

VOL. 3

No. 5

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.
FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1984

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to announce to the hon. House of Assembly that on the evening of March 15, yesterday, a memorandum of agreement was signed between the negotiating committees representing the Newfoundland Nurses' Union,-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - government and the Newfoundland Hospital Association. The memorandum of agreement was reached with the assistance of my department's conciliation officer, Mr. Robert Rex. The Nurses' Bargaining Committee will be recommending this agreement to the 2,500 nurses across the Province for ratification. Until the agreement is ratified, the details will not be released.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we can say about the so-called Ministerial Statement is that we look forward to the details of the agreement which will be released in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the approval of an ocean industries capital assistance grant of \$185,500 in favour of Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation Limited (NORDCO) to assist in the cost of purchasing a new mainframe computer system and ancillary equipment.

Installation of this new equipment will enable NORDCO Limited to carry out major modelling projects both in signal processing and oceanographic areas, including large-scale numerical modelling and finite analysis, and to pursue certain types of oceanographic work that has previously gone to firms outside this Province, thereby now maximizing benefits to the local economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: This project will allow NORDCO to maintain and further develop its credibility and leadership in the application

MR. WINDSOR: of new technologies to the ocean resources development sector, not only in Newfoundland but on a worldwide basis.

The expansion involves the creation and/or retention of ten permanent jobs initially, with prospects for the creation of thirty to thirty-five new permanent jobs in the longer term.

To date, OICAP grants totalling approximately \$2.3 million have been committed to seventeen projects which have created directly some 268 full-time and 164 part-time or seasonal jobs, although two of these offers, valuing \$392,000, were subsequently not accepted.

This program, funded in total by the Province, has been instrumental in spurring further private sector investments totalling \$12.6 million in these seventeen approved projects.

The Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Program (OICAP) is designed to stimulate further development of the ocean industries sector by encouraging the expansion and growth of Newfoundland companies and by helping to attract new ocean-related, medium and high technology industry to Newfoundland and Labrador. In order to achieve maximum effectiveness, the programme was made complementary to existing federal and provincial programmes.

Eligible applicants include Canadian firms or foreign entities which manufacture products or equipment, or provide technical services in support of commercial and scientific activities for use in or on the ocean.

Generally, eligibility for assistance is based on the benefits of the proposal to the overall Newfoundland economy, particularly with respect to the maximization of 'value added'. Preference is given to firms owned or controlled by persons normally resident in

MR. WINDSOR: Newfoundland and Labrador, and to other Canadian or foreign entities who enter into joint ventures with Newfoundland firms.

Financial assistance is in the form of a conditional grant forgiven over a four year period at the rate of 25 per cent per annum. Maximum assistance for eligible manufacturing and service firms is 50 per cent of the approved capital costs, less the amount of assistance available from the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion (DRIE), if any, to a maximum OICAP grant of \$500,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that in connection with this Ministerial Statement that it is one with which I agree. As the hon. gentleman probably gathered from my province-wide broadcast recently, I think this is an area, Mr. Speaker, where we can do something worthwhile. I think the minister and his people, in connection with ocean research and so forth, are on the right track. And, Mr. Speaker, this is one area that I would like to see developed. I think we should concentrate a great deal of our efforts in this area because our whole history, our whole tradition and way of life is based on marine life, as we are stuck right out here in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean.

MR. NEARY: We have a Cold Ocean Research Centre being developed here at Memorial University, we have the new College of Fisheries that is going to be built, and we have NORDCO. Mr. Speaker, there is no end to the research and the technology that we can develop in this Province that can be sold to other parts of the world. And we are all for that kind of development, Mr. Speaker. It is a good move and I hope that the administration will not allow it to become a political football, that nobody will panic, that they will keep their cool because this is an area where we can develop technology and techniques that can be sold throughout the world. We would like to see more of this type of thing going on in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health (Mr. House), it is his turn in the barrel today, Could the minister tell the House when the people of the Province can expect to have the \$5 a day user fee abolished as recommended in the Royal Commission report on Hospital and Nursing Home Costs in this Province?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a royal commission report has been received by government. It has not been studied totally by government. It has not been accepted totally by government. It is in the process of being reviewed. That is one recommendation and when and if the decision is made to accept that recommendation it will be made known at that time.

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman surely must be aware that there is a budget coming down on Tuesday. Monday is a holiday, St. Patrick's Day, and on Tuesday we will have a budget that is supposed to outline plans and give us some idea of what kind of a blueprint the administration have for dealing with these matters like the one I just raised. Surely the minister must have had some input into that budget. Can he tell us if a decision has been made or when will it be made to eliminate the \$5 a day user fee? When will it be abolished? The Royal Commission that we paid substantial sums of money to write the recommendations recommended that the \$5 a day user fee be abolished. When will it be abolished?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talked about the budget coming down on Tuesday and so on. It is a budgetary matter and, if it is contained in the budget, it will be known at that time. It is a budgetary consideration. I did make a statement that, while the report has been received, it has not been accepted in total by government. But it has been under review and that particular aspect of it is a budgetary consideration. The hon. member will have to await the budget to get an answer to his question.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: A supplementary. In the

MR. NEARY: first answer I received
the minister said no decision has been made.

MR. SIMMS: No, he did not.

MR. NEARY: I presume for all practical
purposes the budget is now complete and in the hands of
the printers, probably already printed. And the hon.
gentleman should know whether or not it is included.
He did have input in that budget because his department
is one of the big spenders of government. Now has the
decision been made or has it not been made? I do not want
the hon. gentleman to tell me what the decision is, but
has a decision been made on the \$5 user-pay fee in hospitals.

MR. WARREN: Yes, or no.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: The hon. member is asking me a question on what is going to be in the budget on Tuesday. I am saying to the hon. member that that information will become available on Tuesday and I would suggest that he wait until that time. He asked me if I had any discussions on it. I will say, yes, I have, but the budget will reveal what these discussions have been.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: All my question required was a simple yes or no answer, Has there been a decision made? The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand simple questions. Let me ask him another question about the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Home Costs: Will the minister tell the House that he has recommended to the administration there opposite that a health tax be implemented, as was recently implemented in British Columbia and instituted in that province? And, Mr. Speaker, if the answer is yes, that he has recommended a health tax, as was included in the Royal Commission's recommendations, would such a tax contravene the provision of the federal government proposed new Medical Health Act?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me about what I have recommended. The Royal Commission had a mandate to recommend to government any financing arrangements that they could

MR. HOUSE: think of as to new methods of raising funds for health care costs. I had stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, that the Royal Commission report had been received by government but no decision had been made on any of its recommendations. The hon. member is asking me if I made recommendations. I do not make recommendations for tax increases one way or another but it was in the report to government to look at and I am sure it has been assessed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: It is simply incredible! The hon. gentleman just made a statement again, and I wrote it down: 'No decision has been made on any of the recommendations,' Yet he told me a few moments ago, 'wait for the budget.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Why should I wait for the budget if no decisions have been made? Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this Commission report has been in the hands of the administration for some time. Some of these recommendations could have been implemented quickly, immediately.

I will go on to the next question, Mr. Speaker, about the nursing homes in the Province. I would like for the minister to tell the House if any decision has been made on this recommendation that his department should take over the operation and the management of the Province's nursing homes, as recommended in the Commission's report?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, again, as I keep saying to the hon. member, the report was received, it is in the process of being studied by both departments involved - incidentally, those are the Department of Social Services and the Department of Health, The recommendations were, of course, to put the nursing homes under the Department of Health. The report, as I have mentioned, has not been accepted, it has not been rejected. There are some aspects of the nursing homes now under Health and some still under Social Services, So the recommendations have not been accepted nor rejected because the government have not made a final decision on them. And, Mr. Speaker, I might add, it is going to take some time to comment or to have that report finally accepted because there are some 217 recommendations, some of which have six and seven parts, and it is something that is going to take a lot of time and a lot of study. I reiterate it is a good report but it cannot be accepted or rejected or dealt with overnight. Certain parts of it obviously have been used. It was brought down by February 15 to give us some information or to help us with budgetary considerations, but it is going to take a lot of time before the report is going to be finally dealt with.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear! Good answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what an incredible performance! They must intend to study the report to death. Mr. Speaker, some of these recommendations should have been implemented by now. What is the minister's views, by the way - perhaps he can tell the House - on nursing students' tuition? It was recommended

March 15, 1984

Tape No. 166

MJ - 2

MR. NEARY: by the Commission of Enquiry
that the nursing students commencing their studies in
September 1984, that their tuition be increased, be not less than
\$500 a year. What is the minister's views on that? You
have young people who have applications

MR. NEARY:

in for nursing school and they would like to know as soon as possible what is going to happen. What about the recommendation that their allowances be dropped altogether and that they pay not less than \$500 a year tuition for going into nursing school? What is the minister's views on that? And when can we expect a decision on that recommendation?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, again that is one of 217 recommendations that is a budgetary one. I would imagine that has been discussed in the financial circles. Mr. Speaker, my view is not important, I will express exactly what the Commission said. The Commission said that nursing students now at the University are paying tuition, vocational students are paying tuition, teachers and all other people who are training at our institutions are paying tuition, and they recommended that nurses in training in our hospital schools pay tuition. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any reason why it could not happen, but I am not recommending it now, and I am not saying that I am for or against it because it is not important at this time. Students who will be enrolling into nursing next Fall will know by that time what the policy will be, and it is not necessary for them to know now before the Budget.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

It is absolutely incredible. The hon. gentleman said, 'My view it is not important.' His view, meaning the minister's view, is not important. Well, whose view is important if the minister's view is not important? You know, if you did not hear it with your own ears you would not believe it, would you? No wonder the hon. gentleman would smile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has entered into the realm of debate and I would ask him to pose a question.

MR. NEARY:

No way I would do that, Mr.

Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what about the recommendation Section 471 in the Commission's report. Can the minister tell the House when the government will be conducting the detailed provincial bed study as recommended in the Royal Commission's report? Can the minister assure the House - surely the minister can do this, Mr. Speaker - can he assure the House that there would be no further bed closures in this Province in any of our hospitals until the study is conducted and made public?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me a specific question with regard to 217 items on a report that I have mentioned has not been fully studied and fully reported on. This is an executive summary that the hon. member has got. There are about 800 pages, I think, of details to wade through and to analyze.

MR. HOUSE: The fact of the matter is there has been a fairly detailed study gone one before this commission report on hospital beds across the Province. We had a detailed study done in Central Newfoundland. All I can assure the hon. member is that by Canadian standards Newfoundland hospitals, Newfoundlanders, have the most beds per 1,000 population in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: As a matter of fact it is almost five per 1,000 people - 4.9, I think, is the figure. And what the commission is saying is a lot of these beds are under-utilized and a lot of them are vacant. What we mean by 'under-utilized' is they are not used for acute care, a lot of them are used for chronic care. And, of course, obviously before any beds are going to be closed there are going to be studies carried out because studies are ongoing all the time. So it is not something that you can say overnight that we are going to complete a study and we will do this tomorrow or the next day. This is an ongoing thing. I will assure the hon. member that the Department of Health, incidentally as shown in this report, the Department of Health has done a magnificent job in addressing the health care needs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: If ever there was a report that was complimentary to a department, Mr. Speaker, that particular report is. And it is the report that is saying that we did not give savage cuts to hospitals last year, it said that we gave enough money to hospitals last year, when the hon. members over there wanted us to give another \$30 million. So I will say to the hon. member that the Department of Health is in good hands and I will assure the hon. member that bed closures will only take place if necessary of if they are not needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I always thought, Mr. Speaker, that Royal Commissions were appointed to do a job that the department could not do themselves. In this particular instance there was one hundred and some - odd recommendations made -

MR. WARREN: For improvements.

MR. NEARY: - for improvements, Mr. Speaker, things that the hon. gentleman could not do and the administration there opposite could not do. Mr. Speaker, we saw what happened in Education when the hon. gentleman was there. We saw that deteriorate -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and now they are going to do the same thing with Health.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is again getting into the realm of debate and I would ask him to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not mean to get into the realm of debate, I just want to state a few facts.

Mr. Speaker, I will have to leave the hon. gentleman because obviously he does not have a handle on what is going on in his department and I will have to wait

MR. NEARY: for the budget and I will come back to it again. But before I take my seat I have a question to put to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if there is any way that his department, or any department of government, any agency of government, can control the display of magazines, certain types of pornographic literature and magazines that have been brought into this Province and displayed in the bookstores and on book shelves? Is there any way at all that the minister can cut down on the distribution and the display and sale of this pornographic literature? And is it possible for the minister's department to ban the sale of murder stories, such as the magazine used recently as evidence in the murder trial in Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the problem referred to by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is a matter which, of course, preoccupies a number of people throughout the Province and throughout Canada. As the hon. gentleman is probably aware, there are some proposed amendments to the Criminal Code which will assist law enforcement in this area. One of the big problems is, of course, that the Criminal Code makes reference to obscenity, it does not make reference to pornography. But I think that one of the big difficulties is with respect to obscenity.

Now whenever there is a complaint laid, then the matter is investigated and if the evidence is there a prosecution would ensue. I really

MR. OTTENHEIMER: believe that the real answer does require amendments to the Criminal Code which would be more strict, more rigid, and use a term either different than obscenity or give a more workable definition of obscenity. Apart from the strictly law enforcement aspects of it, certainly responsible store owners should at the very least have this material not displayed publicly where children

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

contact with it. I think the real solution is an amendment of the Criminal Code so that the obscenity matter is given a more workable definition and that the hands of law enforcement are not restricted to the extent that they are now.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) regarding the Come By Chance oil refinery. I have had those questions for several days. I asked the minister some questions last Fall, before we adjourned for the Christmas recess, and the minister said he was going to investigate and he would get some answers. Now I understand that officials from Petro Canada were in St. John's recently and had some discussions and met with the minister. Would the minister tell the House what is the latest word on Come By Chance? Is it going to be scrapped? Is there any new hope that it may reopen? Could the minister give us an update on these recent meetings?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member, of course, is well aware, because he takes a great interest and it is to his credit that he takes an extremely active interest in this whole matter, he is well aware that the decision is not ours as to what happens with the refinery.

MR. NEARY:

No, you gave up total power.

