

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Hon. members will recall last week there were a number of points of order and privilege that were raised on which I reserved rulings and I would like to give those rulings now.

X (1) First of all, on a point of order raised on Friday by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) concerning the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) wanting to read a letter during presentation of petitions: I am fearful, first of all, to permit this type of action during the presentation of petitions would lend to a very unusual precedent because the action is really more in the area of debate. And this, I do not believe, can be permitted to happen. I believe that what the hon. member for St. John's North wanted to do could have been done in a debate and would also have been much more acceptable and appropriate at that time. In this particular circumstance, leave was granted for a while and the hon. member for St. John's North did have an opportunity to table a letter that he was attempting to read and, in fact, he did table it. But it should be clear that unless leave is granted for such an action or such a type of discussion during presentation of petitions, I believe the Chair has a responsibility to insist that hon. members speak clearly to the prayer of the petition and the number of signatures attached to it, and let matters of this nature be handled during regular debate.

(2) Also on a point of order raised by the hon. the member for St. John's North on Friday concerning unparliamentary language directed towards the office of the Lieutenant Governor by the hon. member for LaPoile,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I have reviewed Hansard and find, first of all, that certain remarks have been recorded. However, they are by no means complete and part of what was said was found to be inaudible as it was extremely difficult to hear from the tapes exactly what was being said because there seemed to be too many comments and asides that were being made back and forth all at the same time. I have to point out also that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not have the floor, was not recognized by the Chair and, of course,

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): during subsequent debate on the point of order the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) indicated that, "if anything it was a compliment, a message of congratulations to the people who made the appointment."

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: So the comments made by the hon. member for LaPoile during the debate on the point of order would indicate that the hon. member did not intend any unparliamentary words towards the office of the Lieutenant-Governor. So the Chair, under these circumstances, has great difficulty in ruling that there would be a point of order in that instance.

And reference was made to the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile last week concerning the reading of letters by the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) in providing an answer to a question. First of all I can say, as is the Chair's obligation, of course, that there does not appear to be a prima facie case of breach of privilege. But in the way of general comments, while there are references and rules that do not permit members asking questions to quote extracts from documents and letters and the like there are no similar rules that I can find for ministers in answering questions. And I can only assume from that that it may be because obviously there are occasions when there might be a necessity to quote from documents or letters in order to provide complete answers. But I repeat, there are no rules whereby I can disallow such a thing from occurring. However, again in the way of a general comment so that this does not serve as a precedent strict ruling let me quote from May, nineteenth edition, page 424, where it says in part, referring to quoting from letters in debate, and our general practice in this House of course is if a member quotes from a letter or document in debate he must table it, May says, "By general acquiescence very wide

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): discretion is left to the Chair as to enforcement of this rule."

So I will leave it at that as the Chair will clearly have that same discretion in the future. X

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

X
MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, as the House will recall, over the past number of months we have identified a number of sites relating to onshore developments for petroleum activities and that fifteen of those areas have been frozen under the authority of the Development Areas (Lands) Act. Today I am announcing the inclusion of one other site, which was mentioned in the report that we tabled in this House about three weeks ago and was specified then only as the Come By Chance area, and now more specifically defining that by a plan and a schedule, a legal description attached. It is actually closer to Arnold's Cove, so it will now be known as Come By Chance - Arnold's Cove, a site relating

MR. WINDSOR: to onshore development relating to petroleum and gas for concrete platform construction.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Hardly any kind of startling news, Mr. Speaker, and very timely for the particular site -

AN HON. MEMBER: Heave it out of you, 'Tom'.

MR. LUSH: - I am sorry- but needless to say we here, Sir, on the Opposition side are delighted for any area, any site, any community that gets designated with respect petroleum developments in this Province and we are broadminded enough to support any community in this Province, any area, and naturally we are delighted that it looks like Arnold's Cove meets these requirements for the time being. And we hope that over the next few weeks that we will be hearing of others, but we are delighted and we hope that it will become a definite onshore area and providing much needed employment for the people in that area.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice there are a number of ministers not in their seat today. Would the House Leader indicate if the Premier or the ministers will be here today to answer questions?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I notice, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of people in the Opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition who is not only absent today but has been absent for the past ten days, and I would imagine they are in the same general vicinity.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the House knows that it is not members of the Opposition who answers questions. It is ministers who answer questions - that is if you can get any answers out of them. We have not been able to get any answers out of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

X

I would like to ask - perhaps in the absence of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr.Dinn) I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr.Collins) if he could tell us why it was necessary to install searchlights on the top, on the roof of the Workers' Compensation Building over the weekend?

