



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 46

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Thursday, 15 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. I would like to know whether he is yet in a position to let us have a statement from himself as Premier on the effect that Mr. Wilson's minibudget will have upon this Province. I would like to refer the Premier to the fact that at the time of the last federal budget we had the Premier making a fairly detailed statement in this House of Assembly following the statement which he first gave, which I believe was the same evening as the budget was released.

Now, the minibudget has been down for a number of days and we have not yet had a statement from the Premier. Just to help him along, maybe, in the preparation of that statement, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier if he recalls using in his comments on the last federal budget the following statement: "With the highest unemployment rate in Canada, 22.5 per cent last month, Newfoundland welcomes any effort by the federal government to tackle this unemployment nightmare. The contribution which the budget is expected to make in reducing unemployment, both in absolute terms and in relative terms, will therefore be the measure of its success or failure." I would ask the Premier if he recall also having referred to a long list of

programmes and a long list of matters which the Province felt should be funded in this Province, and whether the Premier recalls stating: "The delay of these badly needed programmes at a time when unemployment is at its highest is deplorable." Has the Premier decided that he will not make any similar statement to indicate the effect of the recent minibudget, or has our fighting Newfoundlander become **The Mouse That Roared?**

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, now come the heavy blows from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). Mr. Speaker, the difference between what happened the last time and what is happening this time is that the Government of Canada is consulting with us. The previous Government of Canada would not consult but unilaterally decided they were going to a,b,c and d and that was it, over and done with.

One of the critical areas involved in the Wilson economic statement was the question of CN Marine, and as the minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) pointed out to this hon. House yesterday, he, with his officials, will be travelling to Ottawa, I guess on Tuesday, to go over the details of that and to see what are the specifics relative to the monetary or the money cutbacks.

In the other areas we are still consulting with the federal government. We do know that the Forestry Research Centre for Corner Brook has been deferred. It has not been cancelled, but has been deferred. There have been a number of cancellations across the

country. For example, there has been, I think, the cancellation of a \$30 million to \$40 million building in Halifax, I think it is around \$38 million, to do with Fisheries and Oceans. In contrast to that, the third phase of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries building - there are two phases done - up in the hills down here, has just been deferred for one year. So if you look at the relative impact of some of the projects, I think buildings that were due to go up in Winnipeg and in Edmonton under one department or another have been cancelled indefinitely, whereas we do have a deferral on the Corner Brook situation. Obviously, we would have liked to have seen it go ahead. We went ahead and made our move on the grounds of a commitment made by the former federal government and they did not live up to it at all, and now we have a deferral from the present government but we are hopeful that that deferral will be lifted in due course and we will go ahead with that Forestry Research Centre

So in the areas of projects like that we have not been dealt as severe a blow as some of the other provinces. Obviously any cutback is one that we do not savour or relish, but in relative terms it is not as severe on us as it has been on other provinces.

For example, there is an area in the IRDP programme, under DRIE, under the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion, and there are some cutbacks there but there is some streamlining of the programme. Just let me give you a good example of that, Mr. Speaker, so that I can clearly pinpoint the number of situations. I just got this information last night. In the IRDP programme that was

brought in about a year and a half or two years ago, the federal government had, because we are in phase three and phase four rather than in phase one and phase two of - in other words, phase three and phase four means that you get the maximum amount - there was a commitment for 60 per cent capital cost for assistance over \$100,000. There have been no applications from Newfoundland for \$100,000. They have now cut that from 60 per cent of capital cost to 30 per cent of capital cost, which is more realistic with all the other programmes that are in effect. For example, the pulp and paper modernization agreement is 20 per cent of capital cost. There have been no applications from Newfoundland for anything over \$100,000, but on all those up to \$100,000 there will be no red tape at all and are going to be approved at the maximum 30 per cent automatically, whereas under the old programme, before the P.Cs got in power in Ottawa, they all went through a whole lot of red tape and could get anywhere from 10 per cent to 15 per cent or 20 per cent of capital cost. So they have all been approved. Any application that is in the system under IRDP programme has been approved automatically because we have not had any over \$100,000. That is one area in detail that I do know about which, realistically, is still not a bad programme at all and is very much in line with other similar programmes in the forest industry and other industries.

On CN Marine we will have more details next week, after the meeting. Mr. Mazankowski, the Minister of Transport, has agreed to meet to allow us to make our positions known, that if there is to be a reduction in money, there

may be certain ways that this can be done and certain offsets brought to bear which would mean that it would not be injurious upon this Province or would have a very minimal negative impact.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was in consultation with the Department of Finance in Ottawa this morning and we will be getting more details on some of the other programme areas where Newfoundland may be impacted. So that is all I can tell the hon. gentleman at the present moment. The hon. gentleman should be reminded that regardless of what political stripe there is in Ottawa, if in fact there are programmes and decisions made by the federal government which we consider to be injurious to the Province, then we will speak up just as loudly now as we ever did.

I would go on to remind the hon. gentleman that I think when he was over here, I think it was when he was still a Conservative before on a matter of great principle he moved to the other side, there was a Conservative Government in Ottawa for a brief period of time which made a number of statements on the fishery. We considered it a matter of principle, and it was a very important matter of principle, the question of fisheries policy, and even though the person who articulated the federal position was an M.P. from Newfoundland and was Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. McGrath), we saw fit to object and we objected in the strongest possible terms, and, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do so in the future. So there we have it. As more details become available, obviously, as I have just informed the hon. member about the IRDP programme under DRIE, as we get

more information we will let the hon. gentleman know and let the people of Newfoundland know. As it relates to CN Marine, consultations are now underway between the two Departments, Transport and Transportation, and as soon as those have been completed and decisions made we will inform the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he understands that this new era of co-operation will involve the type of consulting that he just referred to with respect to CN Marine, where the minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is going up tomorrow or in a few days time to sit down. But the decision has already been made and the rates are already raised 15 per cent on the Gulf ferry? Is that what the Premier understands as consultation?

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the deferral of the Forestry Centre, if the Premier looks in the little blue book that was supplied by Mr. Wilson, he will see that there is a saving of \$3.5 million noted for this year. So whether one wants to refer to that as a cancellation for this year or a deferral for a full year, the only way there is going to be a saving of \$3.5 million is if that Forestry Centre is not moved to Corner Brook. And what ever the Premier calls it, it is of no benefit to the people of Corner Brook, whether it is called a deferral or a cancellation.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that statement the Premier made will not be time out of Question

Period, I assume that that will be a Ministerial Statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier whether what we are seeing now is a carryover from before the election where, as the Premier may recall, Miss Carney let the cat out of the bag and indicated that there was an agreement between the Conservative Premiers that no embarrassing questions with respect to energy policy would be raised so as to embarrass Mr. Mulroney before the federal election. I wonder if this conspiracy of silence, as carried over since the election, has been extended to matters such as silence on the cuts to the unemployment insurance programme, silence on cuts to fisheries programmes, silence on cuts to student aid, silence on broken election promises such as the non-moving of the Forestry Centre? Is this current conspiracy of silence a carryover from the one that was in effect before the recent election?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you wish to answer the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) when he turned to you and asked whether my answers would not be considered part of the time in Question Period or not. The Leader of the Opposition asked a question, and he has sometimes been longer in asking the questions than ministers have been in answering them. I just take it that the Chair has just ignored that request by the Opposition.

I cannot understand what the Leader of the Opposition is talking about, the conspiracy of silence. I just explained the

IRDP programme. Is that silence, Mr. Speaker? I just explained that the federal government has changed the IRDP programme. It has on the one hand indicated that assistance to industry in Newfoundland up to \$100,000 will go through automatically, with no red tape, that assistance over \$100,000, they will still be eligible for 30 per cent of the capital cost as opposed to 60 per cent, but that has no impact upon Newfoundland at this point in time because there are no applications in the system for over \$100,000, and that this was one of the programmes that was mentioned in the economic statement on which we have the facts. Now, how can you twist and distort that to mean that there is a conspiracy of silence? I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is going to be in Ottawa consulting with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) over cutbacks to CN Marine. As soon as those meetings are completed and final decisions are made on how they are going to be implemented, the Leader of the Opposition will be informed and everybody in Newfoundland will be informed. I cannot understand how that can be twisted to mean that there is a conspiracy of silence, Mr. Speaker, and so it goes.

We have had more meetings, there have been more federal ministers in Newfoundland in the last forty or fifty days than there have been in Newfoundland for the last ten years, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) was in Ottawa the other day. How many ministers did he meet with? Five ministers he met with. Ms. Carney is coming to Newfoundland very soon, the week of the November 19, to begin

negotiations to translate the letter between Mr. Mulroney and myself into a formal agreement on the offshore which will give us the revenues the same as if it were on land -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- to give us the major say in the management of the resource. You know, this is a pretty big thing for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. There is no conspiracy of silence, there is a new attitude in Canada that the federal government is now articulating which says that this country is made up of ten provinces and two territories and a federal government and we all have to work together if we are going to turn around the abysmal state of the economy that was left as is it by the former Liberal administration, which shows the highest interest rates in our history, which shows the highest unemployment rate in our history. Obviously we have to do something to turn that around, and one way you can turn that around, Mr. Speaker, as was evidenced in our meetings with the other Premiers and the Prime Minister the other day, is that we all have to get together, have an economic summit with business and labour, have an economic summit with the other provinces and together formulate a national economic strategy to eliminate the chaos that we have been left with because of what the Liberals have done in the last twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
I will allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition one final supplementary and then I will recognize the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier whether this consultation that he refers to might not be a little after the fact and be a little late? We have Mr. Price, the recently elected member for the district of Burin - St. George's, stating that the Liberal caucus has not yet been informed of the effect of the Wilson minibudget.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Why would he worry about the Liberal caucus? He is a Tory.

MR. BARRY:
We have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying he is not yet informed. The Premier is obviously not yet informed, since he got up in this House on the first day and said there would be no cutbacks in student aid, when he was looking, presumably, at the fact that \$5 million was going to be saved on the item to which he referred. Now, presumably that is \$5 million that will not be going to the students of Canada this year. And he ignored mentioning the fact that there would be another \$85 million cut out of the Summer Canada Youth programme which would be available for students, again another cutback.

Now, I would ask the Premier, if there is not an agreement with respect to a conspiracy of silence - and I am glad the Premier

referred to the offshore agreement - is it not in fact the case that the Premier has been told by the Prime Minister to keep quiet or there will be no offshore agreement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Is it a fact that the Premier has been told to keep quiet about cutbacks to unemployment insurance, to the fishing industry, to housing and student aid or he might not get his offshore agreement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would phrase his question that way and try to create this kind of suspicion in Newfoundland, because it was the Leader of the Opposition who came to me and said, 'If I cannot have full control over the offshore then I am not going to stay around.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is going to be delivered towards the Premier and I am hoping that it will get an answer from the Premier.

Bill No. 37, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act", which I understand is on the Order Paper and which will be coming down sometime in this session, is a deliberate grab on the part of the

Iron Ore Company of Canada, Wabush Mines and a number of other large corporations in this country to take away from the workers themselves benefits that they have received under this act. A specific case would be something like \$800,000 to \$900,000 from the people at Wabush Mines. A judgement that has been received at this point in their favour indicates that they will receive this money and this piece of legislation intends to cut away the ground under which this appeal was made and to make it impossible to appeal it in the future, and it also destroys a half-a-dozen other appeals that are being made under the same type of legislation.

My question is, since this seems to be the kind of thinking that this government is now coming up with in terms of its approach to management and labour, now that we have our offshore oil agreement and we are putting down the rivets, does this mean that in the future we are going to see this kind of sleeping in bed between the government and the large oil companies and the continual hosing of the workers of this Province and making sure that the oil companies and the large suppliers will get all the benefits from the offshore oil and the workers and the people of this Province will get nothing? That, Mr. Speaker, is my question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) but, first of all, as I understand it, you are not allowed to ask a question about something that is on the Order Paper.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I did not ask a question at all. All I asked was if this was an indication of their new approach and I asked about something else.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Better explain the procedure to him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just for the benefit of the new member of the Legislature, I would explain, if he chooses, perhaps, to interrupt an hon. member, he should make it known that he is rising on a point of order or some procedural point.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In any case, I understand the rules and I did not want Mr. Speaker to interrupt the hon. member, seeing he is a new member of the House, but I do want to remind him that as time goes on and he gets to know the rules, that is one rule, that you are not allowed to ask a question in Question Period about something that is on the Order Paper. But, that aside, given that the hon. member is a new member, I would like to address myself to the substance of the question.