DR. COLLINS:

We never did own the refinery, of course, we never did have power of authority to make decisions on the refinery. It is unfortunate that the refinery was

March 16, 1984

Tape No. 170

ah-2

DR. COLLINS: constructed under a previous
administration the way it was, but anyway that is all
past history. Anyway, we never did have power of
control over the refinery. When it was sold by the
owners at that time - that was the receivers, Kleinworth
Benson in Great Britain and the ECDG, the government
financing agency in Great Britain to whom the ownership
of the refinery fell after the bankruptcy - when they
sold the refinery to Petro Canada, we entered into an
agreement with Petro Canada through a letter of intent
that they would keep us informed as need be on what
their plans were and what their prospects were.

DR. COLLINS: Now I think it is important to remember that, when Petro Canada bought the refinery, they gave no commitment, nor I suppose could they be expected to give a commitment, that they would definitely and without any shadow of a doubt rehabilitate and reactivate the refinery. What they did was to take it on in good faith and say that we will preserve the refinery while studying the unfolding of oil industry events in the whole world to see if this can be made into a viable proposition. The letter of intent was designed not only to keep us informed by physical meetings but also designed to give information to a committee that was set up called the Co-ordinating Committee, and that has been going on all throughout these painful years since the refinery was closed down.

Now, as the hon. member mentioned, we did have a meeting recently with the senior Vice President of Petro Canada and some of his officials. This was at our request. We have requested these meetings at irregular intervals as new events came up or questions arose and whatever. When we sat down with them, we went over, again, what their plans were, how they saw the possibility for marketing in the United States in particular but really throughout the world, what the economics would be related to the cost of oil, the cost of rehabilitating the refinery and the profit margin thereafter. And at that time they told us that they had not come up with a more hopeful scenario than they had come up with at previous meetings, the conditions still were not there. They pointed out that there had been continued close downs of refineries not only in the United States but also in Canada itself and that there was still an overcapacity and that the refinery itself could not be rehabilitated at this time. They did point out - and I think this is only realistic -

DR. COLLINS: they did point out that the longer the refinery remains unrehabilitated the more out-of-date it becomes, the more technology changes, the greater cost it would be to bring the refinery back to anything like an operating venture. So at that point we asked them to undertake particular studies because we were aware that time was not in favour of the refinery. We asked them to undertake particular studies and tried to come up with a firm position one way or the other and they undertook

DR. COLLINS: to do that and we expect to hear from them in a very short while, perhaps in a matter of weeks, as to a more definitive notion on what they plan to do, and at that time I will be glad to pass the information we get from them along to the House.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I heard the minister on the airways once during the last three weeks and he gave the impression that he was resigned to the fact that the thing would be scrapped and done away with, because the minister said, you know, it costs Petro-Canada \$25,000 a month to keep the refinery in mothballs and he did not see that continuing for very long. But then, I think it was the next day or shortly thereafter, I heard the minister say that the Come By Chance refinery had some of what the minister called construction-type work done to it. Would the minister please elaborate and tell the House what kind of construction work was there and what was the purpose for that? You know, if there is no future for it, and it looks bleak, what kind of construction-type work was done?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I did give this information on a previous occasion. The work really was of two sorts. One, some of the insulation material had become so deteriorated that it was no longer protecting the refinery, its deteriorated condition was actually endangering the refinery, so that material was taken off. Secondly, there was some valuable catalytic materials in the refinery which, of course, were just lying there doing no good. Those could be used elsewhere and they were taken out and

DR. COLLINS: used elsewhere. And the idea was that if it were necessary to put them back they could be put back, but, in the meantime, these valuable materials were just lying there doing no good and they were used elsewhere in Petro-Canada's operation.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the minister has said they have asked Petro-Canada to do some investigating and some further studies and so on on the prospects, But what is the Department of Finance doing, the minister's own department, and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the gentleman who is now sitting next to him, for example, when they were in Europe recently? You know, when these various government department officials travel around the world looking for new markets for this and that or new industry to be established in this Province, have there been any efforts made by either the minister's department or

MR. CALLAN: the Minister of Development's (Mr. Windsor) department, you know, to probably get some prospective buyers? Because obviously everybody around the world knows that we have the oil offshore and it is just a matter of time when the refinery, obviously, or so we hope, will be a great asset to somebody involved - perhaps J. R. might be interested in buying it. What efforts have the minister's department or the Minister of Development made to find developers?

MR. WINDSOR: Who do you want to answer?

MR. CALLAN: I do not care.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Does the hon. Minister of Development have leave to answer the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, certainly government is not without knowledge of the importance of the Come By Chance refinery and the opportunity that that presents to perhaps attract petroleum-related industries. In fact, we have had discussions with companies who may perhaps be interested in being involved in Come By Chance as part of a petrochemical complex. And from my perspective, at least at this point in time, it would certainly seem to me that if Come By Chance has a future it may not be as a pure refinery but as a refining operation in conjunction with a petrochemical complex, and there is some interest in that. This is long-term, Mr. Speaker, and it will obviously depend on our ability to have some control over what takes place offshore and ensure that some of the benefits from the offshore accrue to this Province in that we have the ability to ensure that some of the product from offshore comes to this Province for further processing. There are real potentials

MR. WINDSOR: there and, yes, we have had discussions with international companies that have some interest.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) also. I gather from the news report this morning that the minister attributes the loss in sales tax to cigarette smuggling into the Province. Could the minister elaborate on what was said in the news this morning? Would he venture to say what would be the number of dollars, in his estimation, lost in revenue to Newfoundland by cigarette smuggling into the Province?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, of course, it hardly needs saying that it is difficult to get accurate statistics on smuggling. Smugglers do not file reports and so on and so forth, so one can only indirectly get at the figures.

Just as a little bit of a preamble, Mr. Speaker, smuggling is related - again this is a truism, I suppose - smuggling is related to the fact that in one area an item is more costly than it is in another area. If it was of the same cost there obviously would not be any smuggling. But you cannot, therefore, look at just the high cost of tobacco, shall we say, in this Province, you would have to look at the low cost in other provinces. And, of course, strangely enough, one of the lowest cost areas for tobacco is Nova Scotia. They seem to have kept their tax on tobacco products at an unusually low level, lower than in New Brunswick, lower than in PEI, lower than in Quebec, lower than in Ontario and so on and so forth. So there is this interface here between ourselves and Nova Scotia which is almost unique, and that is unfortunate but I mean those are the facts. Anyway, as far as we can determine, on the basis of the comparative decline in apparent tobacco consumption in various provinces - and just let me explain that. The only way we can really gauge tobacco consumption is by what taxes we gather. Now obviously the tax you gather is related to either consumption or the payment of tax. If you have lower consumption you get less revenues, but also if you do

DR. COLLINS: not pay the tax you get lower revenues. So when we have lower revenues of, say, 20 per cent, which we have had, and New Brunswick has lower revenues of, say, 5 per cent, you can say there is a 15 per cent loss in either consumption or that much margin in increased smuggling. We estimate that Newfoundlanders probably have not decreased their actual consumption more than anywhere else. So our loss of revenues is likely to some extent, related to that measure of smuggling and, again it is only a ballpark figure, we think we might have lost something of the order of about \$6 million through the smuggling mechanism.

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

MR. WARREN: I guess, Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister, in view of the fact that several businesses on the Newfoundland and Labrador/Quebec border, in particular in the Labrador City/Wabush area and in the L'Anse-au-Clair/L'Anse-aux-Meadows are finding it very difficult to continue in operation, one of facts that has been known by the businesses, by the Chamber of Commerce in both areas, is that there are a lot of goods being brought into Labrador from Quebec, from Blanc Sablon and from Fermont and so on.

MR. WARREN:

What action has the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this Province taken to help those people who own small businesses stay in business? Has he considered dropping some of the high taxes that consumers have to pay in that area? Because one of the reasons they are going to Quebec, to Fermont is because the products are much cheaper and the taxes on them are much lower. Has the minister considered reducing the taxes in those areas where over-the-border sales are very dominant? Naturally it is affecting the business in the community.

MR. NEARY:

And eliminates the temptation to smuggle.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we certainly are aware of the problem there. Over the last year at least we have had communications and representations from various groups there, business groups, Chambers of Commerce, municipalities and so on pointing out the problem. What we have done, we have studied the content of their remarks, we have met with them when they have come to St. John's, we sat down with them, we talked it over, we have looked at how the matters are dealt with in other jurisdictions. We discussed it with them; they also, of course, saw our side of it. We put forward our view of matters. And we assured them that we were sensitive to their needs, that we appreciated the problem, that we would do everything in our power to grapple with it. And I can say this, the meetings were amicable. I think both sides went away, with a deeper appreciation of each other's view point. As I said, all I could say at that time was that we would certainly give the problem our best shot.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for the Question

Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

- MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Health.
- MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Section 37 of The Newfoundland Medical Care Commission Act I wish to table the report for the year ending March 31, 1983.
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.
- MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Advisory Council I wish to table their annual report, I have numerous copies, for the year 1982-1983.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.
- MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked me a question with respect to the Atlantic Lottery outlets and the possibility of sale of other than Atlantic Lottery Products. All I can say at the present time is that Atlantic Loto, of course, is conducted by Atlantic Lottery Corporation, a Crown Corporation of which the four Atlantic Provinces, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island are members, and they have an agreement contract with the outlets, people in private business who sell their product, an agreement that they will not sell a product of a lottery from another organization. There is no evidence that this agreement is in breach of the Combines Investigation Act.

There is another aspect of it as well. The other aspect of it is: It will be recalled that some years ago, during the Conservative Government I believe in Ottawa, there was a federal/provincial agreement made whereby the federal government would not enter into the lottery business, in other words, in competition with the provinces, or would allow

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the provinces to do so, and in consideration of that that an amount was agreed that the federal government would receive back from the Atlantic Lottery Corporation; the federal government receives back \$32 million a year, \$8 million per quarter, that is from the entire corporation. And there would appear to be an attempt now by the federal government to re-enter into that field, in breach of that agreement. Now, there is to be a meeting next week of the ten provinces to discuss that initiative which is viewed at least by this Province and perhaps by others, as a breach of the agreement entered into. So I think probably after next week there would be additional information on it. I would point out I am replying because the hon. gentleman asked me the question. Strictly speaking, this lottery pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement is administered by the Department of Finance. I get my information from officials in Finance. So no doubt the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - I do not mind doing it, - but he would have it firsthand, and I suppose it is always good to get information straight from the horse's mouth, not that the hon. gentleman in anyway resembles a horse.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order 1, Address in Reply. The debate was adjourned the last day by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I only have, I think, about eleven or twelve minutes left, and there are four points that I would wish to make. I am sorry the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is not here because they refer to matters alleged to be by him, but anyway I am sure they will come as no surprise. It will be recalled that the hon.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: gentleman in his letter of resignation to the Premier stated that Dr. Geoffery Marston who had been involved in the preparation of the Province's offshore legal position for ten years, approximately, had been frozen out. And at that time I replied and indeed quoted the exact words of Dr. Marston which were totally inconsistent with the hon. gentleman's allegation that Dr. Marston had been frozen out. And I will just read the most relevant part of it which is certainly totally inconsistent with the allegation of the hon. member from Bell Island (Mr. Neary).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These are the words of Dr. Marston, given on the day that the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) made the allegation, and I am quoting him word for word. "Bearing in mind that the responsibility for the final presentation of written and oral argument to the court rests and has always rested with the Newfoundland Government in collaboration with Newfoundland counsel. 'I was given the fullest opportunity of participating in the preparation of the case as befitted my capacity as a research consultant and in making views known. In particular, Newfoundland counsel came to visit me for several days in Cambridge, in early June 1982. I spent the first two weeks of August 1982 in Newfoundland assisting in Newfoundland's factum in reply, and I was further consulted by Newfoundland counsel when I was in Ottawa in October 1982,' and it goes on and on. And there is no need to read the entirety of it, 'but it is evident and obvious that the allegation that Dr. Marston was frozen out is totally without foundation.

The hon. member for Mount Scio when he spoke in this debate two or three days ago, alleged that Dr. Marston never saw the last presentation that was prepared and by

MR. OTTENHEIMER: that he was referring to the factum filed with the Newfoundland Court of Appeal.

