room. That was an ordinary person in this Province, I suspect.

What about that fleet of cars in the government car pool that I understand has a value of \$500,000?

MR. NEARY: To replace the others there.

MR. TULK: The replacement value is \$500,000 and you are going to replace them. What about them? They are there for the elite, the ruling elite, the ruling Tory elite in this Province. That is what they are there for, the beck and call of ministers. Why not do away with that, Mr. Chairman?

What about the political appointments? What about them, the executive assistants in this Province?

MR. NEARY: Right on! The parliamentary secretaries.

MR. TULK: Why go at the poor people in this Province? Why not go at them?

What about the staff in the Premier's office? Another one.

MR. NEARY: I would suggest \$1 million.

MR. TULK: Nine hundred and forty thousand dollars, almost \$1 million.

MR. TULK: Let me ask him another question. Instead of letting the ordinary people of this Province, instead of letting the poor in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Would you keep that down over there, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: What about the money paid out for rent of the Murray Premises that was not occupied? What about the money paid out for that? Does he have to hit the poor, the widows in this Province? Does he have to raise the insurance premium tax in this Province or the S.S.A. What about that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: What about the liquor agency down in Trepassey?

MR. TULK: Let us take a look at this one, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at another one, the hiring of interior decorators to redo the offices of ministers and deputy ministers and the private dining room? Did that have to be done? No, Mr. Chairman, not at all.

And, Mr. Chairman, what about the symbol, the thing in this Province that has become a symbol of the arrogance and the elite, the ruling elite of this Province? What about that great Mount Scio House? Does the Premier need twenty-seven rooms? Does he need that in the economic times we are in? Does he need free bar and free maid service in that house? Is that what we need in this Province, Mr. Chairman?

Now, what about one other thing, Mr. Chairman - before cutting the door, before the Minister of Health (Mr. House) cuts down the number of hospital beds in this Province, before his actions lead to

MR. TULK: that, what about the enlargement of the office of the Premier's Chief of Staff, \$20,000 worth?

MR. NEARY: Yes, thinks he is a deputy minister.

MR. TULK: Thinks he is a deputy minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word or two to say in this debate not that it is important that I respond to anything that the hon. the gentleman from Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) just said because I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that all he did was take the pages out of Hansard from his leader yesterday and then parrot those phrases here again today but then, again, Mr. Chairman, that is about what we would expect from the hon gentleman from Fogo.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a few things which have been said over the last few days in this debate that I think should be put to rest once and for all. I have heard to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) refer to louses and skunks. I have heard him, Mr. Chairman. And if there is a louse or a skunk in this Province, there he is, Mr. Chairman, sitting there on the other side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: And the Premier.

MR. RIDEOUT: If there is a louse or a skunk in this Province, Mr. Chairman, he should have been in Baie Verte last Thursday, Mr. Chairman, and faced the music from 200 sealers, Mr. Chairman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. G. WARREN: A louse across the floor. A louse across the floor.

MR. RIDEOUT: - faced the music from Bill Rompkey's office, he should have been there and faced them. But what did he do, Mr. Chairman? Like a skunk and a louse he sent a telegram, and condemned Bill Rompkey and condemned the Premier, Mr. Chairman, condemned everybody he could think about, he condemned them all and he stayed here in the safety of St. John's. That is the skunk and the louse, Mr. Chairman,

MR. T. RIDEOUT: who wants to become Premier of
this Province. That is him, Mr. Chairman.

MR. G. WARREN: You cannot defend him boy.
It is too late to defend him now.

MR. RIDEOUT: When I was on the other side,
Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman was down in the corner, he
was out of the Liberal party down in the corner by himself.

MR. S. NEARY: At least I got (inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: He was down there, Mr. Chairman,
and I remember him saying to me one day when I was up
shivering a speech out of me, the first time ever I spoke in
this House, I remember him turning on me and I remember
some of my colleagues saying that nobody would do that to
a new member. Nobody, of course, except the hon. gentleman
who is now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary).

MR. RIDEOUT: One of the worst things the Liberal Party ever did, Mr. Chairman, was to let him back in the party. I should say one of the best things they ever did for this party was to let him back in the party. But the hon. gentleman for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) got up yesterday and made a very elegant speech, made an excellent speech, Mr. Chairman -

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. We got it and everybody in Newfoundland will have it too.

MR. RIDEOUT: - in this House -

MR. WARREN: I did not know you were so stupid.

MR. RIDEOUT: - and the hon. gentleman gets up and he twists it and he turns and he slides and he struggles and does it all, Mr. Chairman, to try to turn that very excellent, eloquent down-to-earth speech into something that somebody would be ashamed of saying.

And what did the hon. gentleman say? What did he say, in essence, Mr. Chairman? The essence of what he said was simply this, that those who can afford to spend more pay a little bit more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is what he said.

MR. NEARY: Is that what he said?

MR. RIDEOUT: That is exactly what he said.

MR. NEARY: Well, you had better read Hansard.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, if there is anything -

MR. NEARY: We have the Hansard.

MR. RIDEOUT: - that should go out of this House over the next day or two, or two or three days, to all constituents in all rural communities around this Province, it is the speech that the hon. gentleman made in the House last week about the situation of fish plants in this Province when he said, 'Close them down. Let them go'. That is exactly what he said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is exactly what he said. And if there is anything that should go out of this House at the expense of the taxpayer, Mr. Chairman, it is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had to say. That is more important, that really tells the philosophy of the hon. gentleman, that really tells the philosophy of the Liberal Party, that really tells what they stand for. And if there is anything that should go out, it is that. It is there in Hansard, I have had a look at it, it says beyond words, 'Let them go, let them die, let them fall, do not try to save them'. Then he comes into this House yesterday and tries to make light of what is happening in Burin, or the potential of what might happen in some other place in this Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman has to stop talking out of both sides of his mouth. He cannot have it both ways. The people of this Province just will not let him have it both ways. So, you know, Mr. Chairman, he gets on again today, and the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) did the same thing, talking about renovations to the private dining room. Mr. Chairman, there has not been any renovations made to the private dining room as far, and I think there was some question on the Order Paper sometime ago and we had this checked out, there has not been a renovation done to the private dining room in years, in years, Mr. Chairman.

He talks about the \$20,000 that was somehow spent on the office of the Chief of Staff for the Premier. Mr. Chairman, nobody else knows anything about it. There was a partition moved back that might have cost - I do not know what the labour rates might be in Public Works -

MR. YOUNG: Any renovations were done by our own employees.

MR. RIDEOUT: By our own employees in Public Works there was a partition moved back that might have cost \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$4,000, I do not know, but

MR. RIDEOUT: \$20,000, you know.

MR. NEARY: What about the chandelier?

That was the biggest expense.

MR. RIDEOUT: The chandelier, and the private elevator and all this kind of stuff, Mr. Chairman, it just does not happen. It is a figment of the imagination of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman gets up and he mouths those things, Mr. Chairman, he mouths them in the hope that the press will make a headline out of them. That is the only reason why he does it, in the hope that the press will make a headline out of renovations to the private dining room, out of spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on the eighth floor, out of the cost of a private elevator, out of anything.

MR. WARREN: How true.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is why he does it, Mr. Chairman, in the hope that the press will pick it up.

MR. TULK: Let him tell us about the cost of moving the member back to the Premier's Office.

MR. RIDEOUT: He can. I will have another dart at him.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would do a lot better - he talks about people who bury their heads in the sand, he talks about people who have become insulated from what the public feels, well he should have been there in Baie Verte on Friday morning -

MR. TULK: Where was the Premier?

MR. RIDEOUT: I was there and I do not mind taking it on the chin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not mind taking it on the chin, Mr. Speaker, this lad has got a thick hide, and this lad has got wide shoulders. I do not mind. At least I was there

MR. RIDEOUT: in person. And when I responded there was a great applause and there was not a word after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentleman sent down a telegram and he should have been there, Mr. Speaker, when it was read.

MR. TOBIN: Why was he not there?

MR. RIDEOUT: Condemned the Government of Newfoundland for trying to save the livelihoods of those 250 people who were there, number one. Number two, condemned the Government of Canada. If the Government of Canada took some sealers from the Northwest Territories I do not know, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) alleges that they did. If they did that is their business.