X

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

DR. COLLINS: I imagine to illuminate the grounds, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to look like Hogan's Heroes down there. Would the hon. gentleman tell us now if the next move, apart from installing the searchlights that I believe had to be switched off on Friday night because the people, the residents in the area complained - I know they complained to me -but now are we going to see the machinegun turrets set up on the roof of the Workers' Compensation building? What is the next move? Would the hon. gentleman tell us why it was

MR. NEARY:

so necessary to protect, put the searchlights on to light up the grounds? Is there any reason for it? Will they be like Hogan's Heroes now, have the big - what do you call these things at penitentiaries?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Towers.

MR. NEARY:

The towers up with the fellows there with the machine guns, is that going to be the next move could the minister tell the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have no information about machine guns, howitzers, cannon or other instruments of ordnance.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell us how many complaints resulted from having these searchlights - I do not know if they are left over from the Second World War or what - but how many complaints came in to the Workers' Compensation Board or to the government? I know I received a number myself and I understand from raising the matter with one of the members of the Board that they were shut off. Would the hon. gentleman indicate how many complaints they had and will the searchlights be put back on or will we have a blackout now for the duration of the strike?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I do not have that information. If it comes to my attention I will certainly give it to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of Treasury Board and in addition to these

MR. LUSH: security measures taken, as indicated by my hon. colleague, I wonder if the minister is in a position to indicate to the House what new developments may have taken place over the weekend with respect to labour problems in the Province, particularly those labour problems relating to the public service?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further questions?

The hon. the member for Terra Nova, a supplementary.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) heard me. It is uncharacteristic of him not to answer a question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he asleep?

MR. LUSH: I do not believe he was paying attention.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was asleep.

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case we will allow the question to be asked again, if you like.

MR. LUSH: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I will frame the question again. My question to the Minister of Finance was whether he could indicate to hon. members whether or not there have been any new developments with respect to labour problems over the weekend, particularly with respect to labour disputes within the public service?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I was sort of concentrating on an interesting document here and I thought the hon. member had directed his question elsewhere.

Over the weekend; I do not know if there was much happening over the weekend. I might just indicate to the House that there had been meetings last week, I think on Thursday, between representatives of Treasury Board, representatives of Labour and Manpower and representatives of NAPE in regard to the two ongoing labour disputes, at the College and at the Workers' Compensation Board. We endeavored to find out beforehand what the subject matter of the meeting might be so that we would be in a position to respond expeditiously, and hopefully positively, but we could not get any indication from the other side as to the nature of the matter to be brought up.

And indeed, Mr. Speaker, the meeting took place despite that and we were somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, when the meeting did take place that indeed there was no new matter brought up and the union representatives indicated that they had not particularly desired a meeting to bring up any new matter. This was a bit surprising in view of the remarks made in this House and other remarks such as that made by the President of NAPE on a television programme last week. The impression given, I think, generally was that the union had new initiatives and wished to discuss new matters and so on and so forth. That did not occur. There was nothing new, no new initiative and there was just a general discussion about things and that was all.

Now, that is in regard to that. In regard to the teachers' situation, as members will recall, the government has indicated that they would respond when the Federation of School Boards have had an opportunity to view the conciliation board report. That meeting is ongoing today, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect that we will be informed of the

April 6, 1981

Tape No. 956

EL - 2

DR. COLLINS: decision of the Federation, perhaps later today, perhaps sometime tomorrow and we will co-ordinate our response to that with the Federation. The Federation and Treasury Board are looked upon by the conciliation board both as the employer so we co-ordinate our response in that regard.

In regard to Farm Products, hon. members may be aware that there was a unanimous conciliation board report in regard to the Farm Products' situation, and

DR. COLLINS: we have been informed that the union unit there has rejected that unanimous report. And I believe they had informed the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) that they have taken a strike vote which will put them in a position possibly to have a strike in roughly a week's time.

A representative, an official from the Department of Labour and Manpower has since been in touch with Treasury Board, and I believe may well have been in touch with the union, and there may be something come out of that initiative on the part of the officer from the Department of Labour and Manpower.