The factum was filed on June 15th and let me show how without foundation that allegation is. And here is Dr. Marston again; "In particular, Newfoundland counsel came to visit me for several days in Cambridge in early June 1982." And that is when Mr. Colin Irving Q.C. associate or counsel went to Cambridge and spent several days conferring with Dr. Marston, and another research consultant, a Dr. Gilmore, came down from Edinburgh and that is what they were meeting on, the final draft of the province's factum. So the allegation that Dr. Marston was not involved in the last presentation that was prepared is also without foundation. The third allegation by the hon. gentleman states that the matter was prematurely referred to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal and there all I can do is quote the hon. gentleman himself. The hon gentleman answered his own allegation in a previous incarnation. On May 19, 1982 in this House of Assembly the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) was arguing against or saying something against reference of the matter to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal and Hansard shows, "Mr. Hodder: Why did it go to court?" And the answer is given by the hon. member himself. It reads, "Mr. Barry: Because, Mr. Speaker, we were put to the situation where we had no choice. The federal government with its arrogance, with its refusal to respond, with the fact that it was pushing another case in the federal court of Canada, the SIU case, put this Province in a situation where it had no choice but to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on appeal." So while a

MR. OTTENHEIMER: few days ago the hon. gentleman alleges that it was prematurely referred to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal, on May 19, 1982 he shows why it had to be done. And he refers to the arrogance of the Liberal government in reply to one of his now colleagues, Mr. Hodder, and it is here in black and white in the Hansard transcript. When Mr. Hodder says, "Why did it go to court?", the answer shows Mr. Barry saying, "Because, Mr. Speaker, we were put to the situation where we had no choice. The federal government with its arrogance, etc. ". So the third allegation which the hon. gentleman made he has answered it himself, and it certainly shows a great lack of any consistency in the hon. gentleman's views. And the fourth matter on which I would like to make a brief comment is, of course, the hon. gentleman's allegation of the omission of a very important case and how this had an adverse affect, etc. on the outcome of the case. Now this allegation can only be related to two things, either Newfoundland counsel did not know about this case, the Trendtex case he is referring to, or they did not understand it. There are only two possibilities. When he says the case was mismanaged because they did not refer that case to the court, it must mean that the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is alleging that either Newfoundland counsel did not know about the case or they did not understand it. Now it is a bit much to believe that Mr. James Green, Colin Irving, with Margaret Cameron, as she was then who were working on the case did not know about the case. Obviously they knew about the case

MR. OTTENHEIMER: and the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) knew that they knew about the case, because the case was referred to in a compilation of legal materials, called a survey of legal materials done up by the government a few years before and added to and altered and it was distributed when the hon. member was in the Cabinet and he has a copy of that compilation of legal materials. So the hon. member knew that Newfoundland counsel knew. So the only other possibility is that Newfoundland counsel did not understand it, that Mr. James Green, or that Mr. Colin Irving, or that Miss Margaret Cameron or other people associated with him did not understand it, did not see the importance, did not see the relevance. And really what can motivate that? It can only be an attitude that there is only one person in Newfoundland to give the political direction for the offshore case, only one person and that was the hon. gentleman himself, or in the alternative, there is only one person who could properly act as lead counsel for Newfoundland and that was the hon. gentleman himself. They are the only two possible interpretations

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

open to it, either the hon. gentleman himself was the only one in Newfoundland who was capable of giving the political direction, or else the hon. gentleman was the only one in Newfoundland and probably the only one in Canada who was capable of acting as lead counsel. So, Mr. Speaker, hon. members can make up their own minds if they are willing to accept that rather preposterous hypothesis but that is what it comes to. So on those four issues: Number one, the allegation that Dr. Marston was frozen out; we have in Dr. Marston's own words evidence to the contrary. Number two, that Dr. Marston never saw the last presentation that was prepared: we have from Dr. Marston's own words confirmation of the fact that Newfoundland counsel were in Cambridge in early June working with him on what in fact was the factum to be filed in the Court of Appeal. The allegation that it was prematurely referred to the Court of Appeal, the hon. member himself has refuted and has shown the inadequacy and emptiness of that allegation when he spoke to this House in replying to Mr. Hodder, the Liberal member for Port au Port, and that can be found in Hansard, May 19, 1982. And the allegation about omission of a very important case, obviously from that allegation either counsel did not know about the case, or if they knew, they did not understand. It is obvious that they knew. The hon. member knows they knew because the case was discussed and referred to in a compilation of legal material made available to the hon. gentleman himself when he was in the Cabinet. So the other part of it, that counsel could not understand what was in the case, then the absurd conclusion you come to there is that only the hon. gentleman was capable of being the lead counsel. Of everybody in Newfoundland and everybody in Canada only the hon. gentleman was capable of doing it, that Mr. James Greene,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Messrs. Collins and Irving, Miss Margaret Cameron and others, none of them individually or in any combination could have had the intelligence and the insight of that one gentleman himself. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is suffering from a delusion of self-inflicted infallibility, the delusion of infallibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And if hon. gentlemen want to subscribe to that that is their own business, but I do not think there are many on this side who suffer from the delusion of the self-conferred infallibility of the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

Before recognizing the member, I would like to welcome to the gallery children from Pleasantville school with their teachers, Mr. Pedderson, Miss Delaney, Mrs. Skinner and Mr. Oldford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, you know, once the Supreme Court has made a decision, and we have lost the case in the Supreme Court on the offshore, then the only thing the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) can do is try to get his Premier to be a reasonable man and the minister responsible to be reasonable and go and sit down with the federal officials, the federal ministers and try to get a deal for Newfoundland before we finally go down the drain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Throne Speech, I can see one only positive comment made there and that was on the first page when the Lieutenant-

March 16, 1984

Tape No. 177

MJ - 3

MR. WARREN:

Governor when reading the Throne

Speech said that the Pope was coming to Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is

MR. WARREN:

positive, it is positive for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and will be a very historical day for the Province. Otherwise, the Throne Speech is just a waste of the Lieutenant-Governor's time to come in and read twelve or fifteen pages of pure nonsense!

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, on the C.B.C. national news, there was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Gilchrist, who announced his resignation from the House of Commons. He announced his resignation because he was convicted under the Income Tax Act and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that hon. gentleman, as should any politician in that position, made the proper move.

MR. DOYLE: Do you think that any politician convicted of tax evasion should resign?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, anybody who is convicted should do the same thing.

I would also like to say in response to what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has just said in response to questions I asked earlier, if there is any hon. member in this House on either side who owes taxes to the provincial government, he should also resign. Can every member in this House honestly get up and say that they do not owe any taxes to the provincial government? Can anybody say it? No, Mr. Speaker. There are members, most likely, Mr. Speaker, who have businesses outside of this House and they owe taxes to this government, and why do they not pay them? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has tax officials in the Department of Finance going throughout the Province to the small retailers and saying, 'If you do not pay your taxes, we will take your licence from you.'

MR. WARREN: This has happened in the last month and a half. They are going throughout the Province to the small retailers and saying, 'We are giving you ten, fifteen, twenty or twenty-five days to pay the taxes you owe or we are going to take your licence from you.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, have they gone to members of the House of Assembly or special assistants to the ministers who have gone bankrupt four or five times and have left this government as much as \$47,000 in the red? Have they gone to those people? No, Mr. Speaker. What they are doing is they are picking on the individual, small businessmen in this Province.

MR. CARTER: What about John Doyle?

MR. WARREN: I am not talking about John Doyle. You go after John Doyle. You may own a savoury farm on Mount Scio but I am not talking about your savoury farm either.

MR. DOYLE: What about those two MPs?

MR. WARREN: That is up to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Why does he not go after them? I am saying those who owe provincial sales tax. The Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle) should know, too. And he should know that there are people in public life in this Province who do owe sales tax to this government. Why do they not pay? And if they do not pay, why do they not resign?

MR. DOYLE: Those MPs should resign.

MR. WARREN: I am talking about members in this House of Assembly, fifty-two of us.

MR. TULK: Are you saying that there is somebody here who owes S.S.A. to the Province?

MR. WARREN: I am saying, if they do they should resign.

MR. NEARY: Somebody in this House.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, another very important matter: Last week the Premier, in responding to the Throne Speech - I will read from Hansard on Monday. He said, 'The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: The hon. gentleman is about to read something from Hansard. Now, that again, will become part of Hansard, so we have a Hansard of a Hansard of a Hansard. This is absurd! It should not be allowed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is just the hon. gentleman being his usual ridiculous and silly, childish self.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it may have hurt the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). However, the Premier mentioned about the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). He said: 'The Minister of Social Services comes under attack from time to time'. He said: 'I am going to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, if you looked at the Social Services budget of Newfoundland and Labrador, there is no Minister of Social Services in Canada who has done a better job.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what a downright contradiction. He is the worst Minister of Social Services in all of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Not only that, Mr. Speaker, remember about a week and a half ago, four social workers in Labrador were fired by his department, four social workers were dismissed. Why? Because they were trying to do a job that was proper. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Social Services, who just came and sat in his seat, is so concerned about his social workers throughout this Province having to follow the manual that he has set out for them, every one of the social workers in this Province should resign today because not one of them follows the manual. It is impossible to follow the manual.

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

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

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about again. It was not the manual that was violated, it was the law. Does the hon. gentleman want to tell us in this House now, and through this House, the people of the Province, that people anywhere in the Province can choose the law they wish to obey and to disobey the laws they do not like?

MR. NEARY: You are incompetent.

MR. HICKEY: Let him answer that.

MR. WARREN: There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member is not out of order. It is a matter of a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

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

It is too bad the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is so upset. I suggested to the Minister of Social Services two and a half years ago to go down to Davis Inlet and see first-hand the kind of conditions they are living in. And he said: 'I would not go on a joyride'. The minister has been on a joyride for the last twenty years in this House.

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

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

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry to interrupt again, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to sit here in the House and let him spew out words which are untrue. I never made any such statement, Mr. Speaker. I am not infallible but I have a very good memory about what I say. I have never referred to going down to Davis Inlet as a joyride.

MR. WARREN: You did so. Read Hansard.

MR. HICKEY: As a matter of fact, I can tell the hon. gentleman the last time I was there it was no joyride when we landed in a seaplane. Has the hon. gentleman

MR. HICKEY:

been up there lately?

MR. WARREN:

No point of order, Mr. Speaker,
a waste of time.

MR. HICKEY:

I have no magic answers for Davis
Inlet and my going there will not solve the problem.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I must
rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon.
members.

The hon. member for Torngat

Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to
advise the hon. minister. if he does not know, I lived there
for two years and I know what the conditions are like. I
did not have the plush living conditions that the minister
has been used to either, by the way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those four
social workers have been dismissed by the minister's department
because they are not following what the minister wanted them
to do. Mr. Speaker, the people there who are living with
individuals are not paying rent, they are not paying

MR. WARREN: board and lodging, it is just a traditional way of life. It was only about two months ago, when the last session of the House of Assembly was meeting, that the Premier brought a resolution into this House asking for support for the aboriginal people. And what did the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) do? Go and take the rug out from under their feet. That is what you would call support for the aboriginal people, Mr. Speaker. And this why four social workers were fired, were dismissed because the minister did not like what they were doing because they were doing justice to the people.

MR. HICKEY: Rave on.

MR. WARREN: You should be ashamed of yourself, Sir, and resign.

MR. TOBIN: You do not know what you are talking about, Garf.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) just referred to me by my first name, I would suggest that he would withdraw it. You call a member by his district and not by his name.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, all along the Premier was hoping for the offshore to be settled by a change of government in Ottawa. A newspaper clipping, yesterday's paper, The Toronto Globe and Mail I believe it is, 'Division in the Ranks.' There is no division in the Liberal ranks.

MR. DOYLE: That is Michael Harris, is it?

MR. WARREN: No, it is not Michael Harris either, it is Geoffrey Simpson, whoever Geoffrey Simpson is. It is not Michael Harris. 'Division in the Ranks,' division in the Conservative ranks, Mr. Speaker, and what

MR. WARREN: does it say about Newfoundland? What does it say about Newfoundland? "Another crack threatens to separate Mr. Mulrooney from the Newfoundland Conservatives. The issue is the control of the offshore resources which the Supreme Court recently and unanimously ruled belonged to Ottawa.

"Now the Newfoundland trouble is complicated by Mr. Mulrooney's frosty, personal relation with Premier Brian Peckford. It is compounded by Tory Finance Minister John Crosbie."

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Is the hon. gentleman going to table what he is reading from?

MR. WARREN: Definitely.

MR. HICKEY: Well, then he should say so when he starts.

MR. STAGG: It is against standing orders anyway.

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

MR. WARREN: No problem, Mr. Speaker. I will table it. Sure. In fact, Mr. Speaker, for the minister's eyes I have it underlined for him. I will table it and plus I have it underlined so he can read it more clearly.

And says, "It is compounded by Tory Finance critic John Crosbie's passionate support for provincial control. Unless Mr. Mulrooney embraces provincial control"-

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: It has just come to my attention that what the hon. gentleman is reading from is a newspaper article. Your Honour, some point last session I attempted to read from a newspaper article, I was ruled out of order, I was abruptly stopped by the Speaker, and rightly so under the rules, I had forgotten it, and I could not continue and I would refer the matter to the House Leader, whom I am sure can enlighten all of us on the matter.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is quite correct. I quote to the House page 117 of Beauchesne which reads and I quote -

MR. BAIRD: What page?

MR. MARSHALL: Page 117, paragraph 332, "On March 17, 1933, a Member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: 'The rule is quote clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because Members are here to give their own opinions, " Mr. Speaker, " and not to quote the opinions of others[Members] may quote an article or a book stating facts, but a commentary on any proceeding or any discussion in the House, with the object of swinging an opinion to one side or the other, is out of order."

MR. MARSHALL: Now what the hon. gentleman is doing, he is reading from an opinion from the Mainland press, reading, Mr. Speaker. We are not interested in the opinion of the Mainland press in this House of Assembly. What we are interested in primarily, Mr. Speaker, is the opinion of the hon. member there opposite and his caucus and the other people who purport to represent Newfoundland in this very serious matter.

So the fact of the thing is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is out of order. He cannot quote a newspaper article for the purpose of proffering his opinion. I would suggest he give his opinion if he has one or, if indeed, Mr. Speaker, he is capable of formulating one.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just spoke can get up on his high horse, he can be as indignant as he wants and he can wave his finger all he wants at the speaker and at this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but the fact of the matter is that my hon. colleague is in order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the arrogance of this administration and about how they are rapidly turning themselves into a full-fledged dictatorship. They would like to muzzle the Opposition, they would like to stop us from hard debate. Mr. Speaker, section 332, on page 117 goes on to say, "Members may quote an article or a book stating facts." Stating facts, Mr. Speaker. What my hon. colleague is doing is quoting from an article stating facts. Mr. Speaker, since when in this House did it become improper and against the rules to quote from a newspaper? Since when? Since when did it become improper or against the rules in any House in the free world? It is silly. The point of order is silly and it just goes to prove my hon. colleague is getting to members there opposite. My hon. colleague, can, if he wants to, quote from the bible, Mr. Speaker. He is in the Throne Speech, wide-ranging debate, and he is quite in order, Mr. Speaker, and all they are trying to do is use up his time.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I rose to assist the point of order taken by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). You can object sometimes or you may not object. If the hon. Minister of Social Services wishes to maintain the objection he certainly can, but as far as I am concerned, the way the article is written it redounds to the benefit of one Newfoundlander anyway, because it shows one Newfoundlander up in the

MR. MARSHALL: House of Commons in Ottawa who is standing up for his Province and supporting his Province in those very critical hours. I am quite delighted because it puts the hon. gentleman and his party to shame, and the five quizlings who are up on the government side of the House. So, I mean, it does not really matter, but I just got up to reinforce what the hon. gentleman says. The government really does not care all that much if the hon. gentleman has not got any opinions of his own and wants to read opinions from newspapers, particularly one like this which shows how strongly one of the members from Newfoundland is supporting Newfoundland's position.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order. It is clear to me from reading page 117 of Beauchesne, reference 332, that quoting a newspaper article is out of order, so I must rule the hon. member out of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: When the hon. Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, was summing up the last time he got on his feet there, in a very sarcastic way, his typical nasty way, he referred to the Opposition as quizlings and I believe if Your Honour will check the list of unparliamentary remarks Your Honour will discover that that is completely out of order and if allowed to stay on the record will only lower the decorum of this House. Mr. Speaker, we have seen all week how the government members have been taking the House on their backs. That must not be allowed to stand

MR. NEARY: on the record , Mr. Speaker, it is out of order, and the hon. gentleman should be directed to retract and apologize to the House for such unparliamentary remarks.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I did not call the hon. gentlemen there opposite quizlings I was referring to the five representatives in the House of Commons in Ottawa who sit on the government side of the House.