MR. WARREN: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I can speak, that is more than I can say for the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: So if they did that, Mr. Chairman, that is their business, that is not my business. But he slides in this Telex, Mr. Chairman, which was read and the deafening was silence. The only thing I can say, Mr. Chairman, in the forty-eight days -

MR. DOYLE: The silence was deafening.

MR. RIDEOUT: - the silence was deafening - in the forty-eight days, Mr. Chairman, that this House has been open, since we resumed the Fall session, I can only speculate, Mr. Chairman, that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Forty-eight days?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, forty-eight days. I suppose that counts weekends and all- I can only speculate, Mr. Chairman,

MR. RIDEOUT: that not only the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), but every man over there, wakes up in the morning and the first thing he does before he gets out of bed or comes to the House, is take an over-dose of stunned pills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. STAGG: The deafening is silence.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, finally we got the member for - where is it? - Baie Verte-White Bay out of his seat.

MR. WARREN: The skunk.

MR. TULK: He says we have been open forty-eight days, Mr. Chairman, his silence has been deafening in this House. Make no mistake about that. We finally got him up and now, Mr. Chairman, he says if I stand up he is going to give me another little dart. Well, Mr. Chairman,

MR. TULK: he said, I was parroting the Leader on this side, parroting the Leader. Did you ever see such a parrot, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WARREN: How funny! Shameful!

MR. TULK: Did you ever see him?

MR. WARREN: Did you ever see such a louse?

MR. TULK: He goes after the Leader on this side, Mr. Chairman, for one time sitting as an independent.

MR. HODDER: Oh!

MR. TULK: What did he do, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WARREN: Yes, like a louse!

MR. TULK: It is time that this House was told what the hon. gentleman did. What did he do? He stood in this House and said, I cross the House on principle.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Opposition (inaudible).

MR. TULK: Let me ask him what principle?

What principle?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Has it changed?

What did he do when he sat in the Liberal Party as the Opposition spokesman on energy? What did he do, Mr. Chairman. He sat at the table.

MR. WARREN: Come across, Sir.

MR. TULK: He sat at the table and said nothing about energy, as the shadow on energy for the Liberal Party. That is what he did. In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, he was scuttling around behind doors getting ready to make his great debut.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Like a louse!

MR. TULK: To be a great man for Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: Like a louse!

MR. TULK: That is what he did, Mr.

Chairman. While he was the spokesman on energy for the Liberal Party, he worked and wormed his way to try to get across the

MR. TULK: House.

MR. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible) for fisheries?

MR. TULK: That is what the hon. gentleman did. That is what he did in this House. That is what he did, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: He did not open his yap while he was the Opposition spokesman on energy, neither in caucus nor out, except perhaps, I am told, to write a few poison pen letters.

MR. RIDEOUT: What are you spokesman on?

MR. TULK: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that is what he did. That is what the man did.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us come back to some more of those increases that the hon. gentleman is standing up over there and defending. Let us come back to them. \$20,000 worth of enlargement to the Chief Staff's office.

MR. NEARY: He says, \$4,000 or \$5,000.

MR. TULK: He says \$4,000 or \$5,000, he is not sure.

MR. NEARY: They only moved a partition to make him an office that is half the size of the House of Assembly.

MR. TULK: Only moved the partition, that is all. For what? For what, Mr. Chairman? For what? So the hon. gentleman can come and sit in the galleries every day. Is that what they made the renovation for?

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) eight floor.

MR. TULK: Let me ask him another question.

MR. NEARY: When we go on the eighth floor we will be going back as the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, is that hon. gentleman now standing up and defending the day of mourning that we had in this Province last Winter, that cost this Province \$4,000 to \$5,000, where the guy that he parrots, the man that he parrots made a complete fool of himself? Is that what he is doing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: More stupid than a louse.

MR. TULK: The biggest joke in Newfoundland's history was the day of mourning that was in this Province last year, the biggest single joke that was ever undertaken by a politician.

MR. STAGG: The biggest joke in Newfoundland's history is whenever your birthday is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: It may be the same day as yours and there may be two jokes.

MR. TOBIN: People did not think it was a joke on April 6.

MR. WARREN: They do now though.

MR. TULK: What about, Mr. Chairman, the daily things that go on in this government, where they send out propaganda sheets after propaganda sheets?

MR. NEARY: Householder mailings.

MR. TULK: householder mailings, could they not cut that instead of hitting the poor. Oh, yes! He is going to stand up and defend that. Because he is a paid puppet, Mr. Chairman, he has to do it.

MR. STAGG: I intend to do it.

MR. NEARY: A paid gun.

MR. TULK: What about that official handshaker that we have in the Province?

MR. NEARY: The what?

MR. TULK: The official handshaker, that man who greets everybody in this Province. Is that necessary in a time of restraint?

MR. STAGG: What about the Lieutenant-Governor now? When are you getting down to him?

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) should be quiet, because I do not want to name him as one of the unnecessary parliamentary secrets, one of the unnecessary expenses of this Province. So he should be quiet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TULK: What about the number of Cabinet Ministers? Is it possible to cut them? Could they work a few more hours, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WARREN: The Premier says no.

MR. TULK: They have one guy in this House, Mr. Chairman, who does everything, he is the catchall, and I speak of the Minister of Development, Tourism, Housing, whatever else you can throw in there. Why not a few more of those?

Mr. Chairman, what about the fancy helicopter contracts where ministers, last year, because they had a certain number of hours signed up with helicopter companies in this Province, had to go up and take joyrides, had to go on the Northern Peninsula - it could have been the hon. member's district - had to go on the Northern Peninsula

MR. TULK: and say pick up that and go out and ride.

MR. STAGG: What about the helicopter you had during the election?

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. BAIRD: Come on now, tell us about it.

MR. TULK: Write me a letter and I will tell you.

MR. STAGG: I know, we all know who it is.

MR. BAIRD: We all know who it is.

MR. WARREN: More power to him. More power to him.

MR. TULK: What about the construction of jails: That is what this government is famous for, the construction of jails all over the Province. Mr. Chairman, this government has done nothing except to hit the poor people of this Province.

MR. STAGG: Somebody told this man he was going down the tubes. Well, he said, I will not go down the tubes, I will get a helicopter and, sure enough, the helicopter pulled it out for him.

MR. RIDEOUT: And he got Len Stirling to send a telegram to Fogo which saved him.

MR. TULK: A telegram to Fogo?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. Do you not remember? I do.

MR. TULK: You do. Is that the same person I wonder who made all the calls to my house? Are you that person too.

MR. RIDEOUT: No.

MR. TULK: You do not write poison pen letters, do you?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not write any letters.

MR. TULK: You do not write poison pen letters, you gave that up. You are reformed. You are living on principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn). About two weeks ago in this House I made a statement on a fisheries

MR. TULK: bill, on a Private Members' Bill, that I think the hon. member has good intentions. I think he has good intentions, but I think he is being misled. Now, you could take his speech and go through it, every word that he said yesterday evening, and what he is saying is that the ordinary people of this Province, the middle-class people of this Province are not ordinary people. But I am not going to do that. What I want to do instead is to comment upon a comment that I heard -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) who said that.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS: Silence, silence.

MR. TULK: Could we have the toddler be quiet over there? That guy who is trying to worm his way into the Cabinet, the parliamentary secret, could he not be quiet? I am speaking about the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Bionic mouth. There he goes.
Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) made a comment across the House that 'True Newfoundlanders,' he says, 'True Newfoundlanders would sooner give than give away.' Now, Mr. Chairman, what was he saying? You know, what he was doing, Mr. Chairman, was again parroting the words of the Premier of this Province. 'If you do not agree with what I do or what I say, then you are not a true Newfoundlander. You are a traitor.' If you do not do it the Tory way, you are a traitor.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: You have to do it our way or not at all. That was the comment he made when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was speaking yesterday evening, 'True Newfoundlanders would sooner give than give away.' Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to him now that the true Newfoundlanders -

MR. STAGG: I wish I had said that.