MR. FENWICK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek on a point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

My point of order is that all I

was doing was indicating that this is an example of their thinking. The question I am asking is how does he intend to develop the offshore oil resources? That is my question. Is it going to be in line with his intentions here or not? That is all I am asking.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, to the point of order, the hon. member used Bill 37 to lead into his question, and it makes no difference to me whether it is in order or out of order, I want to answer the question. We intend to operative the offshore according to the agreement that will be signed very soon between ourselves and the federal government.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile to the point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

With all due respect to my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, we all have to learn the rules of the House and I am sure that the hon. gentleman is eager and willing to learn. But if it is out of order to ask a question, then it is also out of order to answer the question. I would submit that the whole thing was completely out of order. Because the hon. gentleman is a new member, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and my colleague, the House Leader (Mr. Tulk) on this side of the House, as a matter of courtesy to the hon. gentleman did not want to

interrupt. But as the Premier raised the point in speaking on the point of order, if the question is out of order then it is out of order to answer it.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that Armageddon will come and go before the hon. gentleman will presume to speak for this side of the House. Now I realize his colleagues in Ottawa have reason to be apprehensive over the fact that the New Democratic Party may be taking over the Official Opposition. But I think with the poor member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who is new in the job, they are getting just a little bit jittery in this Province, if they think one person elected is going to expand to take over them all. But that may just happen in the next election, I do not know.

But in any event, Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House, as the Premier has indicated, the hon. gentleman is a new member of this House and we wish to extend him the courtesies of this House. The rules are very intricate. It takes a little while to know them. The hon. Premier got up and indicated that, just pointed it out to him and said he was prepared to answer the question. If the hon. gentleman wants the question answered, we are certainly prepared to do so despite the interference from the Official Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, the Chair has sort of reminded the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) that perhaps he should rise on a point of order if he intends to interrupt another member. Rising on his point of order he clarified the question that he really intended to ask with no reference to the Order Paper whatsoever. The hon. Premier certainly indicated that he would like to answer the question and the Chair is prepared to listen to the answer.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I think he has answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is not sure if the hon. the Premier has answered the question or not.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am in the process of answering the question, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we are going to operate the offshore according to the agreement that is worked out between both governments. Leading into the hon. gentleman's question was the issue of Bill 37 and the question of notice as it relates to temporary layoffs. May I just say to the hon. member, he got around to the bill through the offshore through some twisted way that he wanted to make some negative comments about the bill. It is our considered opinion, and I think it is the considered opinion of most reasonable people, not only in this Province but in most jurisdictions, that if

an employer is to lay somebody off for one week they should not have to give sixteen weeks, or four months notice. That is what the story is right now in our Province and our industries are suffering. So rather than it being a negative bill, it is a positive bill in order to retain the jobs that we now have in the Province and to bring in new investments.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) on a point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

My point of order is that he is discussing Bill 37 now and I thought he was not allowed to discuss Bill 37.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair, has in essence, I suppose, made a ruling. The questions asked by the hon. member for Menihék was in order. There was some reference made to the bill. The hon. Premier indicated he was willing to answer the question and certainly, I suppose, if the hon. member for Menihék is allowed to make some reference to the bill in his question, then maybe the hon. Premier is allowed to make some reference to the bill in his answer.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary question. The hon. member for Menihék.

MR. FENWICK:

In order to avoid making the same mistake again, I address the question to the Premier. The comments that we received from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn)

yesterday were that the Minister of Labour felt that the legislation was inappropriate and therefore went on to say that the large number of cases that had been there in the past, something like a dozen or so right now, would involve a considerable loss of money by mining companies, paper companies, and so on. I am referring to his comments now, not to anything regarding Bill 37. My question is that by making it retroactive to 1978 we are in fact looking at an attempt to steal, I think that is about the best way I can put it, from these employees large sums of monies which they would be due under legislation. My question is, and I have not really gotten an answer to it yet and that is why I am asking it as a supplementary, that we now have this large offshore oil industry, and if this the way we are going to treat mining, fisheries, and paper making, which we have up to this point, then we have this new industry being entered into, I would like to know what kind of relationship there will be between the oil companies and the employees in that kind of an industry. And that is my question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

In the original question there was some reference made to the fact that the hon. member perhaps should not ask questions on something that is already on the Order Paper, in reference to this particular bill. The first question was permitted. The Chair, however, will have to rule that continuation of questions on this specific bill is out of order and may be better asked at the time of second reading or Committee stage of that bill.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier. In light of the position taken by the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) yesterday, and the incident involving the resignation of Dr. Fowlow, a resignation which we understand from that gentleman he had no choice but to give as a result of the direction he had been given by the deputy minister - that is what Dr. Fowlow says, that he was told to apologize or resign, a professional man treated like a child - in light of the position that has been taken that public employees must resign if they speak out and differ with respect to government policy, I would like to know whether the Premier has issued instructions to deputy ministers or assistant deputy ministers to write letters to the newspapers of this Province criticizing Opposition members of the House of Assembly? I refer specifically to a letter written by Mr. John McGrath, the Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, on government letterhead, which is a point the Minister of Health took pains to stress Dr. Fowlow had been involved in that great crime of writing a letter to council on government letterhead. We have here a letter from Mr. McGrath, the Assistant Deputy Minister, addressed to the Editor of The Evening Telegram, criticizing the attempts by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), to see that proper native language capabilities were held by the members of the staff of the new Correctional Institute in Labrador. I ask the Premier does he agree, does he accept, does he condone, does he approve, or has

he instructed that this approach be now taken and that, instead of the minister with the responsibility for such political statements, it is the Assistant Deputy Minister who is to do it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I did not.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND
SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) that the Official Opposition wish certain changes in the complement of the Public Accounts Committee. I move that in the place of the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and in the place of the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that they be replaced with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). My motion is that the hon. member for LaPoile and the hon. member for Port au Port replace the hon. members for Strait of Belle Isle and Torngat Mountains on the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

All those in favour of the motion, 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those again, 'Nay'?

On motion, carried.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to table the Annual Report for 1983-1984 of The Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Create A Loan Farm Board And To Provide Loans and Incentives For Farm Development."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Medical Act, 1974".

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Exemption Of Baie Verte Mines Incorporated From Taxes Imposed By The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978", carried. (Bill No.46)

On motion Bill No. 46, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Revise The Judicature Act," carried. (Bill No. 21).

On motion, Bill No. 21, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice, to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For Arbitration," carried. (Bill No.22).

On motion, Bill No. 22, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 3, Supplementary Supply. It is already on the Order Paper.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of The Whole on Supplementary Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! I understand that last day the debate was adjourned by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

In connection with supplementary supply, there are a few very important items that I would like to raise in the ten minutes that I have at my disposal. I would like to reiterate some of the things that we have said in recent times about the provincial debt. The hon. gentleman can go because the

next time I get ten minutes I will be talking about the environmental impact study and how right I was the other day that the real reason for the government demanding that the environmental impact study be kept under raps was because Chevron and Mobil Oil fully intended to use semi-submersible rigs, platforms for producing the oil, there will be no pipeline, the oil would be loaded at the wellhead and taken away in tankers and the average Newfoundlander would not even know it is out there. I was so right on that. But now what I want to talk about is the provincial debt, Mr. Speaker. We are all aware, maybe some of us have to be reminded but those of us who follow the fiscal matters in this Province closely are aware that the provincial debt at the moment is close to \$4 billion, \$4,000 million.

MR. CALLAN:

It has not gone over yet.

MR. NEARY:

No, it is not gone over yet. It will go over next year, I can guarantee you that. But the provincial debt is close to \$4 billion, which means, Mr. Chairman, that our per capita debt, every man, woman and child in this Province, every newborn, every child that is born in this Province today will be in debt \$6,350. The personal per capita debt is \$6,350. The amount required to service the debt now, according to the Minister of Finance's own budget, is \$340 million. To service the debt, \$340 million, before anything else, before you can spend a cent on highways or hospitals or education. Mr. Chairman, \$340 million has to come out of the estimates, come out of the budget, 17 per cent of the budget, \$1 in

every \$7 in this Province is used to service the provincial debt.

MR. CALLAN:

One dollar in what?

MR. NEARY:

One dollar in \$7, \$1 out of every \$7 spent in this Province is spent to service the provincial debt.

MR. TULK:

Fifteen per cent of the budget.

MR. NEARY:

No, it is 17 per cent; 17 per cent of the budget is required to service the provincial debt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have expressed concern over the years about the large provincial debt that we have in this Province, that it is out of control. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) told us when he brought down his budget that there were four things he was going to do, and one of the things that he said he was going to do was to reduce the deficit in current account. Now has he done that? No, Mr. Chairman, not according to his financial statement for the first quarter that the hon. gentleman made. The hon. gentleman told us for the first quarter of this year that his estimate, or his guesstimate on the deficit in current account was out by some \$25 million. He was \$25 million out in the deficit in current account. A \$32 million shortfall had been forecast by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) at the end of the fiscal year but at the end of the first quarter there was a shortfall of \$57,100,000 so the minister was out in his estimates by \$25 million. Now that is the first quarter, Mr. Chairman, but we do not have a report for the second quarter and we are well now

into the third quarter. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance owes it to this House and to the people of this Province to come clean man-fashion, make a financial statement to this House now, before Christmas, and tell us exactly where we stand now as far as the estimates are concerned in the budget that he brought down in March of this year. We are entitled to know, Mr. Chairman, before we pass this supplementary supply bill for \$130-odd million. The Minister of Finance should tell the House and tell the people of this Province just how we are doing on the retail sales tax collection, how we are doing on the gas tax and how we are doing on profits from the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can no longer sit on that information. Look at the deficit that we have at the end of the first quarter, \$57 million as compared to \$32 million, or a mistake, misjudgement of \$25 million over that period of the fiscal year. Mr. Chairman, what I want to know, and this is very important, we have to know, is are we now going to end up with the \$57 million deficit in current account the hon. gentleman told us about in his financial statement or will it be more? Because the hon. gentleman based his figures on the trawlermen's strike ending and he based it on the gross domestic product increasing by 2 per cent this year. Mr. Chairman, he based it on a few other assumptions, but mainly on these items, that the retail sales tax would increase in the second, third and fourth quarters. But has it increased? That is what I would like to ask the minister. Has the gasoline tax increased and profits on liquor increased? I would say, if

anything, because of the horrendous state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy and because of the trawlermen's strike and fish plant workers being out of jobs, and because we have record unemployment in this Province, and because there are going to be savage cutbacks by the Government of Canada, the new Tory government up in Ottawa, who are going to alter the ground-rules for the unemployment insurance to people who are unemployed and alter fishermen's unemployment insurance, because there are going to be brutal and savage cuts, because they are now looking at changing the equalization payments in this Province, and because the establishment programme funding is going to be cut, and, Mr. Chairman, all these changes will mean the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will have to lash out more welfare to people who are in need, I expect that we are going to end up with a deficit in this fiscal year much more than the \$57 million that the hon. gentleman forecast in his statement for the first quarter. And the hon. gentleman should be in his seat. We do not intend to let this matter slide by, Mr. Chairman, we want answers. We want to know from the hon. gentleman if we are still on target on our retail sales tax, if we are still on target on the gasoline taxes and on the liquor profits, which are the three biggest source of revenues we have apart from the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada provides us with 49 per cent to 50 per cent of revenue. Does the hon. gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) realized that 50 per cent of his salary comes from the people of Canada, 50 per cent of the Premier's salary comes from the people of Canada, 50 per cent of

our budget comes from the people of Canada?

MR. CALLAN

Are you counting the PC Party payment that he gets now as the Premier?

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not counting that. I will leave that to my hon. colleague.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. the Premier can tell us how bad the deficit is going to be at the end of this fiscal year. There is no upturn in the economy. There is no improvement. There are no plans or programmes to stimulate the economy. The trawlermen are still on strike. Fish plant workers are out of jobs. Fishermen do not have enough stamps to get their unemployment insurance. The exchange on the Canadian dollar, which was one of the reasons the hon. gentleman gave for the additional expenditure, because the exchange on the Canadian dollar we have to pay more for the American dollars that we borrowed.

So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman just cannot sit there like a dummy in his seat, or wherever he is, out in the Common Room, while we are asking very serious questions about the economy. When will we get the second quarterly statement?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Very soon.

MR. NEARY:

Very soon. How soon? Will we get it while we are doing this money bill? Will we get it tomorrow? Will we get the financial statement for the second quarter tomorrow?

DR. COLLINS:

No.

MR. NEARY:

Well, when will we get it? Will we get it this week? Will we get it early next week?

MR. CALLAN:

You will get that now the same time as you will get all the jobs the Premier promised in 1979.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He is still getting some data. The second quarter, as you know, it takes much longer than that for the data to be accumulated.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that kind of help and information from the Premier but surely the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can answer a few questions that I raised about the retail sales tax. Are we on target? Will the deficit now at the end of the fiscal year be \$57 million or will it be much more? I am expecting it to be much greater than \$57 million. I think it will go up to \$75 million or \$80 million before the end of the fiscal year. But the minister has preliminary information. He has the data. He can tell us now, if he would only come in and sit in his seat, he can tell us what is happening, Mr. Chairman, regarding these financial matters, which as you know are very, very serious indeed because of the amount of the provincial debt which is close to \$4 billion.