MR. NEARY: It is unparliamentary. You cannot use it.

MR. MARSHALL: No relationship, Mr. Speaker, at all to members of this House. I said it before and I will say it over and over again, that people who represent a political party rather than the interests of their own Province deserve a discription such as it. I did not refer to the hon. gentleman as such , what I may think of the hon. gentleman is something else though.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I will check Hansard and rule at a later date.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) has done a relatively good job of trying to cut my time. However, I am sorry that I am cutting to the quick, but I believe this is where

March 16, 1984

Tape No. 181

ah-4

MR. WARREN: we were supposed to show this government that they are going in the wrong direction. The Premier did mention one thing in the Throne Speech that is

MR. WARREN: worth noting and that is the
bravery award. I would strongly suggest, by the way the minister
spoke in the last five or six minutes on a point of order,
that he be the first recipient of the bravery award.

MR. TOBIN: What, gravy award?

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, recently
there were three houses in Nain that were repossessed by this
government, and instead of being turned over to other social
assistance recipients in the community to rent, or to the Social
Services Department to rent for social assistance recipients,
Newfoundland and Labrador Housing chartered an
aircraft which cost them \$1,500, and went in with
a hammer and a bag of nails and nailed up the doors on the
three houses. Instead of contacting the Department of Social
Services and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and
saying, Look, we have three houses vacant in here, why can you
not use them, instead of that they spent between \$1,500
and \$2,000 and went to Nain and barred up the three houses, and
as of last week they still were not in use.

MR. HICKEY: On a point of order.

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

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. You
know if the hon. gentleman is going to continue to deceive the
House I have no choice but to rise to correct him.
He is talking again and blaming everything on the Newfoundland and
Labrador Housing and the provincial government when in fact he
knows, so he is deliberately misleading this House, Mr. Speaker,
he knows, he is well aware -

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

MR. NEARY: Take it back and apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the hon.
minister that it is not permissible for the hon. minister to

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): say that an hon. member is deliberately misleading the House, and I would ask him to withdraw that.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize and I withdraw that remark. I will say that the hon. gentleman must have had a lapse of memory. In other words, he must have forgotten what he knew last month when he was informed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, when he was informed by my department people that the three houses in question were barred up because they needed repairs.

MR. WARREN: Not true! Not true!

MR. HICKEY: They were foreclosed upon by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. Mr. Speaker, those houses are controlled by a federal/provincial committee made up of people from Canada Mortgage and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. This Province has a 25 per cent stake in that operation, the federal government has 75. So it is the federal people who are at fault more so than we.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe Your Honour is aware that that is not a point of order, it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen. As a matter of fact, the houses that were referred to were idle for three months, they were ready to be occupied the next day.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The taxpayers were paying for heat and lights and fuel for these houses, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is negligent in his responsibility. And by the way, Mr. Speaker, after the hon. gentleman apologized to my

MR. NEARY: colleague for making unparliamentary remarks he went on to do through the back door what he could not do through the front door.

MR. TULK: He should apologize again.

MR. NEARY: He should apologize again. If the Chair will just check Hansard he will discover that the hon. gentleman had to get his licks in, his little darts in after being forced by the Chair to withdraw unparliamentary remarks. So there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is just merely an attempt on the part of the hon. gentleman to use up the time of my colleague who is making an excellent speech.

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

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to willingly apologize for the hon. gentleman losing his memory. The only conclusion I can draw is that he does not understand when he is told things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order I rule that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I know, Mr. Speaker, my time is getting short, however, I wish to refer again to those three houses in Nain. I only wish that Mrs. Rowe and her concerned group who have taken the minister to task in St. John's for the conditions of the St. John's housing, I only wish that Mrs. Rowe and her group would go to Nain and see the conditions that people have to live in, then the minister would realize

MR. WARREN: the minister would realize that there cannot be any discrimination. The minister is doing everything he can for social assistance recipients in St. John's, why can he not do the same for people in Labrador?

MR. NEARY: That is why he fired four social workers?

MR. WARREN: Why does he fire four social workers? Why are three houses left unoccupied? They are just not doing anything. Mr. Speaker, he fired four workers and left three modern houses unoccupied for over three months. This is the concern that the minister has for Labrador. Some social workers stand up for justice and the minister says, 'It is not justice. I am going to fire you, get rid of you.' Mr. Speaker, this minister should have more respect for human beings, especially for human beings North of St. Anthony, which the minister rarely ever sees.

MR. HICKEY: Special treatment for your district

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Native people in this Province under the Terms of Union deserve special treatment. If the minister does not know that he should look at the Terms of Union of this Province when it joined Canada. If he will read the Terms of Union he will find out that the Native people came under the Terms of Union and they needed special attention.

MR. HICKEY: What kind?

MR. WARREN: Go and do your own work, which you cannot do. You have not done it in the past.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: The minister is incompetent.

MR. WARREN: The minister is very incompetent.

MR. WARREN: I have so much to talk about, Mr. Speaker, and I know I only have three or four minutes left; however, if hon. members will grant leave, I will carry on.

In this entire Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, some nineteen pages, there is one sentence about Labrador, the vast territory of Labrador! And what is that one sentence? That one sentence concerns what the government will get out of Labrador. What will the government get out of Labrador?

MR. NEARY: The only reference.

MR. WARREN: The only reference in the Throne Speech is what they will get out, not one reference to what they will put in. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what you call a government that is concerned.

MR. NEARY: Concerned, alright! Concerned about their 'planes they fly around in.

MR. WINDSOR: What 'planes?

MR. NEARY: The LFY.

MR. WARREN: The picture is in the paper this morning.

MR. WINDSOR: How many times have I been in it?

MR. NEARY: I do not think the hon. gentleman has been in it at all -

Thank you.

MR. NEARY: - but ask his colleague, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) how often she has been in it, Or the members for Humber East (Mr. House) and Humber West (Mr. Baird) and Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), ask them how often they have been in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I wish to remind all hon. members of the House that the hon. the member for

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), while speaking, has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for
Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest concerns that I have - and I only have a couple of minutes to clue up - is our local preference policy. I agree that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians should be given the first opportunity for jobs if they are qualified but I beg this government not to continue doing what they have been doing for the last four or five years, giving jobs to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that they are not qualified to do, Mr. Speaker. That is happening, it is causing static in the communities and it is resulting in accidents. Because through the local preference policy that companies have to follow, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are being given jobs that they are not qualified to do. If we cannot give them the proper training, for God's sake, do not put them in positions where they will cause injury and damage to other people!

MR. WARREN: And hon. members know what I am talking about. In due course, when the commission is finished, it will show that because of this government's policy we have accidents. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the one thing government will listen to is 'Do not put boys in men's places'.

MR. HICKEY: You are not in favour of it?

MR. WARREN: I am not in favour of anybody trying to do a job he is not capable of.

MR. NEARY: Who is going to be in charge of the new super company, a Newfoundlander? Where is your local preference there?

MR. TOBIN: Do not talk about that.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, the Government of Canada is going to have the say about it. Did they have something to say about the provincial appointees?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Another concern, Mr. Speaker, that I have is the future of the International Grenfell Association in Labrador. The future of the International Grenfell Association in Labrador or in Northern Newfoundland I am very much concerned about it. In fact, Dr. Taite a famous doctor, a well-known doctor, who has been in Labrador for quite a while, has decided to resign and go back to Australia. He has been practically forced out, Mr. Speaker, he has been practically forced out. And I have to say one thing in defense of the people in Port Saunders and that is they are objecting to the idea of the IGA taking over the clinic in Port Saunders. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is time that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) - I am glad

MR. WARREN: that he came around the corner and is going to listen to my last remarks, - the Minister of Health (Mr. House) looked very seriously at having one Department of Health, right from Nain to St. John's. I do not think we need the International Grenfell Association any longer. Let us put it all under one umbrella and have one Department of Health, and with that I believe that we may see improvements in the health care in Labrador.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I suppose the only occupation for which no ability whatsoever is necessary is that of being an elected member in the House of Assembly. I do not suppose you have to be able to read or write, you do not have to be literate.

MR. NEARY: You must have looked in the mirror this morning.

MR. CARTER: You do not even have to be sane, thinking of the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: And yet nothing can disqualify one from membership in this House and certainly even less can disqualify one from being a member of the House of Commons. You can be convicted of assault, you can diddle your income tax, there is almost nothing you cannot do.

Now to get serious, Mr. Speaker, the biggest non-event of the month, I think it was this month, was the defection of the hon. Leo Barry, the member for Mount Scio, from this side of the House. And it is a pity it went by unnoticed and no one paid much attention to it and there was nothing formally done about it. So a number of the

MR. CARTER: members here have taken up a small collection to make a presentation to Mr. Barry, if the Page would leave this on his desk. Unfortunately he is not here. I believe he is in Labrador where he intends to run next time. I do not know which of the members he intends to supplant - probably Torngat Mountains, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CARTER: Obviously members are not aware of the law.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just sent an envelope to my colleague's desk who does not happen to be in the House today. He is travelling to Labrador where he has been invited to speak to a great joint meeting in Labrador West. But, Mr. Speaker, that envelope is laying there, we are all going to be looking at it with suspicion for the next little while, until the House rises at 1:00 p.m. Can the hon. gentleman assure the House that there is nothing in that envelope that could do any damage to the furniture in this House?

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

MR. NEARY: Is it savoury that is in the envelope, Mr. Speaker, or is it something that can detonate down there, explode and do damage to the House and to hon. gentlemen who may be sitting nearby? Can we have some assurance from the hon. gentleman that there is nothing,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, of an inflammable nature in that envelope? I believe it is incumbent upon Your Honour to adjourn the House, and have security come into the House. With the way they feel about my colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), have security come into the House, take the envelope out, call in the RCMP security, open it up, Mr. Speaker, and make sure that there is nothing in it that is of a harmful nature, that will do either damage to the furniture or the House itself or to the people who sit nearby. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that for our own safety we should have that done because, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not indicate what is in the envelope. Knowing how devious the hon. gentleman is, Mr. Speaker, I believe Your Honour should send immediately for the security, take the envelope out of the House, have it opened and have the security people tell us what is in that envelope in the event, Mr. Speaker, that they may be out to do some harm to my new-born colleague.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: There are two points to that point of order. One is that the hon. gentleman is obviously ignorant of the law. A letter or a communication, properly addressed, legally becomes the property of the person to whom that is addressed once it leaves the hands of the person who surrendered it. The other thing is, it is not the thirty pieces of silver which I have in my desk which I have attempted on numerous occasions to give to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I had relabeled it; instead of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Mount Scio, but I was and still am holding this for the Leader of the Opposition. By the way, this thirty

MR. CARTER: pieces of silver is taken up from all of us. Now there are more than thirty of us here so some had to forego the pleasure of donating. This is not the thirty pieces of silver, it is in fact a very serious gift, a very useful gift that I hope, which I know the hon. gentleman will have many occasions to use it. I hope he takes it in the spirit in which it was sent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, further to that point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking Your Honour to have that envelope removed from the desk of my colleague, who is not in his seat, who cannot acknowledge receipt of it. Mr. Speaker, we were not given any assurance by the hon. gentleman that the envelope when it is opened may not explode, may not blow up. Mr. Speaker, they did say they took up a collection and they were sending something over to put on the desk. I believe it is improper, Mr. Speaker, to have things put on the desk of hon. members, especially of that nature, can put down, I suppose, legislation and that sort of thing. But, Mr. Speaker, we are all very conscious of what is happening in the world today and, as I say, the hon. gentleman is capable of doing anything. Sometimes he does it for a lark, but the hon. gentleman really does not have a sense of humour, I believe that that envelope should be removed from the desk, Mr. Speaker. And if the hon. gentleman wants to send it to my colleague when he is in his seat, and my colleague acknowledges and accepts it, that is a different matter, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it can be done under the rules well, I do not know if it is against the rules or not - but certainly I do not think it should be done in the absence of my

MR. NEARY: colleague.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I could just quickly respond.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is obviously on his feet on a point of order to try to consume the time of the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who is going to speak to us in his usual colourful fashion, whatever vein he wishes to speak. It is not of a point of order, but with all due respect I think the hon. gentleman is wasting over time. When a member gets up and wastes time on a point of order, I think it is fitting that he should be interrupted and told to sit down, let the gentleman get on with his speech and not be wasting his time. The fact of the matter is all disposed of anyway, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is obviously licking his wounds after the keelhauling he got in this House in the past couple of days and that is why he is not here. But if he has got the courage to come back in the House again in a month's time then there is something over there. I am sure the hon. member for St. John's North will tell us what is in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, as all members realize in this House of Assembly there are items placed on people's desks while they are absent, there is no rule that says messages or mail cannot be placed on a person's desk in their absense, so I rule that there is not a point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a very wise decision.

MR. CARTER: I was trying to make the point that the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) did, I think, notify the Chairman of our caucus that he wanted his desk moved. But, you know, I doubt still if he is officially a Liberal because there has been no formalities, I think the way is still open for him to return to our caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. MCLENNON: No way! The door is closed.

MR. CARTER: Well, I do not like to disagree with my colleagues but I would like to point out that no official oath has been taken by the hon. gentleman, and that if one becomes a Liberal one surely goes through some formality, one has to kiss the boots of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or somehow abase oneself. So in the absence of any oath that the hon. gentleman may have sworn, or may not have sworn, I have taken the liberty to write one out which I am going to have to table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read it.

MR. CARTER: Well, I will have to table it if I read it because it is a written communication.

"I," and it is blank, I suppose you would have to put in -

MR. STAGG: I, Leo Barry.