MR. TULK: You could not make that up in a month. If you sat down for a month with pen and paper, you could not make up that. There is one thing I will say for the member for St. Mary's - The Capes, he far surpasses the hon. gentleman with his ability to say things. He does not have to get up and repeat himself over and over.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the attitude is. And I say to him that the ordinary people of this Province have given enough. They have given enough to this government, Mr. Chairman. That is the same attitude, it is the Tory attitude that reflects itself in the Premier's licencing policy for the fishery, put them in the boats and let them starve, give them all

MR. TULK: a boat but let them starve. They will all fall out and somebody else will come in and take their place. That is the attitude. I am sorry to hear the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) say it, but he showed himself yesterday evening, Mr. Chairman, as a true Tory. That is the same philosophy, Mr. Chairman, that in 1980 made the Premier of this Province get on television and say, 'Oh, take a twenty-one day cooling off period.' In July, he said to the fishermen of this Province, 'Take a twenty-one day cooling off period.' In other words, Mr. Chairman, 'You are fishermen, but for my sake, so I can do something with this, would you take twenty-one days off? It does not matter if you starve, you can catch moose and rabbits.' That was what he said, 'You can catch moose and rabbits.'

It is the same philosophy, Mr. Chairman, that appointed a Royal Commission which still sits on the shelf, that we hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) once in a while coming out and saying he is going to resurrect. That is the same philosophy.

MR. HISCOCK: And raised the loans from the Loan Board from 8 per cent to 12 per cent.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, raised the loans to fishermen in this Province from 8 per cent to 12 per cent.

MR. HISCOCK: And now a lot of them are having difficulty making payments.

MR. TULK: Well, a lot of them are having difficulty making payments. Let me tell you something else, they are going to find themselves paying interest rates that are higher than the interest rate at the bank pretty soon.

MR. STAGG: There are only two guys over there that have any sense, over on that side, only two.

MR. TULK: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is true, let me tell the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that there are at least two more over here that they would accept than we would, because there is nobody over there that we would have.

MR. RIDGOUT: (Inaudible) carrying on negotiations.

MR. B. TULK: You are lying, Sir.

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

The hon. the member made an unparliamentary statement, I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. TULK: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statement. Let me tell the hon. member that he is not telling the whole truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. TULK: And I will ask the hon. member to go outside the House and make the statement that he just made there. Will you do that?

MR. T. RIDEOUT: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: Good, go make it.

MR. S. NEARY: Get the boxing gloves out.

MR. G. WARREN: He is too much of a chicken.

He is too much of a louse and a skunk.

MR. TULK: You are not telling the truth. You are not telling the truth. Now, let me tell this House something, the hon. member, because I was a junior member in this House, pulled me into his office one day and said, 'I do not know about this side, I wonder. I wonder could I win my district as a Tory in two years?' He said, 'What do you think? Do you think you could win yours?' That was the question. That is the hon. gentleman.

MR. RIDEOUT: I did it. I did it.

MR. TULK: And the answer that I made to that hon. gentleman is the one he should have made, Mr. Chairman, because I was elected as a Liberal. If I want to be a Tory, I will go out and try to get elected as a Tory, but he did not have the guts to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order! Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. B. TULK: He did not have the guts to do that. He wanted to take his two little years and try to win back his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. TULK: Talk about snakes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. the members time has elapsed.

MR. L. HEARN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: A real Tory speech again.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I suppose the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) would recognize a Tory speech if he heard one, you know. I left the House yesterday evening thinking that the hon the Leader of the Opposition was rather dense. Today I am convinced of it. Not only has he misinterpreted the words that I uttered yesterday evening, the truth that I brought forward yesterday evening, but he is also mixed up in relation to every issue that has come about in the House today. I am going to try to be relevant in relation to the bill that we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, but there are a few other points that we have to bring in. First of all we heard him this evening talking to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Wm. Marshall) concerning the agreements with the federal government. Perhaps he should ask the reporter from CBC, Mr. Seaward, what answer Mr. Chretien gave him last night when he asked him over and over and over about the flexibility of the federal stand; no answer. Absolutely no answer. Perhaps his should ask his counterpart - we are talking about waste -

November 30, 1982

Tape No. 2901

MJ - 3

MR. L. HEARN: perhaps he should ask his counterpart up in Ottawa, Mr. Rompkey, how come his travel expenses this year is \$96,833, up \$76,404 from last year, since he realized that he is falling behind out in Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador.

MR. HEARN: You know, talk about waste and extravagance. Maybe he should also ask Mr. Seaward how come an independent economist being interviewed by him last week stated that there is a cap on the Nova Scotian agreement, that the hon. members across the floor say, "Sign up, boys. Grab that agreement while you can." You know, "Get it while the getting is good." Get what?

MR. STAGG: How silly, how foolish.

MR. HEARN: The Leader of the Liberals in Nova Scotia, who has little more on the ball apparently than the Interim Leader of the Liberals (Mr. Neary) here in Newfoundland says -

MR. DINN: I hope so.

MR. HEARN: - "Buchanan gave away the farm". Perhaps it is time to give away the Opposition, except we would not be giving away the farm, we would be giving away the zoo.

Being a little more relevant, we are talking about the state of our economy in Newfoundland, and once again I am just pointing out things that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has brought up and I am beginning to doubt his wisdom. A few days ago we heard him stand up in the House and say, "The Premier should resign. He should resign. Bring somebody in who knows something about the economy." And he went on for twenty minutes to laud Mr. Harry Steele, a tremendous Newfoundlander. Three days later Mr. Steele was in the press and on radio stating, "The only logical step the government could take at this time was to do what it did." So much for the Leader of the Opposition and his impressions of who would make a good leader.

MR. NEARY: He automatically disqualified himself. He disqualified himself the next day.

MR. HEARN: So all he is saying there is, if Mr. Steele would know what to do, consequently Mr. Peckford and his government knew what to do and we did it.

MR. STAGG: Right on.

MR. HEARN: However, Mr. Chairman, being a little more relevant. We have been knocked since the financial statement concerning the imposition of taxes about hardship upon the people and I clarified yesterday evening that the poor people in this Province are not being hurt as much as the richer people. They cannot afford to be hurt. So consequently because of the low incomes that they have, and we all know not high enough in a lot of cases, they are not affected as drastically as others are. That is the point we tried to make.

But let us go back to the history of assessment tax in this Province. December 7th., 1949, Act No. 97, an act that was proclaimed and brought in force in November 1950 by the Liberal Government, introducing sales tax. The tax rate increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, July 1st., 1960. 1967, the rate of tax increased from 5 to 6 per cent. One year later, just one year later, and of course times were not as good as they are now and the income of people was not anywhere near as high, the rate of increase for one year went from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. But, Mr. Chairman, during that same period the minimum purchase subject to tax was reduced from 17 cents to 8 cents, the candy bar tax.

Now the hon. gentleman who was a minister in that government has a very, very short memory, and people who

MR. HEARN: live in glass houses should not throw stones.

MR. WARREN: How much is it today?

MR. HEARN: So I suggest to the hon. members across the floor -

MR. NEARY: Carry on now! Carry on!

MR. HEARN: - that before they start knocking progress, they start looking over their shoulders.

MR. WARREN: Progress?

MR. NEARY: Let us hear the rest of the story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. MISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment very briefly upon this bill by saying, as the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) just stated - by going back to 1949. We could go back to Coaker's day, we could go back to Bond's day, we could go back to Whiteway's and Squire's and the ones before them, and we can even take the present day, Mr. Chairman - and next year is our 400th. Anniversary - after 400 years of this Province being settled we find ourselves now with the highest taxes in Canada, we find ourselves with the highest incomes. And the reality is, Mr. Chairman, we are still struggling and whether we have a Liberal government or a Conservative government, we would still find the same thing. And that is why, Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, the most important thing for us to do is to develop our resources, develop our fisheries, not a new Confederation Building, that we will have to renovate downstairs and take this, not dining halls, not Premier's houses, not parliamentary secretaries, not big Cabinets, after 400 years we have the highest taxes but you would not know but we were Kuwait or Saudi Arabia the way we are acting. So I, for one, will not get up and fling things back and forth, but I will ask this House if we are going to

MR. HISCOCK: continue to not look after our resources and not go after tourism and agriculture and fisheries, but go after big capital projects like building hospitals and building the new Confederation Building in a time of restraint.

MR. BAIRD: No, do not build hospitals.