When the Liberals left in 1972 the provincial debt was less than \$800 million and some twelve years later it is \$4 billion or \$4,000 million, Mr. Chairman. It is astounding, absolutely astounding. And the present

Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) used to give us a lecture and scold us when we were on that side of the House about having a debt of \$750 million or \$800 million. Now it is \$4,000 million, \$4 billion, and yet not a peep out of the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister when he stands to answer the questions raised by my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I would like to ask the minister, since it appears that we are not going to get a statement from government with respect to the impact of Mr. Wilson's minibudget, to give us an indication of whether the cutbacks to the fisheries programme of \$11.7 million, which is shown in the statement of expenditure and programme review which was prepared by Mr. de Cotret, I guess the President of the Treasury Board, and which accompanied Mr. Wilson's statement, whether the minister does not agree that this seems to be a fairly petty approach to the matter of developing policy for the fisheries industry when we have the fishing in the state of crisis. We have a matter of great necessity for us to expand the markets for our fishing industry and we see the Government of Canada slashing \$11.7 million away from what programmes? They are not capital programmes to build wharves or plants; these are programmes to assist the development of the fishing industry, the marketing of

products, and the development of marine resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford in this Province to have money taken out of programmes which have been put in place to promote the marketing of fish products. This is a short-sighted approach. If we have to save money, if we have to cut expenditures, this is a short-sighted approach, it is a dangerous approach, it is an approach that should be condemned by members opposite. The fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador are looking at these ladies and gentlemen opposite and they are asking where are their voices fighting to make sure that we see policies coming from the Government of Canada that will improve the situation in the fishing industry. And I would like and I challenge the minister or any member opposite to get up and explain how cutting \$11.7 million away from marketing is going to help the fishing industry.

Mr. Chairman, export promotion, tied in with the marketing of fish products, export promotion as well will see a cutback in expenditures because of this minibudget that has been brought in by Mr. Wilson. Now when we have the inventories, at least the inventories we had before the strike started, and the inventories that will be there again if this trawlermen strike is ever settled - if government ever issues the instructions that it should issue to its Board of Directors on Fisheries Products International once this strike is settled we are going to see the same problem of rising inventories. And we have to see a better approach to export promotion that we have seen in the

past. And what do we see the Government of Canada doing and opposite? Meekingly accepting without a word of protest dollars being cut from a programme that may not be very important to the rest of Canada but that is crucially important to this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the views of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with respect to the industrial incentives programme cutbacks, not a minor amount I might say, Mr. Chairman, \$200 million being cut from programmes designed to promote regional industrial development by providing financial assistance to support private sector initiatives. Now, Mr. Chairman, members opposite, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Premier, have gotten up and praised this new era of cooperation, they have praised this new approach of the Government of Canada where we are going to see cutbacks on government expenditures because the private sector is going to be encouraged, the private sector is going to be nurtured, the private sector is going to be depended upon for job creation. I agree with the recognition of the fact that governments cannot create the numbers of jobs needed to meet the cries of the unemployed in this Province or in the rest of the county. The small businessman and the small businesswoman are the ones who will create these jobs, but here we have the Government of Canada taking \$200 million from programmes designed to support private sector initiatives. Again, it makes no sense. It is crazy. It is totally inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, with what the philosophy of Mr.

Mulroney and his colleagues in Ottawa is supposed to be. They are getting up and espousing the importance of the private sector for job creation and then they turn around and they slash programmes that are geared to support private sector initiatives. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the cutback of \$200 million in this area is something that is going to be of very great advantage to this Province and I ask for members opposite to get up and let us have their views. Have they all been muzzled? Has this conspiracy of silence been extended to cover not just the Premier and the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or have all members opposite been muzzled by Mr. Wilson and his minibudget? Have they been told not to mention a word of criticism? The closest that we have come so far - and I have to commend the member - the closest we have come is the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the Minister of - they shuffle those chairs so quickly.

MR. ROBERTS:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. BARRY:

That is right. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

The closest we have come to a word of criticism is the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands indicated he was disappointed that his provincial Department of Forest Resources and Lands has ended up in Corner Brook where it was supposed to link up with the federal one and the federal department is left back in St. John's. It was an expression of mild disappointment and that is

the closest that members opposite have come so far to indicating that all is not right with that budget of Mr. Wilson, that all is not well in an approach to government which has such an adverse impact upon this Province.

Mr. Speaker, let us refer to a few other departments of government. Well, we know the foam insulation programme, the cutback there. It is too bad they did not cut it back before they put the urea formaldehyde into the homes in the first place and we would have all saved a lot of money, Mr. Chairman. But again there are still homes that could do with insulation and where we could see energy savings as a result, but we see \$1.5 million being removed from this programme designed to assist home owners insulate their homes. Again, a matter that is of importance to a lot of families in this Province.

The employment pension income programme, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the minister's views on this \$30 million that will be cut from that programme. How many Newfoundlanders will be affected and hurt by this cutback of \$30 million? How much of this \$30 million could have gone into the economy of this Province? And again with respect to unemployment insurance, how much of this \$60 million, because they are not going to consider separation payments as earned income in determining unemployment insurance, how much is this going to cost?

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How much is this going to cost the people of this Province?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other question I would like to put to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and that has to do with Kruger coming to Corner Brook.

Up to this point in time we do not know what the Province has given Kruger in the form of financial assistance. We have heard various figures being tossed around but we would like to know if it is \$10 million, \$15 million, \$20 million or \$50 million. What is the amount of the loans and guarantees and financial assistance given to Kruger for taking over the mill in Corner Brook? And, of course, the hon. gentleman was out of his seat but I hope the hon. gentleman intends to tell us about the quarterly statement, about the retail sales tax and the liquor tax.

DR. COLLINS:
I am a real blabbermouth when it comes to that stuff.

MR. NEARY:
And the hon. gentleman might tell us also about the 550 public service positions that were not to be filled. The hon. gentleman might tell us also what has happened to the implementation and recommendations of the Commission on Hospital and Nursing Home Costs. Mr. Chairman, I will have a few words about the Convention Centre probably later on this afternoon.

I would also like to know about these doubtful accounts in the public accounts. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how we are doing now with the outstanding amounts that have been owed to the government by businesses throughout the Province in the area of retail sales tax? It was \$14 million a year and a half or so ago. How are we doing with that? Are we making any effort to collect that amount? The mining tax - there was an outstanding amount of \$13 million, I believe; insurance tax - there was close to \$1 million; and the tobacco tax - there was some outstanding amounts there. So perhaps if the hon. gentleman made a little more of an effort to collect this money then we might not have the deficit in current account that he is forecasting.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other day when I had a few free moments I decided to go through the details of salaries that are being paid, a little bit of research into salaries that are paid in this Province. Now the hon. gentleman and the administration there opposite have imposed a restraint programme on NAPE and on the public service employees. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are all aware that there is a little technique that is used by top management to get reclassified. They do not call them increases, they reclassify them now and move them up the line.

MR. HODDER:
Like musical chairs.

MR. NEARY:
Yes. And I think a fair amount of that has gone on in the last couple of years. While NAPE cannot negotiate because there is a restraint programme for the

people in the lower income brackets - the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) should listen to this - in the lower income brackets they have a freeze on, but the higher echelon has reclassify themselves and get big fat salaries. So I decided the other day to take a look to see what kind of people and how many we have who are drawing salaries, say, over \$45,000. First of all, I cannot get the figures on the Chairman of the Churchill Falls Corporation, they will not give us that figure here in the House but I would imagine that is quite substantial. The Chairman of Newfoundland Hydro, we have not had an updating on that in recent years. I would think that is somewhat in the vicinity of \$90,000 to \$100,000 a year, anywhere from \$90,000 to \$100,000. But that does not include the insurance benefits and the other perks that the gentleman got before he went over to Fisheries Products International. The Ombudsman, \$59,762 for correcting government mistakes, mistakes made by ministers. That is not the Ombudsman's fault, but all he can do is correct mistakes and blunders made by ministers.

Senior Policy Advisor to the Premier, \$50,711.

MR. TULK:
Not worth five cents.

MR. NEARY:
Press Secretary to the Premier, \$44,179; Secretary to the Cabinet, just listen to this one, \$70,749.

MR. WARREN:
Who is that for?

MR. SIMMS:
What about the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. NEARY:

Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet, \$57,505; Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet Deputy Clerk, \$53,743; Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet Social Policy, \$53,743; Assistant Deputy Clerk of the Executive Council, \$44,179; Assistant Deputy Clerk of the Executive Clerk, \$44,179 again; Statistician, \$44,179; Secretary of Treasury Board, \$57,348; Assistant Secretary to Treasury Board, Financial, \$56,862; Assistant Secretary to Treasury Board, Personnel, \$55,192; Director of Classification and Pay, his little rewards for reclassifying all these people and making sure there are put up in the higher echelon, his salary as Director of Classification and Pay, \$48,687; Director of Government Insurance, \$42,000. And listen to this, Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, a branch of the Premier's Office that is unnecessary, redundant, it does not accomplish one thing, the Deputy Minister of that department, \$67,348. And they have an Assistant Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. TULK:

How much does that cost?

MR. NEARY

\$57,705. And they also have a Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, economic and social programmes, \$69,664; and they have a Director of DREE Liaison, \$46,380; Director of Protocol.

MR. TULK

Who?

MR. NEARY:

Director of Protocol, \$42,089.

MR. TULK:

What does he do?

MR. NEARY:

To listen to this, Mr. Chairman, you would not know but we were the United Nations or we were representing the United States. We have also a Chief of Protocol, who is on a contractual basis, Chief Protocol Officer, \$32,760. Director of Protocol, \$42,089.

MR. STEWART:

He is worth more than that.

MR. NEARY:

Chief Protocol Officer, \$32,760. Director of Communications, \$38,000.

MR. NEARY:

Deputy Minister of Finance, \$69,000; two Assistant Deputy Ministers of Finance, \$58,500; Director of Debt Management, \$40,000, and on and on it goes, Mr. Chairman. The Comptroller General - \$67,348; the Deputy Minister of Public Works - not exactly on welfare - \$61,716; Associate Deputy Minister of Public Works - now I can understand with that minister why they need so much back up - \$60,170; and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works (Administration) - \$51,429; and another Assistant Deputy Minister of Public Works - no wonder! The hon. gentleman is so incompetent that he needs all this back-up, Mr. Chairman - who is responsible for Property Management and Accommodations - \$51,000; the Public Service Commission Chairman, a political appointment, \$61,716; Vice-Chairman - \$48,500; and a commissioner - \$47,000; the Deputy Minister of Development - \$67,348; the commissioner of Housing - \$61,716; a special advisor to the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) -

\$67,348; Director of Staff and Specialty Teams Development - \$50,500; Industrial Development Officer - \$51,000; Deputy Minister of Mines and Energy - \$67,500; Assistant Deputy Minister of Energy - \$58,500; Executive Director of Mines and Energy - \$67,348; Assistant Deputy Minister of the Petroleum Directorate - \$58,500; Assistant Deputy Minister, again on the Petroleum Directorate, they have two, apparently, over there - \$58,500. Not bad, Mr. Chairman. Chief Petroleum Geologist - \$54,000; the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, not doing too bad either - \$65,390. They have three assistants there. What are they making? They are all making \$54,500.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I just want to add a few brief words to this debate. It is always a pleasure, of course, to follow the Leader of the Opposition - the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I am sorry. I am so used to referring to him as the Leader of the Opposition because he did such a magnificent job over there as leader and I know there are many in that party who wish that he still were the Leader of the Opposition. In any event, he has shown on many occasions, as I know he always will, his leadership abilities. It is a pleasure to follow him in any debate. He always tends to

liven it up a bit although what he has just said for the last ten minutes is absolutely irrelevant to what we are suppose to be discussing here today. It is a favourite tactic of his on occasions when he is not prepared to speak in any great depth on any particular debate, he simply gets a list of things and reads it all off and wastes the ten minutes that he is allowed. You would swear he had never spoken in the House before. In any event, he does, sometimes, tend to liven up the debate and it is a pleasure to be able to follow him.

Mr. Chairman, some of the comments that have been made here today in this debate are kind of interesting, I find. They are, opposite, using words like 'muzzling' and sort of insinuating that we have been muzzled on this side with respect to the statement delivered by Mr. Wilson last Thursday evening. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that the word 'muzzle' is not in the dictionary for our side at least, and never has been, and I think if anything we have been accused of being too outspoken on all those occasions. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), of course, is very well aware of it. It is a word not in our vocabulary but it is obviously a word in their vocabulary because they use it inside out everyday in Question Period and in debate. Mr. Chairman, all you have to do is reflect on debates in this House in the last few years in particular and see if you can recall if members on the other side of the House, very often if at all, attacked or criticized the former Liberal administration on any aspect of policy, on budgets, or anything else. So if there are people expert with respect to the

word 'muzzle', then it would have to be the members from the other side.

Really, Mr. Chairman, all we have heard for the last few minutes and few days is nothing but petty foolishness, I suppose that is about the best you can call it. It is certainly nothing more than rhetoric and it is really an attempt to deflect attention away from their own inadequacies over there and their own inability to be able to ask questions related to provincial government policy because, after all, what we are discussing and debating here today is a supplementary supply bill as it applies to funding for various government departments in the Province. All their questions and all their debate, I suppose, over the last few days in particular have been addressed to the provincial government about the federal government's financial statement. So it is obviously clear that they lack the ability to be able to ask detailed questions as they relate to provincial government policy or in fact their abilities to be able to direct anything of any substance as it relates to our government. So it is all pure rhetoric, an opportunity for them to try to deflect attention away from their own inability and I suppose they will attempt to do it as often as they can. I rose, Mr. Chairman, really just to address a couple of questions that have been raised in the debate with respect to a couple of issues in particular. And I refer to the Kruger question that I believe the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) raised a little earlier, asking. I think in essence what is happening with it or where it sits.