MR. CARTER: "I, Leo Barry, being of unsound mind do hereby make oath and say: that I will henceforth strive to stifle my conscience forever and absolutely and to forget the difference between right and wrong; and that I will stand for no principles whatsoever and will undertake to blackmail and slander whenever necessary or desirable.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Is this Sesame Street
we are watching, Mr. Speaker?

MR. STAGG: There is Big Bird.

MR. NEARY: If he put the feathers on
he might look like Big Bird.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the
hon. gentleman's trying to be witty and humourous, he
is using the worst, the lowest kind of unparliamentary
language. Does Your Honour realize that? And the
Chair is sitting there letting him get away with it.

Mr. Speaker, he is questioning
the mental health of my hon. colleague. He is using such
terms as "slanderous" and "libel", Mr. Speaker, all
unparliamentary, and Your Honour is sitting there watching
the Big Bird made these statements, Mr. Speaker, instead
of trying to maintain decorum in the House. I believe
it is Your Honour's duty to -

MR. SIMMS: Do not be such a spoil -
sport.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not a spoil -
sport. I think we have too many serious problems in
this Province, unemployment and high taxes, and high
gasoline rates and high -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Speech, speech!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the
hon. gentleman being witty, I do not mind banter back and
forth, I do not mind humourous interruptions, I do not mind
all of that, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid that the hon.
member is making unparliamentary remarks.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman be directed, if he is going to speak, if he has any contribution to make to this debate, that he be ordered to carry on with the debate and not turn the House into a shambles.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it arises out of some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman in making his point of order. He can make whatever point of order he wishes to if he does not want to take it in the vein that the hon. gentleman is giving it, but in his point of order he brought up something that I have to take exception to and draw to the attention of the House that he says Your Honour sits there and allows this to go on, as if it has been an imputation on Your Honour and on the Chair. Now the fact of the matter is, the rules of this House are such, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly proper for any person to rise on a point of order and raise that point of order,

MR. MARSHALL: but it is not proper in raising that point of order for the hon. gentleman to cast aspersions of that nature on the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And the Chair uses its discretion, if it wishes to, at certain times to interrupt, but if it does not choose to use its discretion it is perfectly competent for any member of the House to get up on a point of order and it is not right for anybody to get up and cast aspersions of that nature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! To that point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody casting aspersions. The hon. gentleman is waving his little index finger over there again and trying to dictate to the Chair, trying to bully the Chair, and trying to take the House on his back, as he has been doing all week. Mr. Speaker, I just merely ask for the protection of the Chair, that the members of this House be protected from the low, rotten remarks being made. It is not witty. If it were humorous, Mr. Speaker, we would appreciate it. But I believe it is the duty of the Chair, and if that is casting aspersions on the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. But I believe it is the duty of the Chair to protect members of this House whether they are in their seats or not. And I am asking Your Honour to direct the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) to carry on in the debate if he intends to debate the issues in this House, and not just make a holy show of himself and try to take the House on his back with the encouragement of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

There is no intention on my part, Mr. Speaker, to cast any aspersions on the Chair. But I

MR. NEARY: believe that the Chair has the duty and responsibility to protect members of this House, whether they are in their seats or not, from that kind of abuse.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair is well aware of its responsibilities in this matter. I have been listening very closely to the remarks that are being made by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), There was one word used, 'blackmail,' which the Chair does not consider a lot to the debate in this House or to the decorum, but Beauchesne, pages 110 and 111 "Since 1958 it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions" and 'blackmail' happened to be one of those expressions. So I cannot find that the hon. member used an unparliamentary expression but the Chair is listening very carefully to his remarks.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: This is only a suggested oath, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will not want to administer it, I do not know, but I will just finish it very quickly. Number three, "That I will genuflect at the mere mention of the name Smallwood and will regularly prostrate myself before the temporary, makeshift, interim leader of the opposition soon to be appointed to the Senate, and THAT I will entertain the Liberal habits of indolence, uselessness, sloth and ignorance except when it comes to undermining my colleagues, and THAT I understand this oath to be but a first step on the road to total degradation and Liberalism and that it shall have all the force of the Canada Evidence Act as amended."

I have to table it, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

On a point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon.

member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware

that the Throne Speech is wide ranging, but-

MR. TULK:

That is what they elect in St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

- I would suggest to Your Honour

that what I just saw happen in this House is not relevant in any way, shape or form to government policy, to the plans that the government has for the running of the economy of this Province, or anything else. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why it is that members on the other side, since this session has started, have continued over and over again to come forward with such tactics. It is demeaning of a government with forty-four members that in the debate on the Throne Speech we have to listen to this kind of stupidity in the House of Assembly. Although the Throne Speech may be wide ranging

MR. HODDER: and the members can speak on a wide variety of subjects, Mr. Speaker, I think that many members who are speaking, and particularly the last member who spoke, in no way can be considered relevant.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. member did point out that the debate in the Throne Speech is wide-ranging; therefore, the Chair finds it extremely difficult to judge on a rule of relevancy in such a case. I would have to rule that there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

All of the members on this side have agreed in discussing the Speech from the Throne that we would concentrate on the offshore situation, and although we may have other remarks around that, still the main thrust of our debate, if given the time to make the points, would center around the offshore. So let me quickly get into the meat of the debate. We heard the Premier say that the administration have moved from the very reasonable stance of outright ownership to the stance of not even bothering to discuss ownership, that they have moved from total administration of the offshore to a shared administration, and from a shared administration to an administration whereby the federal government would be the major decision-makers in such an administration until such time as Canada becomes self-sufficient in oil and gas and hydrocarbons. And then we have heard that on the revenue sharing, the administration has been prepared to move, not only from - well, it is a very

MR. CARTER: reasonable stance that we should get the lion's share, but they have been prepared to move to a low of 25 per cent once Newfoundland reaches an average level of prosperity with the rest of Canada.

Now, my question to the Opposition, and it is a very serious question, is this: How much further would you suggest we move? How much worse of a deal would you want us to accept? In fact, I would suggest that if the Premier tried to move any further along these lines, he would be in trouble with his caucus, he would be in trouble on this side of the House. And if the members on the other side think that there is a deal that should be accepted, I would like them to let us know what kind of a deal it should be. Presumably, it is something worse, a little further along the road than we have moved, and I cannot imagine us moving any further along the road and not being howled out of office. Because let us face facts, Mr. Speaker, this heaven and this earth must pass away before another opportunity presents itself for us to get control of a major resource. Once this is gone, there will be no other resource left. The hydro reserves of Labrador have largely been thrown away, and if we throw away our rights to this offshore, then heaven help us, and our descendants will never forgive us!

Those are the main points. Now, I do have to take issue with the Deputy Premier, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who suggests that the Opposition is not doing its job. I do agree that the Opposition are not being very effective but I still believe that strong Opposition is important. Because a strong Opposition, a well-constituted and informed Opposition, are the protectors

MR. CARTER: of the institution of government, or to abbreviate, p.i.g.s, P-I-G. So, the hon. PIGS and I mean this quite seriously, are a necessary part and parcel of the institute of the running of this House. Now, again I would like to point out that I realize that some of the members are not going to be here too long. We do have it on reliable authority,

MR. CARTER:

through the grapevine, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is soon going to become a senator.

MR. NEARY: That is just Tory propoganda. That is just wishful thinking.

MR. CARTER: I guess he is what we would call a legislator in a rush, or to abbreviate, an L-I-A-R, a LIAR. So I guess the hon. LIAR will soon be a senator.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is twice now that Your Honour has allowed the member to use two unparliamentary words. Your Honour just merely has to refer to page 112 and 113 of Beauchesne and I believe, Mr. Speaker, if we allow this sort of behavior to continue in this House there is going to be ructions. The hon. gentlemen are treating the House as if it was a beer garden. They are taking the House on their back. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) sits there with a silly grin on his face, Mr. Speaker, enjoying it, but I believe it is incumbent upon the Chair when these kind of remarks are made to protect members of the House from these kind of remarks. I can only again appeal to the Chair to protect us from these rude, unparliamentary, low, rotten, unparliamentary remarks that are being made by the hon. gentleman who thinks he is funny, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman thinks he is funny. In his ignorance and in his simplicity, he thinks he is being funny and smart when in actual fact he is showing how ignorant he is of the rules of this House. So, Mr. Speaker, I can only raise a point of order again, Your Honour heard the remarks the same as I did and I ask for the protection of the Chair again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I very carefully defined my remarks, it was meant as a compliment, a protector of the institution of government, what could be more complimentary? And it is perfectly acceptable to use abbreviations, what about NORAD - I forget what it stands for exactly - North Atlantic Treaty Organization or North Atlantic Defense. It is perfectly acceptable. It is part of our linguistic tradition, especially if there is a long-winded description of something, rather than repeat the long-winded description every time, we abbreviate and this is part of the language. I cannot help what it sounds like. I was very careful to define it before I used it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Name him, Mr. Speaker. Name him.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order. The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) had qualified his remarks that he was using abbreviations for other words which he had already used and I will check to see if this could be considered ~~to~~ unparliamentary, but at present I do not consider the remarks to be unparliamentary because they were being used as abbreviations.

MR. NEARY: You cannot say through the back-door what you are not allowed to say through the front door.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

But I will go over these remarks and have it researched and if the ruling is not correct I will correct it as soon as possible.

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: To end off my remarks on a really serious note, I will say, for instance, that the Opposition are suggesting that we should accept anything that the federal

MR. CARTER: government offers us and if the offer is too low we should negotiate. Well, I will make a serious offer of \$1,000 for the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) house. Now that is a serious offer. I will give him \$1,000 for clear title to his house and if he will not agree to that I say he is being hard-nosed and unwilling to negotiate. Now will the hon. member negotiate or will he be like the federal government?

MR. NEARY: I will give you a dollar for your savory patch.

MR. CARTER: Well, see, the same idea. I do not intend to listen to frivolous stuff. But this was a serious offer for his house once it has been repainted and cleaned up and made fit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So there it is, Mr. Speaker, I think that puts the whole thing in context.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR.CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have a few words but I do not have anything prepared at all but I think I can go on memory of what has transpired. And I want to be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker, so I will not accept any interruptions from the member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) or anybody else who wants to throw them across. So anyway, Mr. Speaker I want to say a few words about the happenings in this legislature during this week which is now ending. I have been here, Mr. Speaker, for most of the years from 1975 until now, and when I have not been here physically I have kept in touch with what has been happening either as an employee in the Liberal Opposition offices downstairs or whatever. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this week now ending is a week which should be noted, which will be marked, I think, as probably one of the worst weeks of this legislature's existence, the sort of things that have happened. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been exactly pleased with the impartiality of some of the media. There are members of the media in the press gallery daily who have been here for a long time and some of them, their colours, I think, are showing through. Whether they are doing what they are doing because they are always threatened by the Premier and other members opposite who accuse the CBC, for example, all the time of being unfair and unjust to the administration, just why they are doing it I do not know. But let us take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what happened. On Tuesday it started. And I want to draw an analogy, Mr. Speaker, of what happened on a previous occasion and, of course, the conclusion that we will come to is

MR. CALLAN:

obvious.

On Tuesday, a man spoke who should have been asked to resign on three separate occasions, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who was asked by the then Public Accounts Committee Chairman, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), who was a member on this side of the House when he was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and not only the Chairman, but the Public Accounts Committee, Mr. Speaker, made up of a majority of members on the government side, unanimously agreed that the Minister of Fisheries should resign. Was he asked to resign by the Premier? No. On three separate occasions. Now here is a man who was put up front to belittle and tear down the character of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who had crossed the House. Now let me then, just by going on memory, let me relay some of the things that he said in his foolish hour-long speech. He made reference to the member for Mount Scio as representing the Bank of Nova Scotia, and he suggested in the superb way that he can spread innuendo - and he has had lots of experience at it and I have seen it, - he suggested that the member for Mount Scio was in a conflict of interest, was wrong because he was representing the Bank of Nova Scotia. And then, of course, the Minister of Fisheries realized, as he looked up the front benches, and as I sat here and looked across, the first person I was was the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and he was half blushing. And when the Minister of Fisheries looked up and realized what he had said, 'Oh, he said, 'now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that,' because he then realized that he should not have mentioned that at all because he

March 16, 1984

Tape No. 190

ah-3

MR. CALLAN: the Government House
Leader (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. John's East,
also represents a bank, the Bank of Montreal, so
therefore he

MR. CALLAN: knew then he had made a mistake. What other statements did the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) make where he realized as soon as he said it, almost, that, you know, "I should not have said that either because it applies to someone on my side of the House." He spoke to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and he asked him, "Why do you not go and get your hair curled?" - referring to the Afro that the member for Mount Scio had a few years ago. And then the Minister of Fisheries looked up in the benches and then he realized that the former Speaker, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) was also a man who enjoyed getting his hair curled from time to time so he dropped that argument.

MR. SIMMS: I told him to drop it.

MR. CALLAN: But here was the man, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who appeared on CBC television and in the other media talking about the insincerity of the member for Mount Scio. I mean, what worse man could have been chosen to talk about insincerity? Here is a man, the Minister of Fisheries, who does not even know the meaning of the word "sincerity". He does not even know the meaning of the word. And he talked about the personal attack that was made on him. All the member for Mount Scio accused the Minister of Fisheries of being was an incompetent, an incompetent. And is that a personal attack? Was he talking about the man's wife or children or his actions outside the Legislature? He was talking about his abilities

MR. CALLAN: as a minister of fisheries.
And he got away with it in the media. He got away with it. This man who should have resigned on several occasions -

MR. NEARY: Five times.

MR. CALLAN: - several occasions, this man who took a government helicopter in Labrador, and these are facts, and with other officials from his department went shooting wild game from a helicopter in the air, shooting rabbits - these are facts, this is not fiction - this man who seven or eight years ago challenged me to a fight because I referred to a newspaper article where the Minister of Transportation, as he was then, took a government helicopter, went out with his good friend and Tory partner, Bren Howard, whom he was trying to get re-elected in Trinity-Bay de Verde, and went out to Brownsdale, nobody knew why they were there, and I quoted the newspaper clipping to the minister and he went off the deep end, he went into a tirade and crossed the House challenging me because I was pointing out to this Legislature, and to the Minister of Transportation as he was then, the sorts of things that he was doing with taxpayers' money. And he is still doing it, Mr. Speaker. He is still doing it. He is still continuing to do it, taking his lackies with him. And he has Jim Peddle a defeated Tory candidate in the district of Bellevue, still working in his department on a contractual basis doing nothing.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) helicopter (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: No. No.