MR. HISCOCK: No, Not at this time, no, as much as we need them. We need the fish plants and we need permanent jobs. We may need smaller clinics, we may need better ambulance services, we may need other things, but it is not a good idea to get into big capital projects, and people would admit that, even down on the Burin Peninsula, and I, for one, do not mind saying it.

But with regard to our resources, Mr. Chairman, we are not developing them. One of the things is, after 400 years, our people have always known that we struggled and we will be struggling again in the future. Even after Hibernia, Ben Nevis, and the other ones we will still be struggling, because it is not going to be the be all and end all. And that is why the Premier got an overwhelming mandate in April, and the overwhelming mandate, Mr. Chairman, was to give him a chance to see if things could be better, to see if he could sit down and negotiate, to see if he could get a little bit more resources and jobs and other things in this Province, to see if he could supplement the offshore hiring practice, to see if we could get more people in our plants and our mines and other things.

That is why you have forty-four seats. The government over there now with forty-four seats is operating more with an Opposition mentality than the Opposition. With forty-four seats, Mr. Chairman, we do not expect the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to get up and say the federal government has to accept this.

MR. HISCOCK: What we have to realize, whether we like it or not, is that we are a Province and part of a nation. What is happening with this government is the government is acting as if we are the nation and the nation is a province. So there has to be agreement. Maybe they should be locked up in a room, or maybe they should be off on the Funks, both of them. But there has to be an agreement. Because if there is not an agreement, Mr. Chairman, then Canada is suffering.

We are bringing in \$3 billion to \$9 million worth of oil, I believe, from Venezuela. If you can say that is the way it should be on the East coast, all that oil used in the thermal generator at Holyrood, and electricity being subsidized here on the Avalon Peninsula, fine! But we have to pay for it as a country and as a Province. Mr. Chairman, we are not being fair.

This government, with forty-four seats, got that mandate for one reason only, to negotiate an offshore settlement, an offshore settlement which was honourable for this House, this Province and this country, not a giveaway. I, for one, believe very, very strongly in the federalist, central position. That is what my philosophy is for a strong Canada. Because we know in hard economic times we always look to Canada, the nation, to help us, as does Ontario, British Columbia, Quebec. So if we weaken the central government in hard economic times we have no one to fall back on. I, for one, Mr. Chairman, will say this, two or three months ago I would have said, Yes, have a settlement. But now, with the hard economic times, and the bottom coming out of the economy, I am a little bit scared in the back of my mind that maybe there will be too much pressure on us and that the deal we will get may not be the best one.

MR. HISCOCK: This side of the House has never said that we should accept the deal that the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has put forward. We have never said that. We have said joint management and joint ownership. Now, finally, the government accepts that. We had the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) cross the floor on that matter and he is now saying the very things that we, as a Liberal Party, have said. But I, for one, Mr. Chairman, believe that we should sit down and negotiate a settlement that is fair for Canada and fair for this Province. If we do not do that, Mr. Chairman, it is for one reason and one reason only, the same reason why this government would not give Shaheen another chance at the oil refinery, the same reason they closed down Linerboard and took it from an international company to sell the products in America, the same reason they had the false startup in Labrador, \$150 million for tunnels and now we find out they are going to use submarine cable, politics, putting the P.C. Party ahead of the people.

And now we see it again. They know there is going to be a federal election in two years. They also know that there is going to be a decision made by the court. And if the decision is in favour of Canada, they know the Prime Minister of the day has to come back and talk to the Premier of the day here to have a political settlement. They know that. But what are they doing? They are doing one thing only, prolonging it

MR. HISCOCK: as much as possible. And then finally when the ruling comes down by the Supreme Court of Canada whichever way it is, and if it is not in favour, as the Premier said, 'If it is not in our favour then what we are going to do, well 520,000 people are on my side.' So what is happening, Mr. Chairman? This party here wants to fight the offshore in the federal election. Now, I do not care myself if that is going to be the issue, but I will tell you the people in Corner Brook and the people in Burin and the people in Labrador City and the people in Bay de Verde and the construction industry here in this Province do care. And if that is what is going to be the co-operation between Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Peckford, who are going to go - their way and are going to put the political interests of this Province over the welfare of this Province, the Party interests, then I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that is going to be the fight when that election comes. Because the people of this Province are going to know that they have had children go to school without proper footwear. They have had children go to school without proper lunches. They have had people on welfare. They have had people who have had untold hardships of having to leave their houses and apartments and that and move in with their parents. We have also seen, as I said, - three years ago, Mr. Chairman, yes we could have had this debate and we could have flicked it back and forth and said - because Labrador City was going full steam, so was Corner Brook and so was Grand Falls, and it did not really matter. But, Mr. Chairman, we are in hard times now. And I would say to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and I would say to all the other ministers over there, use your influence on this government and ask them one thing only, get back to the table and drive as hard a bargain as you can, not only for Newfoundland but for Canada. Because if we continue to go this way we are

MR. HISCOCK: not only going to be tenth on the international countries, we are going to be way back. And, Mr. Chairman, with all our resources of iron ore, of fish and of forestry we are now finding that Brazil has a lot of iron ore and Australia has a lot of iron ore and also other countries have a lot of it.

So, Mr. Chairman, do not think that we are the center of the Universe. The Premier may think it, but we have to come back to reality. And as I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, in supporting the bill, let us get back to the bargaining table and not put any pre-conditions, not say that they have to accept this. It is not good enough, Mr. Chairman. The people of this Province are hurting and none more so than our young people. If there is anything I am probably more disappointed in it is our younger people, how they have been hoodwinked by the emotional aspect of the Premier. Preferential hiring for jobs, 800 or 900 and now, Mr. Chairman, what do we find? That most of them are going back to University at high rates and going back to Trades Schools or cannot get any jobs.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, yet they voted for the Premier, hook, line and sinker, maybe like the young people back in 1949.

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

MR. HISCOCK: In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we will go back to the bargaining table without pre-conditions but with the idea of building a strong Province and a strong Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to speak on this bill again but I felt I had to. I mean, the hon. member who just spoke made such ridiculous remarks! They just cannot remain on the record without any statement in contradiction to them.

One can only say that if the hon. member thinks that because we did not keep Mr. Shaheen in the development of resource of this Province and because we did not keep Mr. John Doyle in the development of resource of this Province that we are all wrong, then I am glad that we are all wrong. I mean, if he uses that as a criteria of showing that we, as a government, do not know what to do with the resources of this Province, I am glad to agree with him, because Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Doyle, if those are his two guiding lights as to how the resources of this Province should be developed, well, I am glad that I am on this side of the House and he is on that side of the House.

DR. COLLINS: Now, the whole argument that the hon. member brought up was so laughable it hardly deserves rebuttal but it has to be done. The hon. member implied that the government is not interested in the welfare of this Province. Well, if anything can be said about this government and if the people of this government have spoken out clearly on one thing, they have spoken out and said that this government, the Peckford Government have the interest of this Province above any other interest that any other government in the past has ever held.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. COLLINS: This is the hallmark of this government, that we have not let the welfare of this Province or the future of this Province be sold out for some short-term gains, as has happened so often in the past.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is confused, very severely confused when he talks about what is the national interest with regard to our offshore. He talks about the nation and the Province. They have rights offshore, therefore the Province should give in, it should let its position go so that the national interest can prevail. That is the thesis, Sir, that he just brought before us.

Now, just let us see what is the national interest offshore. Firstly, the national interest has to do with security of supply. Does the Newfoundland Government's proposal have anything that would negate security of supply for the nation? Are we proposing under our proposal to develop the offshore for some European country, for Russia, for some South American country? We are proposing under our proposition

DR. COLLINS: to develop the offshore in the national interest, for Canada, not for any other nation.

What is another national concern? The other national concern is that the federal government should get increased revenues. Now, Mr. Chairman, look at our proposal. Our proposal will render to the national government a

DR. J. COLLINS: higher proportion of revenues from our resource than they now get from the Western resources. Our proposal will give them a higher percentage. If you break down revenues on a percentage basis, how much does the Province get, how much do the companies get, how much do the federal government get? under our proposal the federal government will get a higher percentage on a break down like that than they now get from the Western provinces who are producers.