MR. NEARY:

No, what financial assistance they were given.

MR. STIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, all those questions, of course, will be answered at the appropriate time. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is well aware of that. The process, after a great deal of effort on the part of this government and the Premier, and a number of senior public servants who have spent a considerable amount of time on this issue over the last year or year and a half, has reached the stage now where we can pretty well be assured that by the end of this month or thereabouts, somewhere close to that time we hope, the whole matter will be put to rest and put to bed. And questions such as that raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will obviously be answered in more detail at that time. But I can tell members of the House of Assembly that the situation now is that the unions, of course, have reached an agreement with Kruger. That was one of the major hurdles and after a very responsible series of negotiations on all parts they were able to successfully conclude those negotiations. Other matters that still remain include the signing of a federal/provincial remodernization agreement between the two governments, the signing then of an agreement between the two governments and the company with respect to that same modernization programme, approval from FIRA or Investment Canada, I guess, as it is now known, which is in the system and should come about in due course without any undue delay, and other matters of that nature. Some legal jargon has to be put in place and put together, dotting of 'i's and

crossing of 't's and matters of that nature. But hopefully in the matter of a few weeks or so the whole process will be put to place and I trust and hope that the efforts of this government in bringing this about will be recognized at the appropriate time.

The other matter that was raised, I believe by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), dealt with the forestry center and the fact that I somehow was very weak in my criticism of the federal government with respect to their decision to place the movement of that center on a deferred basis. I can say to the Leader of the Opposition that in his mind, and perhaps in the mind of some others, I admit, the position that I took publicly may have been, in his view, not as strong as he would like to have seen. But I would remind him also that in the past we did not have the opportunity to meet with federal ministers on any kind of a regular basis, did not have the opportunity to meet them on short notice face to face and express our concerns and our criticisms. So therefore it became more notable, I suppose, in the public eye, and with respect to media coverage of those kinds of issues. We now have a different situation where there is a tremendous amount of co-operation on the part of both governments. I can use as an example my own communications with the federal Minister of Forestry, Mr. Merithew, whereby three weeks ago I met with him in Ottawa and put forth the government's position which has not changed at all with respect to the forestry center. It has not changed one iota. We still maintain the position that we had at the time that we made our own commitment in

response to Mr. Tobin's promise to the people of Corner Brook in November of 1982, two years ago, which, by the way, he failed to deliver on, and now he is trying to weasel out of it some way by shifting the blame onto us or onto the new federal government. He is the one who made the promise and commitment in November of 1982, two years ago, and he was unable to deliver on it. So if he had been able to deliver and had had any influence in the federal government which he was a part of at the time then we would not even be facing this particular situation because the matter would have been cleared and the project hopefully, would have been underway. In any event, we proceeded to fulfil our part of the commitment to the people of Corner Brook, moved our forestry personnel over there; they are now all in place, I have met with them on a couple of occasions and I think things are working out quite nicely over there. Obviously it would be more practical and sensible if the federal Forestry Research Center was located in the same place. So I just wanted to say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that I met with Mr. Merithew two weeks ago. My colleagues, the Minister of Education, the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) two weeks ago went to Ottawa and met with Mr. Merithew and expressed their grave concern and their position on the matter and, again, I was there just a few days ago and met with Mr. Merithew for a three hour meeting. In just the last three weeks I have had two meetings with him face to face and expressed our concern. He pointed out to me quite clearly that what has transpired with respect to Mr. Wilson's financial statement is

that they looked at projects and placed them in three categories: One was a category where they would proceed on those projects where there were formal agreements already signed and in place or work had already been underway; two, there were numerous projects that were cancelled, outright, absolutely cancelled; and then there were a few projects that were deferred and Corner Brook was in that particular category.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Chairman, this is about the third time today now we have heard about this great consultative process that is going on between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. As far as I can determine, what the Premier and the President of the Executive Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) mean when they refer to this consultation which takes place and this new era of cooperation, is that they go up to Ottawa and they go into the minister's office up there, or the Prime Minister's office and they sit down and they are told what is going to happen and they accept it.

MR. SIMMS:
Wishful thinking.

MR. BARRY:
Well, before the minister leaves maybe he can tell us to what extent his consultations affected the decision of the Minister of Forestry for Canada (Mr. Merithew), which had already been made, that the Forestry Center was not moving from St. John's. That was a firm, sacred promise that the Prime Minister of Canada made. I think the voter expects in his or her heart that there will be some inability to follow-through with election promises. But when the Leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, in the course of an election campaign gives his solemn word to the people of a constituency that something is going to happen and then the day after he is elected he says, 'No, I will not live up to my word', now that is not getting off to a very good start in terms of keeping faith with the people of this country or the people of this Province. I think that was my biggest disappointment in the recent statement by Mr. Wilson, is that we saw the Prime Minister of Canada cynically, ruthlessly, cold-heartedly was prepared to reject these promises that he had made, that he had given to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, not in the heat of political oratory, not in the course of a political rally where you could expect that a person might get carried away and might have to backtrack a little bit afterwards, but no, this was a statement given to the Conservative candidate running out there. The man came back after meeting with the Prime Minister and said, 'I have it from the Leader of the Conservative party

that this move will take place and,' he said, 'I will resign my seat if it does not take place.' Within days after the election we see all of this changed. Now that is cynicism carried to new extremes, to new heights. Unfortunately, I suppose fortunately for this side of the House, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will recognize the cynicism that exists on the opposite side of the House as well for being party to such a farce and not criticizing it. Mr. Chairman, again this consultation that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) referred to, I guess it is the same consultation that has taken place with respect to the Gulf ferry. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to go up in a couple of days to consult on Gulf ferry rates and anybody who wants to call up the press secretary for the federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski), the minister's press secretary will tell them, 'Yes, these are the rates, they are now in place' My colleagues did it this morning. They called up the minister's office and they were told, 'Yes, these rates are now in place.' And members and ministers opposite expect the people of this Province to believe that there is consultation underway? No, Mr. Speaker, that is not consultation. The Government of Canada is dictating to the government opposite. The Government of Canada is telling the Premier and the ministers of his Cabinet what will take place. More than that, Mr. Speaker, he has arrived at an agreement with them that they will maintain a silence and they will not tell the people of this Province the true affect of these savage cutbacks. And there is the continuation of

this conspiracy of silence that existed with respect to energy, or we thought it was only with respect to energy before the election, but apparently the conspiracy goes further and it extends to the forestry centre and to cutbacks in fishing programmes and to cutbacks in unemployment insurance and on and on. Now, either it is a conspiracy willingly, whole-heartedly entered into by members opposite, or else, Mr. Chairman, we have a sadder picture; we have a picture of members opposite being told, being threatened. Let us be nice to members opposite, let us give them the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Chairman, and to do so we must assume that what has happened is that the Prime Minister of Canada is dangling this offshore agreement, which, of course, we know the government, the Premier and the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) have based the entire future of this Province around. Nothing can be done. We do not have any money for the fishing industry, we do not have any money to create jobs, Mr. Chairman. The labour force flash sheet for October shows an increase in unemployment of 20.5 per cent over last year. And we have this silence on the part of members opposite, we have this cynical conspiracy of silence on the part of members opposite!

Mr. Chairman, giving them the benefit of the doubt, we can only assume that because all of their political eggs have been placed in the basket of offshore oil and gas, they are terrified because they have lost their bargaining power and they are completely at the mercy of the Prime Minister of Canada. They went to court and they lost the offshore case. Talk about taking your destiny in your

own hands! Have they ever, Mr. Chairman, got their destiny in their own hands now. Have they ever. They are completely dependent upon what Mr. Mulroney agrees to give. Perhaps that is what is happening - maybe I am being unkind to members opposite - perhaps what is happening is that they have been told, "Keep quiet or no offshore agreement." And no offshore agreement means no re-election. That is the bottom line that these members opposite see. And, Mr. Chairman, even with an offshore agreement we are going to have to find out what is in that agreement. And while this House remains open, and we hope it remains open until Christmas Eve, we are going to see whether there is enough in that offshore agreement that is going to merit the people of this Province putting their trust once again in the members opposite. We will see whether an offshore agreement, Mr. Chairman, has enough in the way of reward for the people of this Province to justify once again the Province putting its trust in these people who are sitting back quietly and permitting these savage cuts, these savage attacks upon established programmes. And, Mr. Chairman, we are going to see something else, this is only the minibudget wait until we see the main event. This is just a preliminary bout. Wait until the Prime Minister of Canada tells members opposite that he is going to take a look at the universality of some of our social programmes. Are we still going to see this conspiracy of silence then?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, when I hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) speak on the other side of the House, I really just cannot get used to it. It is a great disappointment every time I see the hon. gentleman over there and I just cannot believe that the hon. gentleman has gone from where he went in the Cabinet to a private member, over to the Opposition and now is Leader of the Opposition, and just about every word the hon. gentleman says is inconsistent with what he said over here. I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, it will be a very interesting comparison in the Hansards, the records of this House, when the hon. gentleman was over here and when he was on the other side. To hear the hon. gentleman talk about the Prime Minister of Canada being a great disappointment. He says he gives his word to the people of a constituency that something will happen and then when he is elected he says it will not happen, and he is very disappointed in that. Well, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, does the hon. gentleman understand disappointed constituents might feel if they were elected a Conservative, or for that matter a Liberal - and that person, elected as a Conservative, very freely crossed over and becomes a Liberal. Now, Mr. Chairman, you cannot have it both ways. The hon. gentleman, either way you look at it, has breached faith with his constituents. If the hon. gentleman wanted to run and represent the Liberal opposition, one would think that the hon. gentleman would have had the courage to resign first, then run as a Liberal, even as Leader of the Opposition in the district of Mount Scio, and see whether the hon. gentleman then would be

elected. He talks about people talking out of two sides of their mouth. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman in this Assembly has talked from two sides of this hon. House in breach of faith with the members of his constituency. And he has the consummate gall to get up here in this House and talk about being disappointed with this particular decision.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that, a lot has been stated in recent times with respect to the Forestry Centre in Corner Brook. I would re-emphasize what the Minister Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has indicated, that this decision has merely been deferred. The fact of the matter is that the federal government found when they took over the government of this country that we were on the precipice of a disaster with a huge deficit that was going to drag this country down the drain. And the place that feels it worse when the financial conditions of this country are bad is the Province of Newfoundland. So the Province of Newfoundland has a greater interest than any other part of Canada in seeing the financial affairs of this country put on a proper and a firm foundation.

So it has only been deferred, as well as many other projects in the country, as a result of the made spending of the previous administration. Now in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, what has happened? The hon. gentleman does not mention that within a very short period of time of taking power that the present federal government has supplied \$7 million additional that was necessary in order to give effect to the agreement of Kruger and Bowaters.

Before the hon. gentleman speaks about one thing, I think he should bear in mind other benefits that have occurred. And I can say, being privy to the negotiations that went on with Kruger and the Kruger takeover, that the Premier of this Province, by the way, is more responsible for Kruger being in Corner Brook than any other agency or any other body or any other person -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- and that will be brought out in the debate on the bill that will eventually be led into this House. But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, we met nothing but utter frustration with Mr. Tobin, now cloaked in his cloak of righteousness, when we were asking Mr. Tobin, and the government of which he was a member, to beef up a bit the modernization programme so that we would have the money to be able to give to Kruger to operate in Corner Brook, and we had no answer at all. We got no answer.

MR. SIMMS:

Right.