MR. CALLAN: Now the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who is in his wrong seat, as usual, is over there talking to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), and I want silence, Mr. Speaker. I want silence.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. SIMMS: The Leader of the Opposition was talking back to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if that gentleman is going to talk at all he will have his opportunity after I am finished and he should do it from his own seat. But in his remarks over there to the Leader of the Opposition he is talking about what happened in a prior administration. But you see not even the Premier talks about that. The Premier condemns Frank Moores, he was never a good premier. This is what our Premier said about his former boss. But you see two wrongs do not make a right. If something happened twenty years ago before there was any conflict of interest legislation in this Legislature, or before there was any Public Tendering Act in this Legislature, if things went on is that my fault? And the fact that it went on, does that condone it now? In other words, is the member for Burin-Placentia West saying that two wrongs make a right? Is he?

You see, Mr. Speaker, what happened in this House this week, the decorum of this House went down considerably and it was brought down by a devious plot by the Premier, who was the man who on

March 16, 1984

Tape No. 191

NM - 4

MR. CALLAN: more than one occasion
stood in his place and lectured everybody about
raising the decorum of the House and not using first
names, referring to members by their district and
all of that sort of garbage, garbage that he does
not keep in mind himself

MR. CALLAN: when he sets out on a devious plot, and it was a devious plot. Now let me talk about what happened, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) referred to it, he said: 'Oh, you know, when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) left the Liberal side of the House and came over here, he did it out of principle'. The fact of the matter is unless the member for Baie Verte - White Bay is a liar, then the Premier must be - one or the other. One of them is lying. Here is what happened. The member for Baie Verte - White Bay approached the Premier, the Premier said it publicly -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: You know, the hon. gentleman from the opposite side can get up and call Mr. De Bane a liar, which is done in very bad taste, but he is not a member of the House. But in this House, Mr. Speaker, you cannot call another member of this House a liar. Now the hon. gentleman said, 'Either the Premier is a liar or the member for Baie Verte - White Bay is a liar'. Now the hon. gentleman cannot use these words, cannot make these imputations, cannot say indirectly what he cannot say directly. I am sure the hon. gentleman would wish to retract an imputation of that nature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALLAN: I retract that, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, before the election of 1979, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay approached the Premier to tell him that he wanted to join your party. Before he had a chance to do so, the Premier called an election, Don Jamieson came back as Liberal leader and the member for Baie Verte - White Bay decided that it would be a mistake to stay with the present Premier, and

MR. CALLAN: so he hung on and he ran in Baie Verte - White Bay on a Liberal ticket. The Premier told us, the Premier said publicly that he was approached by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) before the 1979 election. It was a year or so after that the member crossed the House. So this garbage from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that he did it on a point of principle and all of this is nonsense. The member for Baie Verte - White Bay tried to do it before the 1979 election, but when he thought about it, and thought that he had a better chance where he was, he stayed where he was. Then a year later, when he thought he would have a better chance of going where he wanted to, when he went. He went, Mr. Speaker, for a simple reason, because he was out for his own self betterment; principle had nothing to do with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened in this Legislature when Don Jamieson was Leader of the Liberal Party at the time that the member for Baie Verte - White Bay crossed to the other side? What happened?

I was not here.

MR. CARTER: Why?

MR. CALLAN: I was here four or five months later. Do you want me to answer why that happened as well? Anyway, that was just one of three times that the Premier got beaten in the Bellevue district. The only place in the Province where the Premier has been defeated three times is in the district of Bellevue. I was not here, but I know because I worked on the fifth floor in the Opposition office, Mr. Speaker, and I know what happened. Statesman as he was, the hon. Don Jamieson said, 'Let the member for Baie Verte - White Bay go and take his seat. We will not enter into the sort of nonsense of attacking the man and so on'. Now what a difference in the character of two men, Mr. Speaker. Our present Premier deliberately set out on a devious plot, and he put up the

MR. CALLAN: nastiest man on the government side of the House, the man who should have resigned four or five times, and he said, okay, to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), you destroyed Bill Rowe, or tried hard to and you carried on your innuendo and your dirt and your filth and you made suggestions across the Chamber to the Leader of the Opposition, Bill Rowe, 'why did you resign? why did you go over to France?' and two minutes later talking about drugs and talking about drugs in Vancouver, all suggestions to smear that man's name. And the man, Bill Rowe, challenged the Minister of Fisheries to go outside the Legislature and directly say what he was saying through innuendo. And he did not have the guts to do it anymore than the Premier had the guts to ask for the Minister of Fisheries' resignation, when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), who is now on that side of the House, was Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee with a majority of government members on that same committee who says that he has no choice only to resign. But was it done? No. And here is the man, the Minister of Fisheries, who talks about insincerity. He does not even know the meaning of the word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you know, the Premier does a fine selling job, and unfortunately there are still a large number, perhaps 20 per cent, perhaps 30 per cent or 35 per cent out there who will not change anyway; they are Tories, they were born Tories and they will die Tories; just as there are

MR. CALLAN: 35 per cent of the people out there who are Liberals born and will die Liberals. But there are about 15, perhaps 20 per cent of the population in this Province who are still gullible enough to believe everything that the Premier says. Just let me give an example of the sort of nonsense that the Premier says: He stood up on Monday and he turned to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and praised him for the jobs he created. And, Mr. Speaker, what an insult to the intelligence of Newfoundlanders, what an insult to the thousands of them. Most Newfoundlanders realize that again this was a devious plot. The Minister of Social Services probably was told about it at a Cabinet meeting. 'Now here is what we are going to do, gentlemen, since we cannot get an agreement with the federal government and since we are going deeper and deeper in the hole every day. The federal government pays out UIC.' The same Premier, Mr. Speaker, who stood on many occasions and criticized the federal government for these LIP programmes, LIP, Local Initiative Programmes. And again the Premier was insulting the people's intelligence because Mr. Speaker, whether it was approved by Ottawa or not to put up a graveyard fence, the initiative came from the local people. So the Premier was flying in the face of these local people because it was their local initiative programme that was approved by Ottawa. The initiative came from the local people, and the Premier says they were stupid and silly to apply to put a fence around a graveyard. But to add insult to injury the devious plot comes forward, Mr. Speaker, the Premier says to his Minister of Social Services, it is not enough for just the federal government to be putting people to work for ten weeks or fifteen or twenty and then helping them to collect UIC, we should do it. So 2,500 jobs were created in the Department

MR. CALLAN: of Social Services, for how long? Were they the same sorts of make-work projects that the Premier criticized Ottawa for? Yes, Mr. Speaker, the same sorts of jobs, most of them ten weeks. When you get your ten weeks you are laid off. What happened? The people on social assistance, Mr. Speaker, who were drawing from the Provincial Treasury are no longer drawing from the Provincial Treasury, now they are drawing from Ottawa. It was a devious plot. And the Premier talks about the philosophy and the great Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). It was a devious plot.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is another devious plot and that is the Premier is not at the negotiating table this morning. That is why he is sitting there chatting with a member of the Legislature who is getting about \$12,000 more than he should be getting because he has an office on the sixth floor. A lady phoned in a couple of days ago from Conception Bay South talking about the great member she had, who returns his phone calls and so on, He does not have anything else to do, Mr. Speaker. He is getting paid, he has his own office, his own secretary on the sixth floor, and he is half a Cabinet minister, this man is, for doing nothing, and there are a dozen over there. The fattest administration in Canada; the highest paid Premier in Canada, and the fattest administration. The Premier had forty-four mouths to feed on that side, he could not put them all in the Cabinet so he made half Cabinet ministers out of them, he called them secretaries, \$12,000 secretaries.

The member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) was over in Europe last week or the week before with the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) looking for investors to come into this Province. Mr. Speaker, if things were right

MR. CALLAN: in this Province the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) or no other minister would have to go to Europe or anywhere else, or down to South Carolina or anywhere else looking for someone to come in and build an aluminium smelter or to invest in this Province. If the climate was right they would be flocking here, lining up trying to get appointments with the Minister of Development.

MR. CALLAN: We have \$100 million that we are prepared to use to start this programme here. Give us some guidance. Where can we get the land to build this facility? Is Bay Roberts the best place? How about Come By Chance? Is that a deep water port? Could we set up a facility out there? Is the labour force there? Can we put on buses from Clarenville and a fifty mile radius to flock people in to Come By Chance and to work shifts day in and day out and night in and night out?' These are the sorts of things that would be happening if that Premier were not so stubborn and obnoxious, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) crossed the Legislature, there was nothing said on this side of the House. Now, I could have got up here today, Mr. Speaker, and one of my colleagues who spoke on Thursday could have got up and we could have dragged out the Hansard, the four and one-half hour speech that was made by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay when he criticized that government. For four and one-half hours he dragged them all over the coals, and the Premier was one of them. The member for Baie Verte - White Bay had a running fight with the Premier in the newspapers in Central Newfoundland, letters to the editor, corresponding back and forth, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay criticizing the Premier, the Premier the next week - as a minister of the Crown, he was not Premier then - criticizing the member for Baie Verte - White Bay. And it went on for months. I know all about it.

Mr. Speaker, we could have done the same thing here now. But one point has been proven, Mr. Speaker, it shows how insignificant it was to the

MR. CALLAN: Liberal Party to lose the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) to the other side. And, on the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, the devious plot that took place in this Legislature during the past week and the devious attacks that were made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), all planned on the Eighth or the Ninth or the Tenth Floor of this building - for weeks they were plotting, How can we destroy the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who has joined the Liberal ranks?

AN HON. MEMBER: You can forget the eighth floor, it was not planned on it.

MR. CALLAN: I do not care what floor it was planned on. But what a difference, Mr. Speaker! On the other side of the coin, I was going to say, when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay went across there, it was hardly heeded. In a day, it was all over. But it shows how much the administration are smarting today. Yesterday, all last week and the week before that, it shows how much they are smarting because of the fact that the member for Mount Scio left. He left the Premier a long time ago, a couple of years ago he left his Cabinet, but now he has left the whole crowd. Many of them are more to be pitied than blamed, Mr. Speaker. And if I had time, I would go up and down the ranks and tell you the ones who are more to be pitied and the ones who are more to be blamed. And they are over there.

MR. WARREN: I pity the new members more than anyone else.

MR. CALLAN: Well, they know, some of the new members already know that they are only here for a visit. I told them all that and we will see. They are only here for a visit.

MR. NEARY: What about the other two or three over there who wanted to bail out?

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, some of them are to be pitied, as I said. If they were smart, if they knew what side their bread was buttered on, within a short period of time they would be crossing this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I attended a meeting on Wednesday night in Goobies. There was one gentleman there from Come By Chance. Let us look at the state that this Province is in. Let us look at the town of Come By Chance. This gentleman asked me, 'What time are they going to come out and take the pavement, I wonder?' I said, 'I do not know. What do you mean by that?' 'Well,' he said, 'the Tories took over in 1976. They took away our refinery, and last year they

MR. CALLAN:

took away our school,' - which has happened - 'and,' he said, 'now they are taking away our hospital and that means that the drugstore will go.' He said, 'I would not be surprised if on the next warm day I see somebody out here, some government official, rolling up the pavement to take that and carry it away as well.' Mr. Speaker, as the open line callers have pointed out, the Premier is the highest paid premier in all of Canada, is living in the lap of luxury. In addition to the salary that everybody knew about, a couple of weeks ago we heard that he is getting another salary from the PC Party, a party that has to go and collect funds - as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said yesterday - collect funds from contractors who are doing work with this government. Is that a conflict of interest situation for the Premier to be in? It sounds like it, Mr. Speaker. It appears as though it is.

Mr. Speaker, the member for
St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) -

MR. WARREN: A nice gentleman.

MR. CALLAN: - he has, and I have said this before, it is unfortunate - and I have said this before as well, before I get back to the member for St. Mary's - The Capes, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid), when he was first elected, unless you can see things, unless you can get back, and when you cannot see the forest for trees you are in trouble and when you are blinded by a love for a political party, then you are in trouble as well. Unfortunately I believe the member for St. Mary's - The Capes is one of those gentleman who is more to be pitied than he is to be blamed. Because here we had the former Minister of Justice represent that district and the former Minister of Fisheries, Walter Carter, represented that

MR. CALLAN: district and what did they
leave to the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn)?

MR. PATTERSON: What did Dr. McGrath leave there?
A mess of potash.

MR. NEARY: He left a legacy of hope for the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: What did they leave there, Mr. Speaker?
They left a legacy of dirt roads and problems that the member
for St. Mary's - The Capes cannot find time to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that the member for
St. Mary's - The Capes is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard
in silence.

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

MR. PATTERSON: What did Dr. McGrath leave?

MR. CALLAN: The member for Placentia East
(Mr. Patterson) will have his chance. I want to be heard
in silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
I wish to remind hon. members once
again that each member of this House has the right to be
heard in silence.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon.
the member for Placentia.

MR. CALLAN: When he ran in 1972 -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: I want to say this because my
time is running out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
A point of order, the hon. the
member for Placentia.

MR. BAIRD: How ignorant.

MR. CALLAN: There is the pot calling the kettle smut.

MR. PATTERSON: Would you put a muzzle on that, please?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the hon. member that today is there is no such a place as Placentia East, it is Placentia district. Now remember that and refer to it when you are speaking.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond to the point of order briefly to say it is the first time in something like about ten years I have ever heard the member speak.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. PATTERSON: You are lucky you do not hear me speak, my son.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, whether it is Placentia or whether it is Bellevue it does not matter to me, but I can tell you this, that out in Southern Harbour, in two elections that I fought in the district of Bellevue, the Tory candidates were out in Southern Harbour campaigning thinking that Southern Harbour was in the district of Bellevue. That will show you the caliber of the Tory candidates out there. But, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say and I wanted to get this on the record, that I am not a blind politician. I voted for the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde in 1972, and the hon. James Reid, he soon became in the Moores Cabinet. I voted for the man.