Now, the third point about national interest. The national interest would be served by spinoffs from the offshore. We, in our proposal, have said that in the first instance spinoffs should come to this Province until we get to some equality with the rest of Canada. Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that Newfoundlanders are not Canadians, that if spinoffs come to this Province the national interest is not served? The national interest is served under our proposal precisely because Canadians will get the spinoff the spinoff will not go elsewhere. The spinoff is insured to the maximum degree possible, it will come to Canada in the first instance Newfoundland Canadians because they need to come up equal to other Canadians, in that regard, and then the spinoff will go to the rest of Canada. We do not any way intend to block Ontario, Quebec and the other provinces of Canada from supplying goods, services - especially of a large capital nature - for our offshore. As a matter of fact, we want our offshore to be developed so that those, to the extent that can be done, are directed to the Canadian economy. And finally, Mr. Chairman, the national interest is served if the resource out there is Canadianized. Our proposal in no way interferes with the Canadianization of our offshore resource. No way whatsoever. Canadianization is brought

DR. J. COLLINS: about through certain subsidies and dedication of the development of the resource to certain Crown Corporations and private Canadian corporations and so on and so forth. Our proposal in no way whatsoever interferes with that and it does preserve the Canadianization aspect of development fully. So those are the only four interests from a national point of view that Ottawa has. Firstly, security of supply; secondly, revenue; thirdly, spinoffs; and fourthly, Canadianization. And those are the only interests that the federal government should have in our offshore, because the offshore is otherwise a natural resource and under the BNA Act, under the Canadian Constitution, natural resources are allotted to the provinces. The federal government - in the wisdom of the Confederation Fathers, the fathers of our nation, and this has been proven over the years, that they were wise in making this provision, natural resources are reserved to the provinces and they are reserved to the provinces for very good reasons. Because if they were reserved to the central government we would have a very peculiar nation, we would have strength at the center and we would have almost nothing outside. And the Fathers of Confederation said, 'We will not have a Canada like that. Canada is too large a nation for that. We need to spread the development all around so we will say that each province shall control its own natural resources.' There are national concerns in the

DR. COLLINS:

development of those national resources. I have enumerated them in regard to the offshore, Our proposal in no way interferes with them, but it does preserve the true nature of Canada, that is the primary management and the primary flow of goods and services from natural resources should go to the area in which they are placed, into the contiguous area. And the area that is contiguous to our offshore is the Province of Newfoundland and the other Atlantic Provinces. That is what our proposal will do. It will ensure that the national interest is preserved, well served in terms that it should be served and well preserved, but it will also ensure that the Constitution of Canada is also well served in that natural resource development is preserved to the jurisdiction of the provinces in the main.

So I just wanted to make those few remarks because the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) was parroting words that sounds sensible when they are looked at glibly and generally. But in actual fact if you look at them closely they have no validity whatsoever.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say that I would kindly take my seat and let the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), or the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. McLennon), or the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) get up and speak for ten minutes to defend the government. I notice that two of the three members are leaving and they do not want to get up and defend the government.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to get up and say that I do not see how the hon. members

MR. WARREN: could get up and defend the government. That is why they are not speaking. That is why only one new member on that side of the House -

MR. NEARY: And he wished that he had not said anything.

MR. WARREN: - has gotten up and tried to defend the government, only one new member got up and tried. And what he did was he said that the poor people of the Province did not make a difference.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: That is what he said.

So this is why -

MR. NEARY: He said they only buy food and children's clothing, they do not buy anything else.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Chairman, you can see now this is why we have ten new members on that side of the House, we have a former Cabinet Minister re-elected from Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), and he has not spoken, he has not spoken in this House since the debate started. And, Mr. Chairman, I would be only too glad, I would be only too glad to take my seat and give the hon. new members the opportunity to stand up and defend their government on these bills.

Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the members on the other side are missing something. Because we on this side are going to vote against any tax increase that this government brings in, except the tobacco and the liquor tax, we do not care what happens to those kind of taxes, we are not concerned at all. But as for every other tax, the insurance tax, the retail sales tax, the exemption on the fuel tax, we are going to be voting against. Supposing we have to stay here until six o'clock on Christmas Eve, we are going to stay here.

November 30, 1982

Tape 2908

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. WARREN:

We are going to stay here and we are not going to let those bills pass through.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. WARREN:

So, Mr. Chairman, if the members are excited about getting out on Friday, I wish to advise them now that we on this side will not let this House close. The only way that this House will close on Friday is by the Leader of the Government, the Acting Leader,

MR. WARREN: by bringing in some kind of closure. That is the only way this House will close on Friday because we will not give in on those tax increases.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: 'Garfield', I do not know (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Maybe we will, will we?

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know.

MR. WARREN: It is possible.

MR. NEARY: We are going to vote against all these bills.

MR. WARREN: And we are going to vote against all the bills.

MR. NEARY: We are not going to say at the moment.

MR. WARREN: But tomorrow in our caucus we will discuss it fully.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised, as the saying goes, we only have three more days left before we recess -

MR. NEARY: Before they force the House to close.

MR. WARREN: Before they force the House to close - and the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has not had the intestinal fortitude of bringing in his roads report yet. We only have three more days, and you could see, Mr. Chairman, that the minister had no intention of bringing in his roads report when the session started.

Now, Mr. Chairman, earlier today the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) got up on a point of order and said that he does not tell any lies, 'so help my God.' I think that was the phrase he used. He said, "I do not tell any lies, so help my God'.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if it is lies or not. I would not say that. I leave it up to those who have ears to hear it. However, on November 19th. in this hon. House

MR. WARREN: in response to a question that I posed to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) - the question was, "Have any of his thirteen changes in the social assistance been rescinded?" - and here is what the minister said - I have to read this because if the minister has not told a lie I am sure he did not tell the truth. If he did not tell a lie I am sure he did not tell the truth. Here is what he said, "Mr. Speaker, all except three of the changes have been in effect for some time". So I went further and I asked him what were the changes. So he outlined the

MR. WARREN: changes. One was the change of the assistance to single able-bodied adults and childless couples under the age of fifty, the other one was about people attending university, and I think the other one was - 'generally speaking there was some confusion in interpretation. We modified that - 'let us see what the policy stated, My goodness, I cannot read what he said, sure -yes, the unmarried mothers. Now these were the three changes.

Mr. Chairman, now you can pick up your phone today and you can call any social worker in his fifty-two offices that the minister has around the Province and they will not tell you -

MR. NEARY: New policy.

MR. WARREN: - that these changes are in effect but there are modifications made. The changes are in effect, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, maybe I will have to withdraw it again, if I said he has misled the House. I will not say the minister has -

MR. NEARY: As long as you say he did not deliberately mislead the House.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I will not say the word deliberately, but I am sure, Hansard can record it, that the minister has not told the truth.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: The minister has not told the truth concerning those thirteen changes in the Department of Social Assistance.

Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) must have touched a sore point today because the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) got up and he tried to chastise him, and he called the hon. Leader

MR. WARREN: of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) a skunk, and a louse and everything else. So, Mr. Chairman, we have asked some serious questions, and all the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said was that a wall was taken down and moved.

MR. NEARY: \$4,000 or \$5,000, it is nothing at all, you know. Loose change. A little loose change.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the sales tax on \$50,000 worth of footwear.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Now my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: How much did it cost --

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) question to come.

MR. WARREN: How much did it cost for renovation to the eleven floor in this building?

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. WARREN: How much did that cost?
MR. YOUNG: I do not know.
MR. WARREN: You ask him and he says to put it on the Order Paper, you know. So, Mr. Chairman, what is the point of it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: How come there is a new Executive Assistant in the Premier's office without it being advertised? How much did that cost, another \$30,000?

Mr. Chairman, how about the house on Mount Scio Hill, how about the Garden of Eden over there? How many people are living in that house? And why does not the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) get up -

MR. ROBERTS: It is the newest subsidized rental unit in Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: That is right. And the Minister of Social Services, (Mr. Hickey) can get up and say we are helping those on welfare. No, we are helping the Premier of the Province - rent free.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) Haig Young's car?

MR. NEARY: No, he is too cute for that.

MR. ROBERTS: Is he?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, he is too cute for that. He knows other ministers and deputies who drive around in cars (inaudible) he does not do it himself. He is too cute for that.

MR. WARREN: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, when I sit down the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) will get up and defend some of the extravagance that has gone on in the last three or four months. Why does not the Minister of Public Works get up and tell us how much did the electricity cost in Mount Scio House for the past year? How much for the phone calls in Mount Scio House? How much did it cost for security at Mount Scio House? How much did it cost to operate three cars at Mount Scio House?