MR. MARSHALL:

But within a short period of a few weeks, Mr. Chairman, not a few months, \$7 million was put into Corner Brook. As a result of the efforts of the federal government and the provincial government, today Corner Brook has a future where this time last year there was just a dismal outlook for Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Today it has a viable long-term

future. So I say to the people of Corner Brook, I say to the hon. gentlemen there opposite when they are talking about a deferral of a project in Corner Brook, which is amongst many in this country that has had to be taken in order to save the economic health of the country itself, as a matter of fact, rescue it from disaster, they should balance off one against the other. The fact is that \$7 million has been put in there.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) mentions the offshore agreement and our putting our eggs in one basket. I am very interested to hear that. I notice the hon. gentleman has been silent since this House has reconvened about the offshore accord and agreement. The only indication I have of the hon. gentleman's attitude towards it was that he was reported during as before that leadership convention as saying, I think, 'Yes, we support it.' Now if the hon. gentleman on the other side says he is going to support it, that is fine. But let us not forget that people are bound by their actions, and bound by history, and the hon. gentleman apparently left this Cabinet under the guise that the procedures that were being set up would not result in an agreement. Now that they have resulted in an agreement, and that furthermore the hon. gentleman says that he is going to support it, he owes a duty to this House, he owes a duty to his constituents, and he owes a duty to the people of Newfoundland to explain why he left the Cabinet, why he crossed the House, and why he is now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). This same man is appalled by his interpretation of the so-called actions of the Prime Minister of this country when he was Leader of

the Opposition promising one thing, finding the cupboard bare when he went in there, rescuing Corner Brook and rescuing this Province in the meantime, but having to merely defer a promise that he made, this is the same gentleman who is appalled by it. I say to him the people of Mount Scio and the people of Newfoundland are appalled by the antics of the hon. gentleman. Because if the hon. gentleman is astounded at that and has great disappointment over that, how much more, Mr. Chairman, should not the hon. gentleman be really disappointed about somebody who is elected with one party, be he a Liberal, and he crosses over and becomes leader of the other party in exactly the same session. If he is disappointed with that flip-flop, about his own well what a flip flop? I just say this, what a sad day it has been, Mr. Chairman, for this great party, the Liberal Party? How many leaders have they gone through since Mr. Smallwood? It went from Roberts to Rowe to Jamieson to Stirling to Neary. Then they looked around to see who they could elect, they could not find anyone to elect, Mr. Chairman, so they had to choose a jealous Tory. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the whole reason why the hon. gentleman is on the other side of this House. Events have shown the only reason why the hon. gentleman is on the other side of the House was he could not accept the leadership decision of the Conservative Party in 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

There is no other reason for it. He has no other platform. He can get over there every day of the

week and emit his inconsistencies, as he did in the last speech before this House, and dig farther the grave of the Liberal Party of this Province, which they very richly deserve. Because, Mr. Chairman, he is the undertaker of the Liberal Party. The hon. gentleman from Tornat Mountains (Mr. Warren) knows it. Certainly the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) knows it. He, Mr. Chairman, is going to be the undertaker of the Liberal Party in this Province and so he should be. The people of this Province do not appreciate opportunism, and opportunism is what we have been greeted with by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Imagine the gall of the individual getting up here in the House and saying he is disappointed with the Prime Minister promising one thing and delivering another. He does not get up and mention the fact that \$7 million was poured into Corner Brook in very hard times for this country. He does not mention the fact that Corner Brook now has a future where before it did not. No, he does not care about that, Mr. Chairman. All he cares about is his great, avaricious desire to get to the leadership or the Premiership of this Province, and that is the sum total and the bottom line. And he will not do it, Mr. Chairman. Instead he will dig the grave a little bit deeper.

Now having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the House we are on supplementary supply, we are talking about merely \$44 million, a little bit more than 2 per cent of the total budget and, here again if the hon. gentlemen there opposite were honest, they would be singing the praises of the Hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for being able to budget in this fashion, for keeping and

safeguarding the credit of this Province which other provinces have not been able to. This is the most depressed Province in Canada. In the past two or three years we have maintained our credit rating. New Brunswick has gone down, Nova Scotia has gone down and Quebec Hydro, to whom the hon. gentlemen there opposite, when they were in power, gave the great Churchill Falls resource, even that has been in jeopardy and has gone down. So, the hon. gentlemen, I would suggest, would be better off if they got on the subject that is before the House, and that is supplementary supply. Enquire, will you, why, for instance, we took over the education debt, why Consolidated Fund Services required more? There are being no questions asked, just the opportunists on the other side speaking. So, Chairman, I hope that we will see the level of debate raised a little bit in this committee and I hope we will get down now to the basic questions that are before us. And I hope that never again will we hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) get up and make statements like that, and I hope in future in debate he will explain his inconsistencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Now, boys, listen, do not be nasty now. Be nice over there. There is only one thing wilder than their imaginations over on that side and that is their mouths, Mr. Chairman. That is the only thing that is wilder than their imagination. The Government House Leader, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) asked that the debate should take a higher level. Well,

he is down, so it should. Anybody else who stands up in this House will probably raise the debate above the level that the President of the Council keeps it at. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) , in speaking on this bill, pointed out the great consultative process that is now going on in Ottawa. He went up and he sat down and he listened to the federal Forestry Minister (Mr. Merithew) tell him that the Forestry Research Project, which was promised, guaranteed, a sacred trust, by Brian Mulroney, that it was going to be transferred to Corner Brook would not be. He went out with the Tory candidate out in Corner Brook and said, 'It is coming, make no mistake about it, it is coming.' And that gentleman, I believe in good faith, that gentleman in Corner Brook, believed him. And now the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands had to go to Ottawa, was sat down and told that it is not going to Grand Falls, not going in there at all. And he sits back and takes that for the good of his government. The Premier tells him to be quite. And then he is told that it is not going to Corner Brook either, it is being deferred. Now, let me ask him a question. Did the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew) tell him, when he was in Ottawa, that at the same time he was deferring Corner Brook he was making an announcement on two similar forestry research centers, one of which, I believe, was in St. John, New Brunswick.

MR. SIMMS:
He did.

MR. TULK:
And you sat in your seat and took that. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) must be close to

right, there must be something strangely wrong with this crowd over there. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands for Newfoundland (Mr. Simms) knew all about the two research stations in New Brunswick and he sat back and allowed the federal minister to put them in his own province. He did not cancel his own. You allowed him to put them in his own province and at the same time defer the one for Corner Brook. Now is that not a shame? What a shame. This is the crowd that stands up for Newfoundland. This is the crowd that gets over there and looks across this way, and says, 'Why do you not stand up for Newfoundland?' He wanted a list of the number of times that we have opposed the federal Liberal government, when there was a Liberal government in Ottawa. He is going to get it. We will have our research people brief him, bring him up to date, tell him exactly the number of times that we have.

MR. NEARY:
I believe the hon. gentleman will remember something I said about a federal minister, not trusting him as far as I could throw him. Who was it said that?

MR. TULK:
He does not remember that.

MR. SIMMS:
That is not everybody, that is not the Liberal Party.

MR. NEARY:
But I happened to be the leader at the time.

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. NEARY:
Who was it that said that De Bane

was a liar?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
What we are seeing here is an indication of a crew that are in serious trouble on this offshore issue. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is right, they are in serious trouble on the offshore, they are in serious trouble financially and they have been told by Brian Mulroney, their 'Brian' up in Ottawa, that fellow up along, and I guess they have all been told by the other 'Brian' as well, "Now, boys, we have to keep quiet or otherwise 'Brian' in Ottawa is going to pull the carpet out from under 'Brian' in St. John's." That is what has been going on.

As I told the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), there is only one thing wilder than his mouth and that is his imagination, that is all. He should be quiet because everytime he opens his mouth he makes a bigger fool of himself, than he has already made.

When the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was the leader on this side, how many times in one day did you have to bring the hon. gentleman to order?

MR. NEARY:
Thirty-odd times.

MR. TULK:
Thirty-odd times he interrupted this House. You should be quiet and listen, you might learn something.

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) stands up over there and talks about the federal deficit,

the state that the federal Liberal government left Ottawa in, left this country in. Well, he would be much better advised to be more concerned about the mess that the present Tory administration of this Province has left this Province in. He should have his own house in order before he starts talking about the former Liberal government in Ottawa.

MR. STEWART:
This Province is not in a mess.

MR. TULK:
This Province is not in a mess! Did you hear the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) this evening going through and telling this House about a \$4 billion deficit? We owe \$4 billion, close to \$7,000 for every man, woman and child in this Province. One out of seven, I believe you said, or one out of six?

MR. NEARY:
One out of seven.

MR. TULK:
One out of every seven dollars is used to pay our interest on the debt. And they have the gall to stand up on that side of the House and talk about the mess that the federal Liberal Party left the country in. They should, Mr. Chairman, get their own house in order.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no need to wonder why the financial affairs of this Province are in such a mess. Besides the incompetence of the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), there is nothing else happening in any of the departments over there. There are a few questions that we have to ask the Acting Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) about what is happening to fishermen's

unemployment as a result of the cuts. He should stand up in this debate - if not, he is going to have to do it in Question Period - he should stand up and tell us what is happening in the Unemployment Insurance Commission that is going to affect fishermen of this Province. What is going to happen there? Is there anything on that? Has he been told at this point by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration - what is her name? - that is 'Flora'.

MR. NEARY:
Flora McDonald.

MR. TULK:
That is the 'flora' and the fauna.

MR. NEARY:
The seasonal fisher folk.

MR. TULK:
The fisher folk.

MR. NEARY:
The fisher folk.

MR. TULK:
Is she going to see, as she says, that the fisher folk get projects this Fall so that they can draw unemployment insurance this Winter?

MR. NEARY:
She is not going to do anything.

MR. TULK:
Has he made representation to her on that? Has he tried to get a few dollars into the pockets of people who have seen the worst year that they have seen in a long, long time in the Newfoundland fishery? Is he going to answer those questions. Are they pushing for that?

MR. YOUNG:
No wonder the young people become dropouts with teachers like you.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Kindergarten gave us the answer to that one, supposedly, Grade XII. Her Grade XII is going to solve the problems of dropouts in this Province. We now have a new minister down there, a bright looking young fellow in what is it? - Career Development. They took him clear of the budworm and turned him over on the kids of this Province.

MR. NEARY:
Do not forget the woolly beetle or whatever it is called.

MR. TULK:
Woolly aphid. We have the Minister of Kindergarten, the Acting Minister of Fisheries, and I do not believe he is a good actor. But in any case, there has been no economic development in this Province, no economic activity at all going on in this Province, Mr. Chairman. And as a result, we find, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) so rightly pointed out today, a 20 per cent increase over the number of unemployed people in this Province as compared to last year. Last year all we heard from them was belly-aching about Ottawa and now they are up there holding hands, kissing and dancing around the corridors with each other, loving each other up, and, 'Brian, you do it to Newfoundland.' What is it you were saying today about what Brian Mulroney and Brian Peckford had done to Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY:
Mulroney is demanding blood and our Brian is putting their heads on the chopping block and saying, take all you want.

MR. TULK:
Yes, one Brian demands blood and the other Brian puts Newfoundland

on the chopping block and says, take all the blood you need, boy. Vampires. They should be called the vampires of the Newfoundland economy.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted previously I was giving out some salaries in this Province that I thought people might be interested in. For some reason or other, people are always interested in salaries that are being paid. Especially if you have a freeze on the public service, a freeze on the ordinary workers, the lower strata wonder, 'Well, how are the higher echelon fairing out?'. So I got down to the Chief Petroleum Geologist, I believe - \$54,200; chief production engineer - \$55,000; the Deputy Minister of Fisheries - \$65,390; and there are three Assistant Deputy Ministers of Fisheries, three. The hon. gentleman had three assistant deputies.

MR. WARREN:

And what happened to them?

MR. NEARY:

They are still there at a cost of fifty-four and a half thousand dollars. Chairman of the Fisheries Loan Board - \$54,421; Chairman of the Fishery Industry Advisory Board - \$56,571.

MR. YOUNG:

Valdmanis got that twenty years

ago.

MR. NEARY:

Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands - \$54,368.

MR. YOUNG:

And then he ran away with \$500 million.

MR. NEARY:

The Deputy of Forest Resources and Lands - \$61,716; the Deputy Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development - \$68,527; the Deputy Minister of Transportation - \$61,716 and on and on it goes, Mr. Chairman. I could go all the way down the line. I have quite a list here. I am not going to read them all, but this should give members and the people of this Province a good indication of what is happening in the higher echelon of government as compared to what is happening to people with low income, people in the low income brackets.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he gave his quarterly statement, and when he brought down his budget, told the people of this Province that one of the main items that they were concentrating on was restraint and cutbacks and to eliminate waste and extravagance. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to give the House an example of how this administration are practicing what they are preaching, and I am referring to the government motor pool that previously came under the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young).

The motor pool, as hon. members know, is in the process of being disbanded, if it is not already gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It is gone.

MR. NEARY:

It is gone. The government motor pool, where ministers used to get their cars and their chauffeurs -

MR. YOUNG:

And you used to abuse it.

MR. MORGAN:

What?

MR. YOUNG:

We let him have them three or four times and he abused it.

MR. NEARY:

- where they have their children driven to school and they have their spouses driven to the supermarkets, where all that used to happen -

MR. YOUNG:

Name one time that that has happened.

MR. NEARY:

- that has been disbanded now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YOUNG:

Name once that that has happened.

MR. NEARY:

And we were told that the government was going to save some money. But what have they done with the cars? The cars that are left over, what have they done with the cars?

MR. STEWART:

What have they done with them?

MR. NEARY:

I will tell the hon. gentleman what they have done with them. Did they sell them? Did they auction them off to try to buy a few crutches or wheelchairs for

crippled children in this Province? Did they auction them off? Did they sell them off?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did they do with them?

MR. NEARY:

They disbanded the motor pool, they told us they were going to save money, ministers would no longer have that privilege. But they disbanded the pool, by the way, ministers can now hire taxis, they can hire taxis or they can hire couriers to run their errands for them, to do their messages, to take somebody to the supermarket, to take somebody to school, or take somebody to a night club on the weekend, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YOUNG:

And to take your press releases all over town.

MR. NEARY:

Now they can hire taxis to do that. That was one thing that happened when they disbanded the motor pool. But what did they do with the cars?

MR. STEWART:

Who?

MR. NEARY:

Can the hon. gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage tell me what the administration he supports did with the cars?