MR. PATTERSON: A good man. You made no mistake.

MR. CALLAN: And in the last federal election, I can tell hon. members opposite, that I did not vote blindly for the Liberal candidate, I did not vote for him. He knows

MR. CALLAN: that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who was that?

MR. CALLAN: I did not vote for him. But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) is an example of a man who is more to be pitied than blamed. Because what kind of a legacy did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the former Minister of Fisheries, Walter Carter, what legacy did they leave to him? They left him a legacy of 150 miles of dirt road, and here the hardest working member of the House of Assembly is having callers to open line criticizing him.

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

MR. CALLAN: There are a dozen others who should get them but not him.

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

A point of order the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make clear to the hon. gentlemen that up until 1972, when the district became represented by the PC party, there

MR. HEARN: was not an inch, a centimeter, a millimeter of pavement in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. NEARY: But everybody was working down there.

MR. HEARN: And they are working now again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HEARN: Check it out.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HEARN: Since 1972, \$22.5 million have been spent on the roads alone and 126 miles of pavement has been laid. Now it is unfortunate that a district such as ours covers over 260 miles, which would include about twenty other districts, so consequently the facts that are being stated are way out of proportion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I mean, the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) can get up and quote figures. We have been through that already. We know that. I know that, he knows it. Everybody knows it. The fact of the matter is, you know, there 50 or 40 miles of dirt road in my district, but here is a district that was represented by two former Cabinet ministers, since 1972. What was done? I mean, you know it could not all be done in the twenty-three years that Joey was in power, it could not all be done.

MR. NEARY: But we laid the foundation for the roads down there.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Whatever roads they have we built them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Rural electrification, jobs for the people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: You are going to be named.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order and I have to inform the hon. member that his time has expired. And while I am on my feet, I wish to rule once again on a ruling I made a little earlier in a speech by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), he did use two abbreviations that in themselves would be considered unparliamentary. It is a well-known rule of this House, that I did not interpret at the time, that it is not permissible for a person to say indirectly things that he cannot say directly. So I would ask the hon. member for St. John's North if he would withdraw the two abbreviations that he did use.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, naturally I am in your hands and I fully realize the dangerous precedent that it would have occurred had these abbreviations been permitted. However, just recently I did hear the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) talk about LIP grants, and the word "LIP" could be construed to be uncomplimentary or unparliamentary. And I would like to add that if your ruling is made seriously, and I am sure it is, that all abbreviations should perhaps be ruled out of order on the grounds that they could be construed as uncomplimentary or unparliamentary and could be misinterpreted.

MR. CARTER: However, I thank you for your ruling and I do withdraw them unequivocally and absolutely.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To the comments that the hon. member did make, abbreviations that indicate a person is trying to say something unparliamentary, that would not be permitted would not be accepted. But abbreviations ordinarily would be accepted.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was not so quick to leap to his feet to come to the protection of the Chair when the ruling of the Chair was questioned by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). At the end he did withdraw but in the process of making a long winded statement, which is not really the thing to do when you are asked to withdraw unparliamentary language and apologize to the House for having used such lanaguage but in the process of making that statement, Mr. Speaker, the member did question the Chair, cast aspersions on Your Honour's ruling and questioned Your Honour's ruling, and I believe that is a pretty serious offence, Mr. Speaker. And as I said I did not see the Government House Leader leap to the defence of the Chair but I am afraid I have to do it now.

Now Your Honour may say, "Well, there was no offence meant." Or, "He withdrew the remarks," but that is all beside the point. It is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that there is a procedure in our standing rules for questioning

MR. NEARY: rulings that are made by the Chair. The hon. gentleman chose to abuse that privilege and in his own inimitable way challenged the ruling of Your Honour and then went on to carry out the direct order that Your Honour had given the member to withdraw his unparliamentary remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am raising it is that is the sort of thing that can cause a deterioration in this House, lower the decorum of the House as we have seen happen all week by members there opposite who seem

MR. NEARY: to have now gone into a policy , a strategy of character assassination, hatchet jobs, taking the House on their backs. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to give very serious consideration to what was said by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) before he grudgingly apologized for his rudeness in this House and for his unparliamentary remarks. So I would suggest to Your Honour that maybe Your Honour might want to check with Hansard to see what words were actually used. But certainly there is no doubt about it that the member did question Your Honour's ruling and that, in our opinion, is a pretty serious matter unless you go through the proper procedure of the standing rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!
To that point of order, I really do not think it is necessary to have further arguments on that point of order. The Chair is well able to assess when it is challenged or affronted and will take any member to task for doing such a thing. It is the Chair's interpretation that the hon. member wished to have a further clarification of the ruling that was made. That is all.

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Are you after the leadership, too?

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, if I were the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I would not be talking about leadership speeches or leadership campaigns. If he is going to give me any advise at all, perhaps he can advise me to use the same strategy that he has been using the last three or four days.

MR. SIMMS: and that is to sit back and let the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and other members of the Liberal party hang themselves. Give them enough rope and let them hang themselves: That has been his strategy and it has been working very good. I must commend him and compliment him.

MR. NEARY: I am a little more aggressive than you are but you are doing very well.

MR. SIMMS: I will consider that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to try to return some sanity in this particular debate because what we are debating in the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech. And after listening to the diatribe that just came from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), you know, it was absolutely disgusting, totally out of order. It had nothing at all to do with the Throne Speech. He did not address one point in the Throne Speech, not a single point in the Throne Speech. He condemned all the members on this side for attacking them and lowering the decorum, but what did he do in reverse? What did he do throughout his entire speech but attack all the member over on this side. So you cannot speak out of both sides off your mouth. Anyway, for the benefit of the members opposite I want to advise, them if they have not already heard, that John Turner has just announced his candidacy for the leadership of the Liberal party of Canada and I know you will be very, very happy. That makes four candidates in the race now. Donald Johnston - now there is a stormer for you, I will tell you, Donald Johnston. John Roberts, the minister who just recently had such a difficult time defending the slush fund

MR. SIMMS: in Ottawa, Mark MacGuigan, whose only headline this week since his announced his candidacy by the way a couple of days ago in the paper was, 'MacGuigan denies sleeping!.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: Did you see that headline? That was his biggest headline since his announcement. And now John Turner has announced his candidacy. Well, shoo-dee-doo John Turner is finally running. Did you know, and I only found this out a day or so ago myself, that John Turner keeps his socks up with garters? How can one trust and support a man who keeps his socks up with garters? I ask you, Mr. Speaker. If I wanted to be facetious, I might even suspect that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) might be in that category. If I wanted to be facetious he would probably be a supporter of Mr. Turner. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I thought that they would like to hear that information because I know the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is a great campaigner. We have heard time and time again of all his efforts in the past years.

MR. HODDER: Why are you after me?

MR. SIMMS: Well, you are the only one over there so I had to talk to somebody.

MR. BUTT: 'Beaton' failed the test in Terra Nova.

MR. SIMMS: Anyway, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMMS: I would like to get back to the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech which is what this debate is supposed to be all about. Traditionally and historically it is supposed to provide the members of this Legislature with an opportunity to make some comments about their own districts, which is something, I regret, I have not heard even from members on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: But, I mean, that is the traditional and historical way of speaking in the Address in Reply, so I intend to take full advantage of it and send it out to my constituents after I make some very, very eye-opening comments for the benefit of the people in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: The other thing, by the way, is that most members who have recently spoken in the debate have totally forgotten to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) did a superb job, I thought, in moving the Address in Reply as indeed my colleague the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon) did in seconding the Address in Reply. And I think they should be commended for it and I regret that members opposite in particular deliberately ignored that task and they should reconsider if they speak any further on any amendments.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Maybe they should make their speeches over again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Well, that is quite possible. I would welcome the new -

MR. DINN: The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) would love to do his again.

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. HODDER: You certainly lost out to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) when they moved all the forestry people out of your district to Corner Brook.

MR. SIMMS: Well, the same way we lost out when the federal government forgot to put the forestry centre that they said they were going to put in Corner Brook as well. So your friend from Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) is still working on that one, I believe with your other friend, the member for Humber - Port au Port, Mr. Tobin. I am not quite sure that that is resolved yet.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you a little bit about the district of Grand Falls. For all your information, many of you, of course, have never been out there, never been near the place, I suppose, and are not aware - the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has been there occasionally, I know.

MR. TULK: Come on now! I have been there, too.

MR. SIMMS: You trickled through it.

MR. TULK: A beautiful town.

MR. SIMMS: I know you had a big Liberal meeting out there a couple of weeks ago - twelve people, I think it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: My colleagues should not laugh. I tell you my colleagues should not laugh because twelve people at a Liberal meeting in Grand Falls is a big meeting. Is that right?

MR. TULK: Some were from your executive.

MR. SIMMS: Some members from my executive, right, certainly, that is why I know the number.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: In any event, Mr. Speaker, the district of Grand Falls is a historic district. There is no question about that, everybody knows that. It has received a very favourable response from the representations made by the members who represented the district in recent years.

MR. DOYLE: They have a good member now.

MR. SIMMS: Now all your comments and interjections, by the way, will be published in the Grand Falls Advertiser, so be very careful of what you say.

MR. TULK: Side by side.
with your speech.

MR. SIMMS: It is a town, of course, that has as its major industry the newsprint industry and it is the major employer in the district. Last year, by the way, for the information of hon. members, the Grand Falls mill topped the newsprint industry in Canada with an operating rate of 86 per cent, which was higher than the national average, I am pleased to say, despite the fact that there is some difficulty with markets and so on in the newsprint industry. But I think that that statistic speaks well for the industry and for the future of the town of Grand Falls down the road.

MR. DOYLE: What about the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
a fish plant. Actually it is within the boundaries of the district of Windsor - Buchans represented so ably by my colleague, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon). But I do happen to know the owners; the owners happen to live in my district of Grand Falls.

Grand Falls is a community as well that provides a lot of other industries, especially with respect to government services, lots of shopping malls. It is a hub of activity for that area, there is no question about it. It is the largest community in that particular region. Geographically it is located very, very close to all the major road, rail and air routes for the benefit of the media perhaps who have not spent all that much time out there. And, of course, all these factors play a major rôle when we talk to industries about moving to the Central Newfoundland area, which has net with some success, by the way.

MR. DOYLE: It has a good golf course.

MR. SIMMS: It has a tremendous golf course and so on. Now I want to get specific because, Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have been confronted with the comment, especially from Liberal critics out in the district of Grand Falls, they say this: 'The provincial government completely ignores Grand Falls because they think the town of Grand Falls has everything'. Now that is what Liberal critics out in Grand Falls frequently say to me. They say, 'The provincial government completely ignores Grand Falls because they think the town of Grand Falls has everything'.

MR. HISCOCK: That is why you are going to get the new minimum security prison.

MR. SIMMS: I will deal with the hon. member over there when I get an opportunity. Mr. Speaker, there is a well-known saying,

MR. SIMMS:

it goes something like this, 'When wise men speak it is because they have something to say. When fools speak it is because they have to say something'.

MR. TULK:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SIMMS:

I suggest the hon. member is in the later category.

MR. TULK:

Sit down!

MR. SIMMS:

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there were a lot of issues in the last provincial election related to the town of Grand Falls. The revenue grant which was \$150,000 a year five years ago and was a major issue in the election has now been increased to well over \$1 million a year to the town of Grand Falls.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good member.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, it is, I must say, something that the member is very, very proud of. We have had a contribution of over half a million through community development projects out in the town and the district of Grand Falls over the last few years.

MR. DOYLE:

What a member.

MR. SIMMS:

We have been very fortunate in being able to receive approximately \$300,000 in recreation capital grants and so on provided through various community organizations out in that area over the last several years.

MR. NEARY:

How many ministers?

MR. SIMMS:

And, of course, in excess of \$300,000 has been spent in the district by my colleague's department, the Department of Public Works (Mr. Young) to provide improved services to the people.

MR. TULK:

You twisted his arm.

MR. YOUNG:

All public tender.

MR. SIMMS: A number of provincial government departments and agencies - this is unknown, completely unknown-over the last four or five years have increased their staff, have had creation of new positions. A Workers' Compensation Board office was opened in the town of Grand Falls creating three new positions; Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation opened an office in Grand Falls creating two positions, all in the last three or four years. The government of this Province has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the town of Grand Falls and assisted them in their 60/40 cost-shared programmes for improvements to municipal roads.

MR. MORGAN: They cannot take anymore.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, you have to say here the crowning point, and the crowning point is this, these are just a few examples, those points that I can use to counter the argument that I hear from Liberals out in the Grand Falls district when they say that the government ignores Grand Falls because Grand Falls gets everything. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize my point, I want to quote from Hansard, page 7545, November 28, 1983, just a few short months ago, and I want to refer to a quote made by none other than the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party -

MR. DINN: You do not care who you quote.

MR. SIMMS: - and this was when he was talking about various grants. You know how he goes through the list and he says, oh, they should not get this, they should not get that, shocking, shocking, this town got that, and this town got that. Well, this was about a specific grant through Municipal Affairs water and sewerage projects and road paving projects. And the

MR. SIMMS: direct quote from the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), my friend over there, was this, and I quote, "Grand Falls did not do too badly either; \$315,000 for a company town that has everything practically that they want".

MR. NEARY: How long ago was that?

MR. SIMMS: This is November 1983. About three months ago.

MR. NEARY: Where did you get that?

MR. SIMMS: This is Hansard, page 7545, November 28, 1983. I would strongly suggest that that contrary to criticism and comments that we sometimes get from critics out in the area that government does not do anything for Grand Falls because Grand Falls has everything, I now draw that to the attention of the public and suggest that that kind of a charge to be attributed more to the Liberal Party led by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) because he is the one that actually said it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to use all of my time -

MR. WARREN: Sit down, boy!

MR. SIMMS: - talking about the district of Grand Falls. I am like the member for Torngat Mounts (Mr. Warren), I intend to stay up and say something; he intended to say up and say nothing and did a very good job of it, I must admit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn my attention briefly to some of the contents of the Throne Speech, the Address in Reply gives me the opportunity to do that, and I want to do it in such a way that members in the House will understand that I am trying to express my opinions; whether they agree with them or not certainly is up to them and they will have an opportunity to disagree if they so desire.