MR. NEARY: Food and booze charged up to the private dining room. They do not charge it to Mount Scio House, they charge to the dining room, food and booze.

MR. WARREN: I would only be too glad, Mr. Chairman, to take my seat any time if the minister could only answer some of those questions and be frank.

MR. NEARY: An interior decorator to decorate the dining room.

MR. ROBERTS: I hear it looks like a Neapolitan bordello.

MR. WARREN: It is surprising, Mr. Chairman, that we have ten new members in this House and only one member had the intestinal fortitude of getting up and defending the government's increase in taxes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Where are the rest of them?

MR. WARREN: Where is the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond)? Where is the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin)? Where is the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid)? Where is the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. McLennon)? Where is the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid)? Where is the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross)? Where is the member for Carbonar (Mr. Peach)?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, just to follow through

MR. NEARY: on what my hon. colleague was saying in his few introductory remarks - and I am sure my colleague will have a few more things to say - we are wondering why the new members have not spoken so far since the session resumed? Since this session of the House resumed, we have not heard from the newer members. Have they been silenced? Their constituents did not send them in here to be dummies. Have they been silenced? Why are they not up defending these increases in taxes? Why are not the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon) and the member from Fortune Bay (Mr. Matthews), why are they not up defending these increases in taxes? Mr. Chairman, they are indefensible, that is why they are not up defending them.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) besides, you would not get elected in (inaudible).

MR. TULK: Did you hear what the telephone operators said? The telephone operator said he would not get elected.

MR. NEARY: I see. The minister who is the expert on telephones, telling us they would not get elected.

MR. DINN: The expert on telephones is not here anymore.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, why are they not defending the government's increases in taxes? Because it is indefensible, they cannot defend them. And, Mr. Chairman, the ministry, by the way, have not given them any ammunition. I have not heard very many ministers defending these increases in taxes.

MR. LUSH: There are only two we have heard from.

MR. NEARY: We have only heard from two ministers so far. We heard from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) this afternoon.

MR. TULK: Three.

MR. NEARY: Who were the three?

MR. WARREN: The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

MR. NEARY: No, the Minister of Social Services did not defend the increase in taxes. He got up and he unleashed one of his personal attacks; he takes everything as a personal affront. He did not defend the increase in taxes.

The member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) did not defend the increase in taxes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I did.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman did not. The hon. gentleman talked about everything except the increase in taxes.

MR. WARREN: He talked about the wall being moved.

MR. NEARY: He told us that it did not cost \$20,000 to decorate that office for Mr. Hewlett, it only cost \$4,000 or \$5,000.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is \$50,000 worth of retail sales tax on footwear, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of it.

But, Mr. Chairman -

MR. YOUNG: The Liberals had it on food you know in '69.

MR. WARREN: It still is.

MR. ROBERTS: It is still on. Go and have a Big Mac and see what a Big Mac attack is in this Province, It is a Tory attack.

MR. NEARY: The member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) told us -

MR. ROBERTS: The Big Mac attack is the Tory tax.

MR. TOBIN: What about the chocolate bars, who put it on that?

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, and we paid for it and you will pay for it too.

MR. NEARY: That is right. We got defeated. We have paid the price. We have been defeated. On all our mistakes we have been defeated.

Now what about the hot dog

tax?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - the hot dog tax, the Big Mac attack.

MR. NEARY: The donut tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Let us see what the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) said about the hot dog tax.

MR. ROBERTS: He was all in favour of it, was he not?

MR. NEARY: Listen to this now. He said, "When it comes to the restaurant tax, the meal tax" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could I have silence on the other side?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is what the member for St. Mary's-The Capes said. "When it comes to the restaurant tax, the meal tax, once again," he said, "who buys the meals at restaurants? The people on low and fixed incomes? Hardly. The people who are working, the working class," he said.

"Consequently they are contributing. Now what is the average person saying, 'Oh, this PC Government, a terrible bunch, putting a tax on us?' No, Mr. Chairman. They are saying that this is our Province, this is our debt and we are glad to do what we can" -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! We want to contribute!

MR. NEARY: - "and this is what we are doing. Where do we hear the complaints?"

He said we hear the complaints from across the way and we hear the complaints from the open line programmes. "And who phones in to the open line programmes besides the hon. gentlemen," he said, "and their supporters? You have a number of people," he said, "out there on fixed incomes, receiving in most cases allowances from this very government who in order to pay their allowance had to raise the taxes. Now I think it is time things were put in perspective. So this might help to do it." And he said, "Thank you."

MR. ROBERTS: When did he make that introduction?

MR. NEARY: Yesterday.

November 30, 1982

Tape 2913

NM - 3

MR. ROBERTS: Well, when is he going to make his
speech?

MR. NEARY: This document will be widely distributed
in the hon. gentleman's district in due course.

But the fact of the

MR. S. NEARY:

matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman is asking a question: Who eats in restaurants and who eats hot dogs and who eats hamburgers and who eats donuts? He said it is only the rich people that do that. Now, I go down to Big Macs down here every weekend, down to MacDonalds every weekend, and I see an awful lot of ordinary people going into MacDonalds and the A&W with little children by the hand to buy them a hot dog and a Big Mac, a hamburger -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Carry on. We are listening.

MR. NEARY: - and to buy a regular root beer and so forth and so on, Mr. Chairman. And who are these people? Are they the rich the hon. gentleman referred to, or are they ordinary people? I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that 99 per cent of them are ordinary people buying a hot dog and a hamburger for their children or going out to breakfast on Saturday morning, taking their kids out to breakfast.

The fact of the matter is that everything over five cents is now taxed in this Province. Everything over a nickle.

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot buy a nickle's worth of bubble gum anymore because it costs six cents to buy a nickle worth of bubble gum.

MR. NEARY: You know you could name it the bubble gum tax, you could name it the hot dog tax, the hamburger tax or the donut tax.

MR. ROBERTS: No. The Big Mac attack.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, I think we have adequately dealt with the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. L. Hearn), I have to come back to the old anti-Confederate himself, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) the anti-Canadian, the king of the anti-Confederates in this House, the king of the anti-Confederates in this Province. It would be far better instead of making

MR. S. NEARY: the speech he made this afternoon if he had tried to come to grips, if he had tried to cope with the problem in St. Clare's Hospital, the mess that he has created up there as a result of short-changing St. Clare's Hospital, and the mess he is about to create down at the Janeway Hospital. The hon. gentleman seems to have it in, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) seems to have it in for St. Clare's and the Janeway for some strange reason and only the hon. gentleman knows the real reason.

MR. G. TOBIN: Close down Nickersons.

MR. NEARY: Yes, close down Nickersons. I would say if Nickersons closed down it would not be missed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What about T.J. Hardy?

MR. NEARY: What about T.J. Hardy? T.J. Hardy is T.J. Hardy, not Nickersons. I am not sure if it was the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), one of the ministers of fisheries insulted Mr. Hardy already in this House -

MR. DINN: Is he 100 per cent owner?

MR. NEARY: Yes. T.J. Hardy is T.J. Hardy Limited. Now Mr. Hardy may be in joint ventures. He may be in some joint ventures with Nickersons that have failed, by the way.

MR. DINN: And if Nickersons goes, what happens to poor old T.J.?

MR. NEARY: Well, these places are already gone. Mr. Chairman, T.J. Hardy will survive and has survived without Nickersons.

MR. TULK: Good people like T.J. Hardy are the people who should be saved, but they do not realize that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: Tell them what you would do. I mean, you would let Nickersons go but you would rescue T.J. Hardy.

MR. NEARY: Of course. I am not the Premier of this Province so it is not up to me. I do not make decisions. I am not in a decision making position, so therefore it does not make any difference what I do or say, it does not

MR. NEARY: make any difference. In case the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) does not realize it, the government is on that side of the House. In other provinces the government sits to the right of the Speaker. In this Province -

MR. SIMMS: Not all of them. Not all of them.

MR. NEARY: In all of them, except Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Prince Edward Island.

MR. NEARY: Well, all right, in P.E.I.