MR. STEWART:

I hope they put them back in the departments where they belonged.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman hopes they put them back in the departments. Well, I will tell the hon. gentleman what they did with them. In a letter to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry)

dated November 6, 1984 - I want hon. gentlemen there opposite to listen to this - "Re motor pool vehicles: Dear Mr. Barry: As part of our ongoing efforts to reduce costs, government during the last budget" -

MR. MATTHEWS:

How come it was not written to you?

MR. NEARY:

They would not let me use the cars when I was there, by the way.

MR. YOUNG:

You abused them.

MR. NEARY:

Is that so?

MR. YOUNG:

You abused them.

MR. NEARY:

Is that so? The hon. gentleman is dreaming. It is a pipe dream.

MR. YOUNG:

You have the right to use them and you abused it.

MR. NEARY:

"Government during the last budget process decided to disband the motor pool of the Department of Public Works and Services. Studies carried out by Treasury Board indicated that the services being provided by the motor pool could be carried out more economically and efficiently by other means. As part of the disbanding process, the vehicles that made up the motor pool are being distributed to the departments of government for use by officials in place of the loaner service that was previously available. In this regard, government has decided to allocate one of these vehicle to the official Opposition. The vehicle

is a 1981 Chevrolet Malibu, and is currently parked at my department's depot in the White Hills. All required maintenance and repairs to the vehicles will be carried out by my department's mechanical staff and charges will be made back against your estimates for parts only. In addition, fuel for the vehicle can be obtained at any department of Transportation facility throughout the Province and again this item will be charged back against your estimates at cost.

"As a further aid, a credit card for fuel purchases and small incidental maintenance expenses for after hours usage is also available through my department. For full information relative to maintenance arrangements, fuel and credit card usage, please contact Mr. Neil Payne, Vehicle Fleet Management, at 737-3143.

"With respect to replacement of the vehicle, at some future time the government's policy is to replace these vehicles according to MC-907 '84. Executive cars may be replaced at either 120,000 kilometers or four years depending on the condition as reported by the mechanical division of the Department of Transportation. Again, to rearrange replacement through the approved process, please contact Mr. Payne."

What they have done now, Mr. Chairman, the ministers have given themselves their own private vehicle, credit card, maintenance allowances and so forth.

MR. YOUNG:

Table that when you are finished with it.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I will. We discussed it in

our caucus and here is the reply from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). It is an admirable reply. "Dear Mr. Dawe:" -

MR. SIMMS:

When did he send it?

MR. NEARY:

It was delivered by hand today. "Dear Mr. Minister: Thank you for your letter of November 6, 1984 offering the Opposition office the use of one of the vehicles from the disbanded motor pool. I must refuse your offer. It is the position of the Liberal caucus that these vehicles from the disbanded motor pool should be sold and the proceeds put toward helping the disadvantaged in the Newfoundland society.

"For example, there are children in this Province not receiving sufficient funding for proper crutches and wheel chairs, senior citizens with inadequate funds for dentures, widows with inadequate funds to meet their fuel requirements for the coming Winter, and many, many families with inadequate funds to supply proper nutrition their children. We strongly protest this additional extravagance and waste on the part of the administration and we ask that you take action" - the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) take action - "to see that this policy is reversed."

Mr. Chairman, I am going to table this correspondence and I say hear, hear, to the reply given by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). And, Mr. Chairman, I hope that as a result of the example set by the Leader of the Opposition ministers will forego that little perk, that little additional perk they are going to get of owning their own private

motor cars, their own private vehicles at the expense of the taxpayers of this Province, and given their own credit cards, and given an allocation to maintain and operate the cars.

MR. YOUNG:

Are you going to cut down on the phone bill this year, the highest phone bill that any Opposition the Province ever had?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I hope they will follow the example of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Because I am sure the teachers and NAPE and the people who are placed under restraint by this administration will be interested in seeing what they are trying to do, give themselves another little perk, give themselves their own private vehicles.

MR. SIMMS:

Who is going to deliver your press releases now?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, when I was leader of the Opposition I was not allowed to use the motor pool.

MR. YOUNG:

You did so.

MR. NEARY:

No, I did not.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

You did so. You used it and you abused it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY:

Produce the evidence. My hon. friend shoots from the hip. Let him put the goods on the table. He cannot do it.

MR. YOUNG:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

The hon. gentleman did use and abuse the car pool and I had to issue restrictions to cut him out and he was not allowed the use of it any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Now, now!

MR. MORGAN:

Now, you talk about it. The sanctimony of it all.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

To the point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who just got up and made that low, slimy statement, I challenge the hon. gentleman now to lay on the table of this House the number of times that the motor pool was used by me when I was Leader of the Opposition. And if the hon. gentleman cannot back up what he says, then he should be man enough, if he has the courage, to withdraw what he said and apologize to this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon.

the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

The hon. gentleman never had the guts, Mr. Chairman, to write me. He wrote the Premier's office and I had to reply. I have no log, but it was abused by, as he was then, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). There were no letters to me, Mr. Chairman. I got no letters, because he did not have the guts to write to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! order, please!

Before I hear any more argument on that point of order, I will have to ask the minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) to please withdraw the word 'guts' as it has been ruled unparliamentary many times.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, I will, Mr. Chairman, and use the words 'intestinal fortitude'.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, you cannot make wild, irresponsible statements in this House, as stupid as your are. Ministers like the hon. gentleman, you can forgive them anything else, but you cannot forgive them for being stupid. You cannot make wild, irresponsible accusations and charges against members of this House unless you are prepared to back it up.

MR. MORGAN:

It is true, you wrote the Premier on it.

MR. TOBIN:

The hon. minister told the truth and it hurts.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman just admitted that he does not have the log because there is no log. And the hon. gentleman knows that he has lied to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman has deliberately lied to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Withdraw!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

If that is unparliamentary, I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

And apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

If that is unparliamentary I withdraw it.

DR. COLLINS:

And apologize to the Chair.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman has issued an untruth in this House.

MR. TOBIN:

He has told the truth and it hurts.

MR. NEARY:

No, he cannot back it up. Mr.

Chairman, the hon. member, by the way, who abused the helicopters should keep quiet, because I am coming to the fishing trips and the helicopters later. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am asking now in all fairness under the British parliamentary system of government, you have to have backup, you cannot make charges or accusations against members unless you are prepared to provide the proof. And the hon. gentleman cannot provide the proof, he is running a bluff, Mr. Chairman, he has been caught in the lie and now he is over there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- now twisting and turning and squirming. The hon. gentleman knows he is wrong and he should have the courage to be man enough to get up and admit that he is wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I have heard enough argument on that point of order. I would rule on the point of order that there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

It being a little after five o'clock, I have to inform the House that we have two questions for the Late Show, the first one from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) concerning Come By Chance hospital, and the second from the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) concerning cutbacks, layoffs,

etc., announced last week by the new federal P.C. Government.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On a point of order the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. NEARY:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

On a point of privilege the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the Minister of Public Works and Services either in the heat of debate or deliberately made false charges and accusations at a member across this House, namely myself. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe under the rules of the House the gentleman who made these charges of impropriety has no choice -

MR. CALLAN:

And you use the word loosely.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, 'gentleman', and I use that word loosely, has no choice but to produce the evidence. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is under the rules of the House. And if there were no rules in the House, ordinary decorum would dictate that the hon. gentleman has to produce the documentation or he has to withdraw. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is straightforward. We are honourable men in this House. Mr. Chairman, if we allow it stand on the record, by the way, if we allow what the hon. gentleman said, the charges and the accusations made, if we allow that

to stand on the record what it means is this, that I can get up in this House, or any member can get up in this House and he can level a charge no matter how ridiculous it is, he could level a charge against an hon. gentleman, he could, an untruth, he could lie about any hon. gentleman -

MR. YOUNG:

You have done it.

MR. NEARY:

I certainly have not done it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Now, you see, the coward is running for cover.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

Could I interrupt the member for a minute? When a point of privilege is raised in Committee it is the duty of the Chairman of Committees to report this to the Speaker when he reports. It is not permissible for the Chairman of Committees to rule on the prima facie case of a point of privilege. I will report it when I report to the House and each member involved in the point of privilege will then have to make his arguments to the Speaker to see if there is a prima facie case. So I will report that there has been a point of privilege raised and that matter will stand until we report to the House.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:

Your point of privilege was just ruled out until the House reconvenes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Your point of privilege has just been ruled on.

MR. NEARY:

But I am not finished my point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, but I cannot accept argument on a point of privilege. The Speaker has to accept the argument on a point of privilege from whomever has to make them. I have to report to the Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

So you are going to rise the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I have to report this when I am directed to rise the Committee and report to the Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that you rise the Committee immediately and report this, because there should be no further -

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

- discussion. Your Honour should rise the Committee and report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

I will not accept any further discussion on the point of privilege that has been raised. I listened to some argument so I could understand what the point of privilege was about, and there

will be no further discussion on this point of privilege raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) concerning certain allegations having been made by the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) until until I have reported to the Speaker.

Is there another point of order that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands wishes to raise on another matter?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, a separate issue but related to the heated exchange that took place just a few moments ago. I feel a bit embarrassed for people in the gallery to see this kind of debate going on. It has obviously reached a pretty low level, and it does not make me feel very good to be sitting here and listening to the kinds of things that are being said, and, in particular, to hear the Chairman's position being questioned when he states his position with respect to a point of privilege.

But in respect to the debate that took place, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and he may have rushed through it, may have rushed by it, perhaps he did not realize what he had said, but he clearly said, and I jotted the notes down - now, earlier in the debate he did withdraw the word 'liar', I believe was the allegation - but later in the course of the debate he continued in that same vein and used the words, 'the hon. the Minister of Public Works was caught in a lie', and, Mr. Chairman, he knows, as well as all of us in this House, that you cannot say indirectly what you would normally say directly, and it is clear there that the same insinuation was made.

I raise it as a point of order because I am sure the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), if given the opportunity, would certainly want to correct the record and not use unparliamentary language in this House, and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman, so that it does not go unrecorded for the record, if the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is feeling so embarrassed about the low ebb of parliamentary debate, then perhaps he should look a couple of seats to his left where we have a Minister of the Crown casting an allegation over at a member of this House.

MR. SIMMS:

What about the point of order?

MR. BARRY:

I listened to the minister and he should have the courtesy to listen to me. If he feels chagrined or embarrassed or ashamed about the low ebb of debate in this House, he should look a couple of seats to his left where you have a Minister of the Crown making allegations that a member of this House has misused government property. Mr. Chairman, that is something that is not taken lightly.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

I interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for a moment to remind him that I have ruled that the arguments on the point of privilege referred to

between the the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) will have to be made before the Speaker. I have ruled that I would not accept any further discussion pertaining to that matter, so I would ask the Leader of the Opposition if he would refer his remarks to the point of order raised by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, that is what I was attempting to do but I did not get a chance to finish, being interrupted by members opposite. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made it quite clear that if the term 'lie' or 'liar' was unparliamentary he withdrew it, Mr. Chairman. It is not the intention of members on this side to engage in unparliamentary language or unparliamentary conduct, but the Chairman has to understand and appreciate when these types of allegations are made by a Minister of the Crown, when these low allegations are made, they are likely to create heat in the debate that goes on in this House and in the course of that heated debate all members can make statements that might be considered unparliamentary. So, Mr. Chairman, I say we should get on with the business of the Committee. I do not know why the minister bothered to get up on the point. The Chairman had decided he would rule on it and we will have an opportunity to debate it, but if there is any criticism of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Keep quite and let me finish.

If there is any criticism of the tone of debate or the insinuations or allegations made, the member should turn to his left and address his comments there rather than across the House.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Just as a point of clarification, obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not even listen to what was taking place, I do not know if he was in the House even.

I raised a point of order about the term that was used by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in the heat of debate. 'Caught in a lie' were the words he used. Now the one you referred to he did withdraw, or at least I understood him to withdraw, but he went on to use the same terminology later on. That is clearly against all the privileges of the House and not proper parliamentary language. I raised the issue so that the member for LaPoile may have the opportunity to withdraw the remarks.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, of course I withdraw anything that is unparliamentary. I am not going to be sidetracked off on a different issue

altogether. But that is not what the hon. gentleman said when he rose on his point of order. He indicated that the low level of debate started on this side of the House. What my colleague said was he should look to his left. It was his colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), who made the charges and the accusations, Mr. Chairman, and we have no choice but to defend ourselves against untruths that are made in this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman is not man enough, is not big enough to stand up and apologize for his untruthful statements, if he is not big enough to do that, Mr. Chairman, then I really think that Your Honour does not have any choice but to raise the Committee immediately and report to the Speaker. Now, Mr. Chairman, also I would say to the hon. gentleman before he gets up, if he is going to table information on the Opposition, let him table information on every minister on that side of the House concerning their airplanes and their motor cars and their trips and their telephones. Let them table it not only for the Opposition but for every minister on that side of the House if he has got the courage to get up and shoot off his lip, Mr. Chairman, when he does not know what he is talking about. I do not like that kind of stuff. I do not like that, Mr. Chairman. I do not like it because once you start that you never know where it is going to end.