MR. SIMMS: We are all, of course, Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows and as is outlined in the Throne Speech, very, very disappointed with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada with respect to our offshore resources. But I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, as do my colleagues on this side of the House in particular, that regardless of any legal decision on ownership, one very important fact remains clear and that is that this Province, when it entered Confederation in 1949, did indeed bring the Grand Banks into Canada, and if the people of this Province had not decided to enter Confederation at that time, I really believe that Canada would not have any access at all to any of its present legal claims that it has made.

This administration has tried over and over again to reach some kind of a reasonable agreement which would be acceptable to both levels of government. We have consistently negotiated in good faith, and all hon. members know the facts, regardless of what members opposite may try to claim on occasion. During the last round of negotiations, this administration did everything that it could to try to reach an equitable agreement, but we all know what actually happened, that what the federal representative offered by word of mouth, he was not prepared to commit to paper and now, some sixteen months later, of course, they still have failed to respond to our very reasonable request, to respond to our position.

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1982, less than two years ago, the people of this Province gave this administration an overwhelming mandate to ensure that the natural resources of this Province be developed so as to provide the maximum social and economic benefits

MR. SIMMS: for the residents of this Province. And we intend, and I believe we must, stand firm in our resolve to obtain those maximum benefits. As I have said on many occasions, to settle for less, in my opinion, would be nothing short of a sell-out of our culture, our heritage and, of course, our birthright.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And, Mr. Speaker, to settle for less would be a betrayal, I believe, of the mandate given to us by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba were not given complete control over their natural resources when they were created, as has been pointed out on so many occasions in this House, but in 1930, the federal government of the day, wishing to establish some equality and equity amongst the provinces of this country and also, of course, wishing to alleviate some of the economic stress created by the Great Depression, I guess, of that time, gave the Prairie Provinces control.

We now find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1984, and as we approach the thirty-fifth anniversary of Newfoundland's entry into Confederation, we find ourselves again in the all-too-familiar position of having to struggle and fight to gain what was given to other Canadians as a natural course of history.

There are some among us who advocate the position that we should settle for less than what we can only describe as equality, but to settle for less, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would guarantee forever this Province's dependence on equalization and transfer

MR. SIMMS: payments and, as I said earlier, would be nothing less than a sell-out of our heritage and our culture and our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, a good example is the example of the report that was done under the Federal Environmental Assessment Review process in Nova Scotia to assess the Nova Scotia-Canada Offshore agreement, where a two member panel made up of a federal representative and a provincial representative examined the social economic conditions and implications of that particular agreement and what has happened since. And it is well-known by now, it has been made public on numerous occasions, but I think it exonerates this

MR. SIMMS:

government in terms of the position it has taken when it says, "The panel found that the venture project represents significant social benefits to Canada as a whole, but when loss of equalization benefits are considered there would be small to negligible direct revenue benefit to the Province of Nova Scotia."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Sandy Cameron has been saying that all along, by the way, the Leader of the Opposition in Nova Scotia.

MR. SIMMS:

This same type of an agreement, Mr. Speaker, is the same type of an agreement that we are being pressured to sign. It is very reminiscent, you know, when you think about it of the late 1960s.

MR. NEARY:

I got the impression -

MR. SIMMS:

And the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will remember this kind of pressure in the late 1960s because he was a member of that Smallwood administration.

MR. NEARY:

Let me ask you.

MR. SIMMS:

1960s, 1966 when there was so much pressure you will recall, the hon. member will recall there was so much pressure in that day on the Premier of the day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member for LaPoile I believe has had an opportunity to speak in the debate and I would appreciate the opportunity to speak as well. What I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that in the late 1960s, around 1966 I guess it was, and the member for LaPoile, again, was there and was very familiar with it, will remember the pressure that came on that particular Premier of the day to develop the Upper Churchill as quickly as possible to get jobs.

MR. NEARY:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes, he can deny it all he wishes but we all know the difference. And we all know, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since that with that particular agreement.

MR. NEARY:

It was - great imperial concept.

MR. SIMMS:

Do you want to know the reaction, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

- of the federal Liberal Government as expressed in the Wall Street Journal by the way, by the executive assistant to Canada's Minister of Finance, Mr. LaLonde? "Federal officials expect to win the lawsuit over the offshore rights issue and say the Supreme Court decision will settle the dispute. After a little gnashing of teeth," says Eddie Goldenberg, the Executive Assistant to Canada's Finance Minister, "the Province will not have any choice but to go along." Now that is their reaction and their response to the decision of the Supreme Court. They think we are going to roll over and play dead, Mr. Speaker. That is what they think, and so do the members opposite, and, as a matter of fact, that is what they hope, but not on your life, Mr. Speaker, not on your life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You are dead, boy.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot agree with the philosophy enunciated and articulated by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), which is to develop now and forget the future. Let us do it now. That is what he said on television a couple of weeks ago. Let us sign an agreement, let us do something right now. Forget the future. Somebody else will look after the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to that philosophy and I do not think the majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians subscribe to it and we will find out in due course whether or not they do.

MR. NEARY: How are you going to find out?
How will you find out?

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, there are other issues outlined in the Throne Speech -

MR. NEARY: Call an election.

MR. SIMMS: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Call an election.

MR. SIMMS: Call an election? I will deal with that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: There are other issues in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, which are important to this hon. House and to this Province which I think should bear some repeating. It has been pointed out since 1980, we have increased our expenditures in the area of social departments, Education, Health, and Social Services by 62 per cent. We have been, therefore, able to respond to the social needs of the people of this Province in spite of the economic recession experienced during the past couple of years. We do have hospital construction at Channel-Port Aux Basques, Clarenville and Bonavista and this year, of course, construction will start on the hospital at Salt Pond on the Burin Peninsula despite the fact that there were a lot of people opposing it as I understand it. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased to say that in the Throne Speech there was an indication that the detailed planning for the expansion

MR. SIMMS:

and the redevelopment of the Central Newfoundland Hospital at Grand Falls will take place and that is a decision that I am obviously absolutely delighted with.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just conclude by addressing again just briefly some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I am afraid I must, because I think quite frankly he was the one who made the best speech on that side. I must say that quite frankly and in all sincerity. It was a tremendous speech.

But you will recall in his address to the Legislature that he used the term "hyprocrisy" on numerous occasions and he admits it, he used the term "hypocrisy". Well, I recall in his comments he talked about tourism. On television he encouraged us to do something to develop tourism. And he also mentioned it in his reply, do something to develop tourism. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask all members of the House to reflect back to last year, 1983, the 400th. anniversary of our Province.

MR. NEARY: It was a waste of money.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. member does not like it, I am sure, but it was an activity that improved the tourism industry in this Province, supported heartily and strongly by the people, by the members and people involved in the tourist industry, by the media, by everybody in this Province including members opposite, with one exception, one only exception. Who was the critic, the one lonely voice crying out all last year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Was it West Simms? Who was it?

MR. SIMMS: Was it West Simms? No, it certainly was not.

MR. SIMMS: He was very supportive. Anybody have any idea who it was? A rough idea? It was the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Snow White himself, the member for LaPoile. And then, Mr. Speaker, he has the audacity to use the term "hypocrisy". Well, what hypocrisy is that.

Now a few moments ago, just briefly, he reiterated his call for an election. 'Call an election. Call an election.'

MR. NEARY: Let us have it before October.

MR. SIMMS: But then, of course, you know, Mr. Speaker, do you know what he will do then if we called an election? He will do exactly what he did the last time, he will do exactly what he said on television in an interview a few days ago, they will turn around and accuse us then of having a costly, unnecessary election. That is what he did and what he will continue to do. And he dares to use the term "hypocrisy".

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is one that is dear to my heart. It has to do with the infamous or famous Norman and Gladys. Now who was one of the biggest critics about the Norman and Gladys over the years? Anybody care to guess? When we announced our decision to put the Norman and Gladys up for sale by tender, who was on the radio the next morning saying, "Oh, they should not do that. They should hold on to it." Who was it? The member for LaPoile. And just to reiterate what the Leader of the Opposition said

MR. SIMMS: about the Norma and Gladys in the past, I will just quote from Hansard briefly. November 15, 1983, Tape 3028. It says: "Mr. Speaker," - this is the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - "will they be eliminating the extravagance and waste in the budget such as government entertainment, private dining rooms, free apartments, travelling all over the world, Newfoundland propaganda services, expensive ads in newspapers, exorbitant lawyers' fees," and on the next page: "There was something I forgot there, Mr. Speaker. I forgot to toss in the Norma and Gladys."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And he dares to use the term 'hypocrisy', Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I say in conclusion to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - because I only have a couple of moments left - the traditional amendment put forth by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is nothing short of that, it is a traditional, historical amendment. It was not put forth with any great gusto or enthusiasm. It certainly has not been supported to any great extent by members opposite and has done nothing to convince me to vote for it, so, therefore, I will not be voting for it.

I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition and his followers - there are not many over there, but those who try to indicate that they are following him - I say to them, come clean with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Give us your positions on the issues instead of just criticizing for the sake of criticizing. Mr. Speaker, he used the term 'hypocrisy'. Well, I say this, Mr. Speaker - and they have shown it on many occasions in this House -

MR. SIMMS: that they themselves are often guilty of that same accusation and charge. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot speak out of both sides of their mouths like a good friend of theirs.

MR. TULK: That is not very nice. That is John Crosbie's joke.

MR. SIMMS: No, it is John Chretien's joke, he said it himself, and that is who I am talking about. In any event, Mr. Speaker, they cannot do that, they cannot continue to try to fool the people. They must try to put forth some alternatives themselves before the people will give them any credibility at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have only a few minutes before we adjourn the debate, since I will be attending the Combined Councils meeting in Labrador on Monday and Tuesday, so I may only have a few minutes. But what I would like to say - I was asking a question the other day with regard to the Throne Speech - the most important issue confronting the district of Eagle River, as well as the Strait of Belle Isle, is the development of the Northern Development Corporation. We now have a proposal in. The federal government wanted a proposal since late October of last year. The proposal is now gone in. We do not know how long this proposal has been in but, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier have said, they hope to have something in place by the fishing season. I would hope that it will not become another corporation that the fishermen

MR. HISCOCK: themselves have to pay for: pay for rental space, pay for a chairman, pay for secretaries and pay for the full tier of bureaucracy that accompanies a new corporation. And I would hope that the minister and the Premier will see fit that this new corporation is placed under the auspices of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. They are the backbone of that area of the Province. It is they who buy the salt fish; it is they who make the markets and it is they who give credit to these companies to keep them going, companies such as Earle Freighting Service Limited, H. B. Dawe, Hiscock, as well as Mifflin. And I would hope that the corporation would be changed so that it can take in fresh fish, the sale of salmon, broadening its base. I can see the role that the Premier will probably be looking at. We own the plants, therefore the Northern cod, in his view, belongs to the Province and, therefore, it is just as well to have the provincial government run the new corporation. But that, I feel, Mr. Speaker, would be wrong, because then it will be up to the fishermen along the Labrador Coast and in St. Anthony to pay out first from the amount of profit that comes from the selling of the fish to look after this new corporation, which could be set up by the provincial government, funded by the federal government or, the other option, of course, is to have a joint federal/provincial corporation funded by the federal government.

And I would hope, as I said, Mr. Speaker, that we will not go in and create another bureaucracy, but that we will work together within the one that is there.

I find since being elected in 1979 in Southern and Eastern Labrador, the Province

MR. HISCOCK: owns the plants, but what do we see? The plants are very small, non-operational last year two of them, Black Tickle and Williams Harbour. People did not even get stamps for the Winter and we had to have special work projects. We also find that because the Province owns the plants that we still have over-the-side sales at Cartwright, Black Tickle and in that area, there are not hundreds but a couple of hundred people along the Labrador Coast who do not have any jobs in these plants. And I find that it is hyprocracy, as the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) said, but on this side I find there is a little bit of hyprocracy on the government side which talks about the Northern cod belonging to the Province and wanting to bring the fish down to St. Mary's Bay, down to Harbour Breton, down to St. John's, Catalina. And here is the Labrador Coast, right on the fishing grounds and plants owned by the provincial government not at all being expanded to look after the increase of the cod that is coming ashore not as much as was predicted but expanding. we are also finding, Mr. Speaker, with regard to those area, that jobs themselves are being lost to over-the-side sales. And also the companies that are operating these provincial owned plants, whether it is Black Tickle with the Labrador Shrimp Union Company or whether it be Fishery Products or whether it be H.B. Dawe or whether it be Mifflins or Hiscocks, they find that they have to pay so much for the lease, Mr. Speaker, that after a three or four year period they would own the plant. And that is what is happening. The Cartwright plant and Mary's Harbour plant had to close and may not open this year under the Labrador Shrimp Union Company, and one of the reasons is, of course, the high cost of insurance and the high cost of the lease. So I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Premier would, if they are talking about helping the

MR. HISCOCK: people on the Labrador Coast and make these plants viable that they will lease these plants to the various companies and to the other companies in that area for a minimum charge of one dollar because it is better to have our people, as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and other members have always said, it is better to have our people working for their jobs and working for their money instead of getting welfare payments or Canada Works projects.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech debate I have spoken very briefly and I hope to continue this Tuesday if transportation permits, but the Northern Development Corporation is not the baby of the large super company. And I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the media in this Province have not paid any attention, very little attention, to the dragging negotiations. And I make this prediction now, Mr. Speaker, it will go down to the wire, it will go down to the bottom line that there will be confrontation between the federal government and the provincial government over the development of the Northern Development Corporation, basically over provincial control, and what we are going to see is that the Premier is going to force the issue and try to get his own way because he is going to hold up the fishermen and the sale of their salmon and cod, hold up these people on the Labrador East Coast and use them as blackmail to try to get his own way. Mr. Speaker, maybe I am wrong and I hope I am wrong on this one, but I feel that this is what is going to happen. But I hope that the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will have a change of heart and will allow the Saltfish Corporation to take a change of legislation direction and take responsibility for the Northern Development Corporation entirely and work in co-operation with the provincial government. I do not think that we should give up our responsibility all together, by no

MR. HISCOCK: means. But anyway, in closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope to continue this Tuesday and I move the we adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It is noted that the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

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

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