But in this House the government sits to the left of the Speaker. Now, the government has the majority. They have forty-four members and they are elected to govern. They are elected to govern the Province, which they are not doing. Now what the hon. gentlemen should be doing, instead of asking questions of the Opposition and criticizing the Opposition - it does not make any difference what we do or say -

MR. DINN: Well, I think it does.

MR. NEARY: No, it does not. When the time comes for us to offer a policy -

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I will have another go at it again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, every time the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up to speak, you know, I am -

MR. SIMMS: Spurred on.

MR. DINN: - I am spurred on to say a few words in debate. I was not going to say much in this debate but

MR. DINN: I have listened to hon. members opposite this afternoon and many of the things that they have said do not make a lot of sense. But there is a kind of theme in what some hon. members opposite have said this afternoon. The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), for example, said, 'You had best get to the bargaining table immediately and settle the offshore or the Province is going to go down the drain' Mr. Chairman. 'It does not matter, the Nova Scotia deal or whatever deal you can get now, sit down to the table with Mr. Chretien and give it to Mr. Chretien,' Mr. Chairman, that

MR. DINN:

kind of a thread that always ran through the theory behind, the whole purpose behind the Liberal Party and how they operated. I mean, one has but to look at what happened in the past and see what happened in the past and one would see that what the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) proposed to this House of Assembly today was to basically give away the offshore resource.

MR. SIMMS:

Same old philosophy, yes.

MR. DINN:

Now, every time we make a statement like that we have to back it up with some fact. You cannot just stand up in the House of Assembly and ramble on about nothing, much like the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or interim Leader of the Opposition does and some of his colleagues, you have to get up and substantiate what you say. You should not just get up and say something without substantiating it.

For example, the iron mines in Western Labrador, basically the story goes that a gentleman met the former, former, former Premier on a Trans-Canada Airlines - it was Trans-Canada Airlines flight then and he discussed the iron mines in Western Labrador, the Scully operation right now, and talked about leases for the mining operation down there. And I think there was a pretty fair settlement, in their terms, on the leases for the Scully mines in Western Labrador. I think the price at the time, I think Western Labrador basically or the Scully Mines operation went for something like \$2,745.

MR. ROBERTS:

What is Scully?

MR. DINN:

It is Wabush Mines.

MR. ROBERTS:

In Western Labrador?

MR. DINN:

That is in Western Labrador, yes, now Scully.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it the Carol project?

MR. DINN: No, no. We are talking about Wabush Mines now.

And then the hon. gentleman got off the Air Canada flight after he consummated the deal and went down to Pickand Mathers in Cleveland -

MR. SIMMS: On his honeymoon?

MR. DINN: No.

MR. SIMMS: After consummating this.

MR. DINN: Well after he completed this great deal, went down then to Cleveland and negotiated for a dollar a ton for every ton of ore that went out of Wabush Mines and, as a result, the commission for a year now is about, if they are in full production, about \$6 million a year. The people of Newfoundland get a few jobs and that gentleman who now lives in another country -

MR. SIMMONS: Who is that?

MR. DINN: Well, I do not like mentioning names in the House of Assembly. That is one of the things that I have a problem with. Most people here in the House of Assembly know the gentleman that I am talking about. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) at times goes to visit him.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of deal we are talking about. And the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) got up today and basically spoke for ten minutes in this debate on insurance taxation and basically said,

MR. DINN: 'Sit down with Mr. Chretien now before it all goes down the drain and give him the offshore. We do not care if it is the Nova Scotia deal or what kind of a deal you make as long as you get the deal signed and give it away'. Well, Mr. Chairman -

MR. SIMMS: He also said, it was recently, discovered there is iron ore in Brazil, by the way.

MR. DINN: And he also discovered there is iron ore in Brazil.

MR. SIMMS: There are nuts there too.

MR. DINN: There are a few nuts in Brazil too, and there are a few nuts up here.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is basically what the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said. He basically said this afternoon - and hon. members opposite listened to him, I sat here and did not interrupt the hon. gentleman while he was speaking - but basically he said, 'Get to the table immediately and sign a deal, any kind of a deal as long as we get a deal signed, whether it is the Nova Scotia deal or any kind of a deal, sign the deal.' Well, Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) today made it quite clear that we are not going to sign that kind of a deal. We know that every Premier in this country agrees with our position on the offshore. We know that. We know that the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa agrees with our proposal on the offshore. We know that the Leader of the Liberal Party in Halifax today agrees, Andy Cameron, agrees with our position on the offshore and does not agree with the Nova Scotian deal, Mr. Chairman. We know that the major newspapers in this country are now saying that the Prime Minister of this country should get serious. Here is a quote from the Globe And Mail of last Friday: "It is time for Mr. Trudeau

MR. DINN: to overcome his own haughty pride, make a show of magnanimity and respond to Newfoundland's reasonable bargaining stand. And in doing so the federal government must recognize that the Province's economic and geographic disadvantages entitle it to a more generous agreement than the one signed with Nova Scotia." That is one of our leading newspapers in this country saying this. And, Mr. Chairman, they are also well aware of the fact that Ottawa is basically trying to grind us into the ground because we are not signing the Nova Scotia deal, which is not a deal that we can live with in this Province, nor should we, nor should the people of this Province have to continue for another 400 years subservient to anyone. They should have an equal say in the development of their resources and that is what we are asking for. Imagine! We are asking for an equal say in the development of our resources and hon. members opposite are telling us to go and sign the Nova Scotia deal or any deal we can get.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said today, he just reiterated exactly what the Premier has said, what ministers on this side of the House have said, that we are not going to give away the offshore. It is just not going to happen. It is not going to happen. We are having a rough time. We have had rough times before and when we have rough times -

MR. SIMMS: It is no time for the weak-kneed.

MR. DINN: As the hon. Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) has said, "It is no time for the weak-kneed". Mr. Chairman, we are not going to rush

MR. DINN: to the table and give it away again. We have done it before. It is not just the Upper Churchill, that is not the only thing. It is the mining operation in Western Labrador, Mr. Chairman, and many other things that have happened in this Province. The linerboard mill in Stephenville, a classic example of the develop or perish philosophy of the former, former administration of this Province.

MR. STAGG: Almost took us down the drain.

MR. DINN: Almost took us down the drain as a Province as well as Stephenville itself, Mr. Chairman. And it was only through negotiations - the hon. Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) could stand in his place in this House and tell of the shame of the development of Happy Valley-Goose Bay in the past and the fact that he would not allow, he would not be party to a government that would give away the resources of this Province.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear! A good minister too.

MR. DINN: An upstanding gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, also in this House of Assembly - now hon. members, I mean, we have stood up here and we have done our little bit of politicking at times where we said, 'The former, former Premier had told the fishermen in this Province to burn their boats. There are two jobs for every man.' And hon. members opposite have gotten up and said, 'No, that gentleman did not say that'. And maybe he did and maybe he did not. I personally did not hear him say it. It has been quoted that he did say it. But the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the interim Leader of the Liberal Party, today has said, "Let the fish plants go down the drain". "Let them go", he says. And

MR. DINN: not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the spokesman for fisheries on the opposite side, and I quote from Hansard, the spokesman for fishermen when the hon. the interim Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, "So Nickersons are not all that big in this Province, Mr. Speaker, let them go", what did the hon. spokesman for fisheries say? "Let them go", he said.

MR. STAGG: What district does he represent?

MR. DINN: He represents Fogo district.

MR. STAGG: Fogo.

MR. DINN: He said, "Let them go".

MR. RIDEOUT: That is only a temporary representation though.

MR. DINN: So that is their attitude with respect to the fisheries in this Province. So maybe they did not say, maybe they were not around when it was said, "Burn your boats." But, Mr. Chairman, they were in this House of Assembly the other day when their leader, the interim Leader of the Liberal Party said, "Let them go", referring to the fish plants. And the fisheries spokesman on the Opposition side, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, "Yes, let them go down the tubes".

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave has been denied.
The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, this is what you would call deferring government taxes. That was a

MR. WARREN: good speech by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) of defending the government's tax increases. Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday evening and as I said this evening, I would be only too glad to take my seat right now to give the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) an opportunity to speak for the first time in the session.

MR. OSMOND: Mr. Chairman.