MR. MORGAN:

You like to give it but you cannot take it yourself.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, anything that I ever said in this House was said within the realm of the rules of the

House not against the rules. And if I wanted to make charges and accusations that were untrue about members on that side, I can dream them up as well as the hon. gentleman dreamt that one up. It is a pipe dream and the hon. gentleman is talking through his hat, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Are you going to withdraw your words?

MR. NEARY:
I did withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please! Order, please!
I have heard enough argument on the point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). As I understand it, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said if he had mentioned any unparliamentary language he has withdrawn it, so that point of order is taken care of.

Also, I wish to correct a ruling which I made a little earlier. According to Standing Order 15, of our Standing Orders, "When a matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately." So I have no other choice but to rise the Committee and report to the Speaker.

ooo

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Mr. Speaker, I have to report that during considerations of the Committee of Supply there was a matter of privilege raised between

the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), and, according to Standing Order 15, I have to report to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Aylward) reports that during the consideration of the estimates in Committee a point of privilege was raised between the hon. the member for LaPoile and the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services I am prepared to hear some argument as to what that point of privilege was and if, indeed, it was a point of privilege.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for LaPoile

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, during the debate on supplementary supply, I read a letter that was written by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and I was in the process of reading the reply of the Leader of the Opposition to the Minister of Transportation concerning the disbanding of the motor pool and what would be done with the cars from the motor pool. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), who was responsible previously for the motor pool, made some charges and accusations across the House that were completely unfounded and untrue and, I would say, were merely a figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination. So under section 16, Mr. Speaker, of Beauchesne, under the heading Privilege, it says, "The

distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers". They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity." The vindication of its own authority and dignity of members of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I challenged, during the heat of the debate, the hon. gentleman to produce the evidence, to produce the proof, to produce documentation that I had misused and abused the motor pool when I was Leader of the Opposition. Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that is untrue, the hon. gentleman knows it is untrue. And when he lost control of himself, Mr. Speaker, then he started making accusations about telephones, that the Opposition had the most expensive telephone bill in the country and so forth and so on. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are very serious charges and accusations and cannot be allowed to stand on the record of this House, because if they did, Mr. Speaker, what would happen is that I could come in here tomorrow and I could accuse the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) of all kinds of things that are not true, I could smear the hon. gentleman, I could libel him any way I wanted to and I can dream up a few ways to do it. Probably my imagination might be better than the hon. gentleman's was there a half an hour or so ago when he lost control and in defense of the administration started making charges and

accusations across the House. Let the hon. gentleman produce the logs, Mr. Speaker. Let him produce the documentation or, Mr. Speaker, let him do the honourable thing. And what is the honourable thing for him to do if he is wrong? What is the gentlemanly thing for him to do? What would the Premier insist that he do? Because the Premier knows that once you start a slanging match, once you start slinging mud back and forth across this House, Mr. Speaker, nobody knows where it is going to end. Let him produce the documentation for the use of the car pool by ministers and the telephones by ministers if we are going to start that kind of a game in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad the Premier was not here to see the conduct of his minister this afternoon. I dealt with the Premier in my correspondence because the Premier is the head of the administration and I did not want to deal with the lower strata.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Leader to leader.

MR. NEARY:

It was leader to leader I was dealing.

Mr. Speaker, at least the Premier has the courtesy always to acknowledge my correspondence and I had a great deal of it with him when I was Leader of the Opposition. But the Premier I do not believe once ever in his life that I know of accused the Opposition of abusing or misusing a privilege, I do not recall it and I do not think his ministers, Mr. Speaker, can recall it because it is not true. If he is an hon.

gentleman, man-fashion, if he has the courage, let him stand up, produce the proof, the documentation, the evidence for not only the Opposition but for the ministry, and if he cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, what is the alternative to the hon. gentleman? Let it stand on the record so I can come in here tomorrow and accuse the hon. gentleman of all kinds of wrongdoing? Mr. Speaker, is that what we are going to get down to in this House?

DR. COLLINS:

You said you did not use the pool. That is right, is it not?

MR. NEARY:

No, I did not say I did not use the pool. I certainly did use the pool but I was cut off. The hon. gentleman cut me off.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The story is changing now. You said you never used it before.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

I certainly did use the pool but, Mr. Speaker, I did not misuse it or abuse it and I was cut off. The statement I made when the hon. gentleman lost his cool, lost control of himself, the statement I made was that I was not allowed to use it. I was cut off by the hon. gentleman, not by the Premier or the ministry. Mr. Speaker, I am going to have my say on this because this is a pretty serious matter, these are pretty serious charges and accusations. If the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) wants me to sit down let him instruct the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to put on the table of this House the

documentation, let him produce the proof. Or let him be man enough, if he is an hon. gentleman, if he is not low class, let him be man enough to admit that he was wrong and in heat of debate he levelled a charge and an accusation across this House against a member. It is not the first time he has done it either. If he is wrong let him apologize, let him withdraw and apologize, Mr. Speaker. Because I can guarantee you this, that if this is allowed to stand on the record of this House then I will come in here tomorrow and I will dream up some things to say about the hon. gentleman and there is not a thing the House or Your Honour can do about it. You cannot make untrue statements about people. You cannot accuse them of impropriety if it is not true. It is more than a difference of opinion between two members. It is more than that, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour can argue that I had my say on my point of privilege, but the principle involved is a little deeper than that, Mr. Speaker, it is a little more serious than that. It is a charge and an allegation made by a Minister of the Crown, not by a backbencher, that he cannot substantiate and back up, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask Your Honour in all sincerity to give this point of privilege very, very serious consideration. I know it has come up in the House before and I know it has been ruled on by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) when he was Speaker. The accusations and the charges may not have been as serious as the one that the minister made, Mr. Speaker, but there have been differences of opinion as I will be the first to agree. After twenty-two years in this House I think I have seen a lot of precedents, and a lot of

rules stretched and bent and I have see the rules enforced and I think I have a fairly wide knowledge of the rules. It is much more grave than a matter of a difference of opinion between two hon. members, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour, in order to keep control of this House, to keep the decorum of this House to the level that it should be, should rule that there is a prima facie case, that my privileges have been breached, that wrong, untrue statements have been made about me and about the Opposition because the hon. gentleman used a blanket statement when he was referring to the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is such a serious matter that the House should not rise at 5:30 p.m., that Your Honour should take the time and consider this matter this evening and report back to the House on my question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, as I say - and I do not want to be repeating myself - but if ministers above anybody else on that side, who should be setting an example, if ministers want to make wild, irresponsible, untrue charges, then two can play that game, Mr. Speaker. The Premier knows that. He is well aware of that. That is a mug's game and I do not indulge in the mug's game in this hon. House.

MR. YOUNG:

You have, but you are changing your tune.

MR. NEARY:

Is that so? The hon. gentleman now, Mr. Speaker, is like a coward running for a safe haven saying, 'Oh yes, the member himself made these accusations against members.' That is not true, Mr. Speaker. When I make an allegation against a minister or a member it is about public funds,

the misuse and abuse of funds, Mr. Speaker.

So I submit that there is a very grave and serious point of privilege here, Sir, and I would say that we are just getting off now to a flying start in this particular part of the continuation of the Spring Session of the House. I like good lively debate. The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) told us last week he was bored with the House. I hope he is not bored these last couple of days. The hon. gentleman has the privilege of livening up the House if he wants to. I like the cut and thrust of good, hard debate but, Mr. Speaker, I feel rather sad as a senior member of this House to hear a minister make a charge that he cannot substantiate. I would hope before Your Honour gets a chance to rule on this matter of privilege that the Premier will take the minister aside and say, 'Look, in order to maintain good decorum in the House and in order not to get involved in a slanging match and hurling mud back and forth across the House, would you go and withdraw your statements and apologize to the member?' Because that is what the hon. gentleman should do and Your Honour should instruct him to do it if he does not do it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to section 2 of Beauchesne, the definition of privilege:

"Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or

individuals. Thus, privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law." That is pretty heavy stuff, Mr. Speaker.

"The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers". They are enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication" - these are the key words, Mr. Speaker - "the vindication of of its own authority and dignity. Sir Erskine May, Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament."

"A question of privilege right rarely to come up in Parliament."

"...it is clear that many acts which might offend against the law or the moral sense of the community".

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman was outside of the House I could sue him for slander and libel, but this House is the highest court in the land. Are we going to allow its members to be abused by ministers, Mr. Speaker? Immaterial of how intelligent they are, I can forgive a man, as I said earlier, for anything else except his stupidity. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, was wrong. The statement he made is untrue, he was wrong and if he is a gentleman and an honourable and decent man, then he should stand in his place in this House and admit he was wrong and apologize.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour should instruct the hon. gentleman to lay on the table of this House evidence that the Opposition abused and misused the motor pool and their telephones and also, while he is doing it, table the same information regarding Ministers of the Crown.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has accused me and asked me withdraw statements that I made and apologize to this hon. House. In his statement there just now, Mr. Speaker, he said I stopped the Opposition from using the car pool. Hansard will prove that I never said that the Opposition abused the car pool. I said, the hon. member, when he was Leader of the Opposition, abused the car pool.

MR. NEARY:
Not true.

MR. YOUNG:
Wait now! Let me speak.

MR. NEARY:
There you go. Now you heard him.

MR. YOUNG:
I never interrupted the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, up until the last of August the car pool was under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works. I would say about six or so months ago, Mr. Speaker, it was brought to my attention that the Leader of the Opposition was using the car pool outside the

guidelines of the use of the car pool for members, the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker of the House of Assembly. Now that is who had use of the car pool.

MR. NEARY:

What was outside the guidelines?

MR. YOUNG:

Outside the guidelines, Mr. Speaker, was that anywhere from 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. every morning a driver from the car pool was directed at the request of the Leader of the Opposition to take press releases all over town.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier's office does not do that, do they?

MR. YOUNG:

I do not know anything about the Premier's office, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about the Premier's office.

MR. NEARY:

And that is an abuse, sending out press releases?

MR. YOUNG:

Just a second, Mr. Speaker.

Sometimes more than one car was used. And I said, 'If that be so, as the Leader of the Opposition has abused the car pool, that will be cut out and he will only get the use of the car pool as every other member was to use the car pool.

MR. NEARY:

You cut it out all together. I was not allowed to use it at all.

MR. YOUNG:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition then, like he just did, got his back up and stuff like this so he did not use the car pool, I understand, for about two

or three weeks. The next I heard of it I got a letter from the Premier wanting to know why the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - I can get the letter, it is down in my office in my files - concerning the car pool and why was the Leader of the Opposition refused the privilege of the car pool.

Mr. Speaker, those are the facts. After I corresponded with the Premier, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he was then, was given back the use of the car pool. I did not accuse the Opposition of misusing it. What I said, Mr. Speaker, I will just repeat it, it is fact, I can produce the letters that I wrote to the Premier and I received from the Premier. I did not receive anything only, like I did this afternoon, abuse from the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if I can for a moment address myself to this question of privilege, I was not in the House when the alleged statement was made but I have heard the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) trying to make out his alleged point of privilege.

Now I should refer, first of all, Your Honour, to Beauchesne, Section 84 (1): "One the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established." Mr. Speaker, it is recognized that in order to determine a prima facie

case, with the greatest of respect, the Speaker listens to very brief statements as to the nature of the alleged breach of privilege and then determines as to whether or not a prima facie case has been made. If he rules a prima facie case has been made, then it is a matter for referral to the House and then the substance of the matter is debated. And with the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker, I say here this afternoon we have seen - I am not just singling out the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on this in making the breach of privilege - perhaps a too prolonged period of time in which the point was being made. I think perhaps it should have been made shorter and the ruling made because as the hon. member for LaPoile quoted and I noticed he stopped reading the authorities when he came to No. 17 on page 11: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament." That is one of the prime rules, Mr. Speaker, because a question of privilege suspends all business of the House, and it ought rarely to come up, it is a most serious allegation and it is one that is restricted very, very narrowly to the area in which it comes.

I want to refer you, and I think this can be disposed of immediately, Mr. Speaker, to Section 19 (1) on page 12 of Beauchesne where it says: "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

Now it seems, Mr. Speaker, that that fully and completely answers the question. There is no a prima facie case. There are many times in this hon. House that there will

be a dispute as to facts, a dispute as to facts as the hon. gentleman made an allegation and as I heard it from the mouth of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). It was purely and simply a dispute between two members - the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and the member for LaPoile - as to allegation of facts. So I say there is no prima facie case, Mr. Speaker, and there has been no privilege established by the hon. member. But I also say, Mr. Speaker, if I may, with all due respect, and this is in the interest of the proceedings of this House that I think when items of privilege are raised that members should not be able to debate the substance of it. One is confined to a brief statement of the nature and the basis of the privilege that one is claiming and they Your Honour makes a determination as to whether a prima facie case has been made. If one has been made, then it goes to the House for debate then on the merits of the thing. But we have heard the merits being debated at one and the same time.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that a matter of privilege should only be rarely raised in the House for a very serious matter. But, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), there is nothing more serious that can be said about any member of this House then to raise a question which impugns his integrity -

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. BARRY:

- and which alleges that he has improperly misused the rights or privileges which he is granted by virtue of his position. It is not sufficient for the member to get up after a matter of privilege has been raised and attempt to give some wishy-washy explanation of what he really meant. Your Honour has to look at Hansard, of course, but members within the confines of the House could hear the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) accusing the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of having abused the car pool.

MR. YOUNG:

Yes, I did.

MR. BARRY:

Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a serious allegation that questions the integrity of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), questions the way in which he was performing his duty as Leader of the Opposition, and it is not something that the member could sit idly by or quietly by and not object to, nor is it something that any member of this House should be expected to sit down and listen to without being entitled to get up and raise a matter of privilege. The President of the Executive Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), referred to the member for LaPoile as having stopped a little early in reading the rules relating to privilege. I will just go a little further than the minister and point out that members of the House of Commons or House of Assembly, like all other citizens, have the right to be regarded as innocent until they are found guilty, and like other citizens they must be

charged before they are obliged to stand trial in the courts and, to paraphrase quickly without taken Your Honour's time, the House should not deprive any member of the safeguards and privileges which every man enjoys in any court of the land.

Now as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has rightly pointed out, if the minister had the courage to raise a similar remark or make a similar remark on the steps of this building, outside the confines of this House, the minister could be hauled in court for a slanderous statement because it impugns the integrity of the individual concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker, we may as well get this session off to the proper start. I would suggest to Your Honour that even though it is a serious matter, but there may have been more serious things stated and lengthier comments attacking members of the House of Assembly or other Parliaments, it is an attack on the integrity of a member of this House and cannot be allowed to go unchallenged because if it does then future debate in this House will degenerate and this, of course, none of us want to see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of privilege that was reported to the Chair by the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Aylward), the matter started in the Committee stage and I have not had the opportunity to hear the tapes or read what was alleged to have been said at that time. I shall do that and, of course, review again the arguments that have just been put forth. I must

perhaps agree with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that it appears to take a rather lengthy process to put forth arguments to establish whether or not a prima facie case has been established. Maybe that is something that the Chair has to take a look at and not permit members to be as lengthy in their arguments. However, I shall look at it. It is certainly a serious matter to raise a point of privilege and if it is possible at all to get the transcripts from Hansard by tomorrow morning I will do my best to make a ruling on it tomorrow.

Being Thursday, there were two questions allocated for the Late Show. The first one is the question asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the Minister of Health (Mr. Twomey) regarding the resignation of a doctor. The second one was by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to the Premier having to do with layoffs or alleged layoffs within CN Marine.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, during the Question Period I asked the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) whether or not it is still the intention of his department to shut down the Come By Chance Hospital possibly in April of 1985, which is the time I understand that the Clarenville Hospital is suppose to come onstream. I asked the minister that question because I think that there are some reasons why the new Minister of Health would probably want to review that decision which was made on February 27 of this

year by the former Minister of Health (Mr. House). This new minister was himself a Chief Medical Officer as Dr. Fowlow was at Come By Chance. I think that was his status at the Botwood Cottage Hospital. He is a medical doctor himself, unlike the former Minister of Health. Of course, three days before the Bellevue by-election of 1981, the Premier was in the library of the Come By Chance Hospital and while I may not be quoting him directly, I am quoting Dr. Fowlow correctly in his letter to the Arnold's Cove Town Council in which Dr. Fowlow says, 'I was witness to the Premier stating the hospital was to remain open, while there was a need for it and while it was being utilized, for as long as he was Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

Now then, Mr. Speaker, right now here are some statistics. In 1981 the in-patient under care there were 1,137; in 1983, 1,156. There is an increase. Deliveries at the Come By Chance Hospital in 1981, 32; in 1982, that went down to 25; but in 1983, it came up to 27. Out-patient visits, 19,000 in 1981; and over 18,000 in 1983, two years later. And, of course, in 1982, 18,113. So the degree of activity at the Come By Chance Hospital is not decreasing, Mr. Speaker.

And another point that the new Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) should bear in mind, I believe, is that, and again I quote from Dr. Fowlow, 'Regarding the Come By Chance area, we have the added costs of perhaps Mobil Oil being involved with Petro-Can in the building of offshore platforms in this area. If this were to happen' - whether it is next year or the year after or whenever -

'the hospital would undoubtedly be utilized more than ever'.

You see, Mr. Speaker, what Dr. Fowlow has been suggesting is that why is it that government is assuming that once Clarenville opens that suddenly there will be no people visiting and using Come By Chance Hospital? They are assuming that. Dr. Fowlow says 'Why not leave the Come By Chance Hospital open for six months after Clarenville comes onstream, then we can look at the facts and figures, and then if the number of in-patients and the number of deliveries and all the other things that go on at the hospital, if there is a tremendous decrease then, of course, the doctor can say to all and sundry, well, here it is, here is the reason.

But, you see, there is no reason to suspect that the Come By Chance facility will not be used just as much. Because as I understand it, and as Dr. Fowlow understands it, the facility at Clarenville is not going to be very much more elaborate than the facility at Come By Chance. People from Southern Harbour, in the Placentia district, now will have to go to Clarenville, drive additional mileage, will have to be sent by ambulance from Clarenville now instead of Come By Chance to the Health Sciences or whatever for major surgery. So these are the things that Dr. Fowlow is suggesting. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that the Premier said it there in the library of Come By Chance Hospital, he said it three times during that campaign, and at a public meeting in Arnold's Cove, 'I am not in the business of closing hospitals. I am in the business of maintaining health services.'

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has expired.

MR. CALLAN:
I ask the Doctor again, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS:
You must refer to him as a minister.

MR. CALLAN:
- the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) will he consider -

MR. TULK:
He is a doctor.

MR. CALLAN:
He is a doctor, is he not?

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, but you have to refer to him as a minister.

MR. CALLAN:
You are not a forester.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There were some very definite statements that were made by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). The first and foremost one was he wanted me to make a definitive statement whether or not the inpatient services of Come By Chance Hospital would be closed. I think I did tell him yesterday, and it has been announced in Come By Chance, that the inpatient services of that particular hospital would be gradually phased out after the new hospital in Clarenville had been opened. As far as I know I

believe that this is a gradual phase out, it is not precipitous. That is number one.

To the best of my knowledge I am aware that the new hospital in Clarendville will have many modern facets of new health care in that particular area of our Province. I know they will have improved laboratory and X-ray diagnostic services. I know that there are plans that are now underway to provide specialists in that particular hospital. I know that they will be strongly supported by the doctors in the area. I know that doctors will be given privileges from outside the immediate area to be members of that particular staff. A chairman and a board has been appointed and I believe that very shortly, if not at this present time, a hospital administrator will also be appointed and hopefully early this coming year this hospital will be opened. As regards to comment on the number of inpatients and numbers, I admit statistically there has not been much of a decrease in the last few years, but I could not comment further because I have not seen a break down of these statistics. I think to elaborate further would be for me unkind to be pointing out that often in our lives figures do not always give the true picture of what is going on in a particular center and in this day of monetary problems we have to do our very best to give the best service that is humanly possible to the people of the Province. Not alone do we have to look after the health care of our people but we have to think of the many other priorities that are a part of our duty and our responsibility as government. I am sure that members of the Department of Health did not take

lightly any of the statements made by Dr. Fowlow. I am sure that were well researched statistically and that conclusion was reached. And if I might say, in the few weeks since I have become minister of that department, I have been more than impressed by the sterling qualities of the team that make up the senior part of that department and I have noticed everything has been done with remarkable care, caution and courtesy. And I will repeat, although you did not ask, that Dr. Fowlow was not asked to resign, he had his resignation signed and present in his pocket and he handed it to one of the two senior members of that department.

In view of these facts I think I have to be blunt and honest; I do not think that I could recommend a review of that decision that has been made by the Department of Health at this time by any of the staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when details of the changes to be made to CN Marine in this Province surfaced, when the news media were reporting the details and politicians and ministers were reporting the details, the Premier of this Province stated outside of the House that it was purely speculation, it was conjecture and speculation, and that there would be consultation next week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about the speculation. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) admitted yesterday

afternoon in the House of Commons, under cross-examination by Brian Tobin, M.P., that changes were going to be made to CN Marine, and admitted there was going to be a 15 per cent increase in revenue, that CN Marine were forced to collect a 15 per cent increase in revenue. Yesterday morning my office called Mr. Van Dusen, the minister's press secretary.

MR. SIMMS:

He is gone now.

MR. NEARY:

I would not be a bit surprised. Mr. Van Dusen gave my office all the details in connection with decisions that were made, changes to be made to CN Marine. Mr. Van Dusen told my office that there would be a separate Crown corporation set up to run CN Marine, and indicated that on that Crown corporation private enterprise would be represented, which means that the door was being opened to private enterprise to take over that operation, that ships would be chartered outside of CN Marine, that there would be layoffs, but he could not give the specific number to be laid off in the next year, two years, three years, four years, five years, he could not give the exact numbers, but I would gather from the answers that he gave that the layoffs would be substantial. And, Mr. Speaker, the main point is this, that the decisions were already made.

By the way one of the decisions made is that six ferries would be removed from the Gulf to be replaced by three new ferries. And another point that he made is that carload railway freight would be put in containers in Nova Scotia and sent to Newfoundland in containers, which would eliminate

transferring of freight that has been so traditional in Port aux Basques, Mr. Speaker. All these decisions were made, and now the Premier told us it was speculation. The MP for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Price) on radio this morning confirmed he was frustrated about these changes and that the 15 per cent indeed was true. He admitted it.

So we have the Minister of Transport, his press secretary, and the MP saying the decisions were made and now the Premier tells us that he is going to hold consultation after the fact. By that time the cancer will have spread, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I put the matter down to be debated during the Late Show this afternoon. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, regarding all the Wilson stuff, the new Tory financial statement, is Mr. Mulroney has asked for blood and the Premier has put the heads of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on the chopping block and said, "Brian, take all you want."

MR. SIMMS:

Very dramatic.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have not indicated or denied that the federal government are going to set up a Crown corporation to run CN Marine. That was a statement I made here in the House the day afterwards, read it from the booklet that Mr. Wilson and Mr. de Cotret had published in the House of Commons the day before. Nor did I say anything to contradict that there would be a 15 per cent increase in revenue generation by CN Marine. What I have said and

continue to say is how the Crown corporation is going to function and how the 15 per cent in extra revenue is going to be raised, the specifics of how these things are going to be done are part of consultation between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. We had suggested to CN Marine, long before this present economic statement, ways in which they could be more efficient, ways in which they could save money and yet not have an injurious impact upon the Newfoundland economy. And what we want the Government of Canada to do, and what they have agreed to do, is to sit down with us and allow the Government of Newfoundland, which is going to be affected by this, to suggest ways and means of saving money which would be least injurious upon Newfoundland and Labrador. We do suspect, knowing from the meetings we have had with CN Marine, that the way they want to proceed to save money is not necessarily the way we would see proceeding and saving the same money, and there is also a possibility of trade-offs to Newfoundland in some other aspect of transportation as it relates to any negative impact that came out of it.

So we, Mr. Speaker, are not disagreeing that there is a statement by the federal government asking for CN Marine to generate 15 per cent more revenue, we are not arguing with the point that there is going to be a Crown corporation, but we are arguing with the implementation of these decisions and that there is a wide range of ways in which you can save which would be very negative on Newfoundland, there is a wide range of ways in which you can proceed which would not be very negative on Newfoundland, and we

want the opportunity to sit down with Transport Canada and say, 'Here are the ways in which you can effect and realize what you want to do which will be least injurious upon Newfoundland' and, at the same time, suggest countervailing measures which would offset some of even the least injurious ways in which they could do these things. That is what we are saying and that is why the meeting is being held, and we hope that the Transport Department will listen to our submission, listen to the suggestions that we have made, not in an attempt to change the decision of 15 per cent or change the decision of a Crown corporation, but to move in a way which would be least injurious to the economy and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Obviously, over time, in all operations - Transport Canada is not going to be excluded - there are going to be layoffs. There may be some countervailing ways in which we can pick up other jobs in Transport Canada in Newfoundland to offset that, there may be offsetting measures that we can use, and we are going to be suggesting these to Transport Canada and to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) and to the federal government. But we will wait, Mr. Speaker, until those meetings are over, and we will see how effective we can be in persuading Transport Canada in the way we think CN Marine should move as it relates to the 15 per cent revenue generation, in the way in which the Crown corporation should be established for the ongoing operation of the ferry services and the other modes and activities that they have in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

So I am not disagreeing with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) at all; all I am saying is that there are ways to implement these decisions which will not be so injurious on Newfoundland and there are ways to implement these decisions where they would be very negative on Newfoundland. We are making representation on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to Transport Canada to say, 'Here are ways you can move which will be least injurious. Why do you not adopt them?' And, two, 'Here are a number of offsetting measures that you could implement for Newfoundland if in fact there have to be layoffs over time,' and so on, so that out of the whole group of decisions we could see these matters being implemented and yet we would not be suffering hardly at all as a result. We have researched it, we have our homework done, both the Department of Transportation and Intergovernmental Affairs. We know what we are talking about, we know what the numbers are, and we are responsible. That is why we are going to Ottawa to make our case, and let us see what comes out of it then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 16, 1984 at 10:00 A.M.