MR. WARREN: Here we go.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OSMOND: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking this afternoon. But just for a few moments I will have something to say. I have been listening to speeches - not speeches from the other side, not as I know speeches-but speeches from this side of the House. They have been fantastic speeches, speeches that in some cases I am not capable of giving at this point in time. Maybe a few months down the road I will give that same type of good speech. But I have been listening to speeches, as they call it, speeches from the other side and I was confused when they talked about, they are going to give a speech. Because for one thing it is the same thing over and over. What they have said it is what I heard last Spring. Every time they get up they just repeat themselves in nothingness.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: You should have heard Trevor Bennett when he was here.

MR. OSMOND: I would say Trevor Bennett, being from St. Barbe, was probably ahead of those people, you know, as bad as he was. I never heard Mr. Bennett give any speeches but I have certainly heard the speeches, what they call speeches, from the other side and it is -

MR. STAGG: It is disappointing.

MR. OSMOND: - it is disappointing. It is not what I had expected to hear from people on the opposite side, who, with the time and the resources they have ought to be able to plan their speeches.

MR. SIMMS: And the experience.

MR. OSMOND: The experience they have, yes. I am very disappointed in the speeches that I have heard from the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. OSMOND: Well, there is one person who gave a speech from the other side who said when he smiles he is mad. That is not me. When I smile I am a little bit happy. But I can get mad, you know. But, Mr. Chairman, I did give my maiden speech here, contrary to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I might say it is not as good a speech as I am going to give in this House in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OSMOND: I feel I have quite a number of years ahead of me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OSMOND: In my district this year I made I think it was about ten or twelve trips in the district, each four and five days at a time. I overflowed myself into the Straits district. And in that district -

MR. STAGG: They cannot find their member.

MR. OSMOND: Well, they know it is Mr. Roberts and they know him as Mr. Roberts.

MR. STAGG: He is on the ballot every four years.

MR. SIMMS: They never see him.

MR. OSMOND: Now I think probably in St. Anthony he might go there once in a while. But I have been in my district and, like I say, I have overflowed myself into the Straits district. I am very close to my district, to my people. That is something I am really proud of. I may not be able to give the speech today that I would like to give if I had prepared, or in the future that I am going to give, but I do speak with sincerity. I do speak from the bottom of my heart, as I might say. I do speak

MR. OSMOND: with the aim of my constituents in mind. I am a very sincere man in that way. And eventually, like I say, I will be giving speeches in this House that will cry you to shame. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Chairman, we just heard a new member defending the government's tax increases. Yes, Sir, Mr. Chairman, that is what you call defense. I remember the New Jersey Devils had the same kind of defense.

Mr. Chairman, you know, since the hon. -

MR. DAWE: Why have you got your hands in your pockets?

MR. CALLAN: Put your hand in your pocket and haul out the roads programme list. What are you hiding it for? There must be something there you are covering up. I guess most of it was spent in your own district. Is that what you are covering up?

MR. SIMMS: Stop interrupting!

MR. DAWE: I would appreciate it if you would go on the air - the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will not do it - and talk about all the improvements in transportation in St. George's district. I would appreciate that. I can use all the free advertising I can get.

MR. CALLAN: Table the roads programme list like you promised to, like you lied about doing. Lying comes easy to you, does it not? You are patterning yourself on your new Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, if

hon. members on both sides would be quiet, I would continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, there about ten

days ago when the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought in his little blue Ministerial Statement, Mr. Chairman, it was only just a couple of days after that I received a paper in the mail. And, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be only appropriate for me to read what I received in the mail a few days after the minister brought in his Ministerial Statement.

It starts off by saying:

"The gospel according to St. Brian". Mr. Chairman, it says, and I quote, Mr. Chairman, what is here. I do not know if it will be any help or not but it says - and excuse me for saying this, maybe it is unparliamentary - but anyway it says here, "Brian Peckford is my shepherd, I shall not want. He leadeth me beside still fish plants and abandoned mines. He restored my doubt about the P.C. Party. He amounted my wages with taxes and inflation and so my expenses runneth over my income. Surely poverty and hard living shall follow the P.C. Party. And I shall look for work and live on a rented farm forever. Five thousand years ago Moses said, 'Pack up your camel, pick up your shovel, move your ass and I will lead you to the promised land. Five thousand years later Diefenbaker said, 'Lay down your shovel and light up a candle -

MR. STAGG:

A point of order, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please.

A point of order, the hon.

member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member is reading is obviously blasphemous, it is based on a very important work in the Gospel.

MR. HOUSE: Psalm 23.

MR. STAGG: "Psalm 23", says the Minister of Health (Mr. House). And while it might be appropriate in some journals to be blasphemous I do not think it is appropriate in this House and that is what the hon. member is doing.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. ex-deputy speaker is wrong again. No wonder we had such bad rulings when the hon. gentleman sat in the Chair. In the context that my hon. friend used the word, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: in the context he used it, quoting from the Bible, it is not unparliamentary. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is just merely trying to harass my colleague, that is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, I am having the Standing Order looked up there now and Beauchesne. But, as I understand it, the hon. member is reading from an article from a newspaper?

MR. WARREN: An article.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is an article from a newspaper and there is -

MR. SIMMS: Paragraph 332, Beauchesne.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 332 in Beauchesne, section (1), "On March 17, 1933, a Member quoting from a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker" and so on. The Standing Order is there for everyone to see. So I would rule that the hon. member should not be quoting but should be giving his own opinion in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, we can see, Mr. Chairman, from the author of this report that it really shows that this government is really giving the taxes, they are wacking to the ordinary people of this Province. To quote, Mr. Chairman, what he said was, "He leadeth me beside still fish plants and abandoned mines". Is that not true? It is true, Mr. Chairman, is it not? Is that not true, Mr. Chairman? Still fish plants and abandoned mines, is that not true? That is a fact, Mr. Chairman. And the Premier of the Province has led the people of Newfoundland to abandoned mines and still fish plants. And not only that, before this year is gone and before

MR. WARREN: next year is gone there will be more abandoned mines and there will be more still fish plants because this government has not got any confidence whatsoever in looking after the well being of the people of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, what could this government do instead of bringing in taxes on clothing and footwear, and a 1 per cent increase in sales tax? What could they do? What could they do, Mr. Chairman? I would like to give them three little clues of three ways they could have gone instead of raising the taxes. Just see how much money they would have saved. If they sold Mount Scio house, how much money would they make? How much? How much would you get if you sold it? How much would you

MR. WARREN: get? How much would we save? How much would you save if you -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Mr. Ryan.

MR. WARREN: Forget about Mr. Ryan down in the Murray Premises. How much would you save down there? That is two. That is about \$1 million right off the bat. Okay.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at some other ways of saving. How much have the new cars cost the Department of Public Works that were purchased? How much do the new cars cost?

AN HON. MEMBER: Five hundred thousand dollars.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Chairman, how much money have we spent this year on the extension to the Confederation Building?

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. gentleman know the answers to all those questions?

MR. WARREN: Yes. And at the same time the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has the gall to bring in thirteen policy changes that are going to hurt the average person in this Province.

MR. HICKEY: You are wrong.

MR. WARREN: Now this is what happens, Mr. Chairman. The minister has not told the truth in this House, and now he is saying I am wrong. In fact Hansard on November 19th. will show you that he did not tell the truth.

So, here is the kind of government we have running this Province, Mr. Chairman. They bring in taxes and at the same time the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) brings in thirteen policy changes that will do nothing but hurt the people on social

MR. WARREN: assistance. They are going to hurt the people on social assistance.

So, Mr. Chairman, we cannot vote for any tax increases that this government brings in, in insurance and increases in retail sales tax and the exemption on fuel tax. Because the big thing - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) does not realize it yet. I know he is not too bright - but he does not realize -

MR. NEARY: He is just interested in how he is going to pass the day away.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

DR. COLLINS: We should raise some money by selling the hon. member. He must be crazy, he attacked us.

MR. NEARY: Go up, boy, and straighten out St. Clare's. Straighten the mess he caused up in St. Clare's.

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

MR. WARREN: Oh, too bad, Mr. Chairman. But we will have time again tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I do not want to speak in the debate. Does the hon. gentleman wish to put the question?

MR. NEARY: No.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL) :

Order, please!

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD :

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL :

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Chairman of Committees thinks we made progress.

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

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