I think that is all of the information I can think of it at the moment. Now all of that did not occur during the weekend but it occurred around the last few days.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the thing that immediately concerns me is the situation with the workers at the College of Trades and Technology, and the workers at the Workers' Compensation Board, and I am a little bit confused by what the minister is saying. Last week there seemed to be some indication that there was a willingness on both sides to get back to the bargaining table. Now in the response from the minister to the question that I asked, I am not able to gather from that just what is happening. If I could be just allowed a brief preamble, the minister alluded to the fact that the government was trying to get certain information, then there was the meeting and it seemed as though NAPE did not

MR. LUSH: have any new initiatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question is , I do not know what meeting the minister is referring to; the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) in an answer to me on Friday indicated that he met with the officials of NAPE to point out their willingness to go back to the bargaining table. So what meeting was the minister specifically referring to when he said that that NAPE had no new initiatives and this sort of thing? Just what is the position on this getting back to the bargaining table? Is there bargaining going on outside before we get back to the bargaining table? Or is there an opening to get back to the bargaining table? Just what is the situation with this particular problem right now with respect to getting back to the bargaining table?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the meeting I alluded to was a meeting between a negotiator from Treasury Board and a negotiator from the union and an officer from the Department of Labour and Manpower, in other words, a conciliator. We have had, hon. members will recall, a conciliation officer in place for some time who has acted as a liaison

DR. COLLINS: between the two disputing parties, and that officer was present at the meeting at which there was representation from Treasury Board, and representation from the union and that took place on Thursday.

The hon. member asked are there preliminary moves? Well, I can assure the hon. member there always are preliminary moves, there are many moves in a labour dispute. Of course there are preliminary moves. One wants to, in going into a meeting, to be as prepared as possible to make the meeting as contributory and as useful as possible so, of course, there is gathering of information, there is trying to assess what is the agenda, what are the matters likely to be discussed, and that did go on beforehand.

As I pointed out, Treasury Board was not able to get any indication beforehand of what would be on the agenda, what was the matter to be discussed, and when we got in there, lo and behold there was nothing new to be discussed.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister is very quick to say that there were no new initiatives put forward on the part of NAPE, on the part of the union. Can the minister indicate whether there were any new initiatives put forward on the part of Treasury Board?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in response to that I can only restate the position of government, which has been consistent all along, which has been defensible all along, and which has been accepted by a very large number of people all along, and that is that

DR. COLLINS: for certain numbers of types of work agreement has been reached, over and above the objections, I might add, Mr. Speaker, of the NAPE executive who were violently opposed to this acceptance, but nevertheless, this acceptance was made by a very large number of workers in the public service.

Now, a small number of workers in the public service, i.e., approximately 2 per cent of those types of workers in the public service, have not accepted the position that has been accepted by 98 per cent of their fellow workers doing similar work. And our initiative has been to offer to those 2 per cent exactly the same packet as was offered to the 98 per cent of similar workers who have accepted.

Our other initiative has been to say to those 2 per cent of workers, who have not accepted what 98 per cent have accepted is, 'If you are different, please show us how you are different. Indicate to us how a truck driver or van driver, or a carpenter or a food worker or whatever in this union, which has accepted it, how that person is different from this person in this smaller union doing exactly the same kind of work and if you can show us a difference, we can offer a different packet.

MR. T. LUSH: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I am understanding what the minister is saying but it looks like to me there is no point in getting back to the bargaining table. It looks like the government is inflexible in their position. So can the minister indicate whether or not the government is flexible within this particular issue because from what he said it looks like the government is pretty inflexible. Their stand is a permanent one and they are not willing to bend one way or the other.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is the hon. member's word, not mine, 'inflexible.' My word is 'consistent' and 'equitable.' Possibly I might have a moment just to explain to the hon. member how the Public Service works. We have in Treasury Board a division called Classification and Pay and the objective of that division is to decide what is the nature of an employee's commitment to government for which he gets paid. This is what it is all about. We do not pay people on an arbitrary basis, ad hoc, illogical basis. They are paid on precisely the basis of careful classification and that classification applies to anyone in any part of the service. So that if people are classified the same, government pays them the same and it would be most disruptive, the Public Service could not work if we paid, say, a van driver doing a similiar type of work in one part of the Public Service differently from a van driver doing exactly the same type of work in another part of the service. That would be so disruptive that the Public Service could not work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: Now if there are differences in jobs: In other words, if a van driver in one part of the Public Service is not indeed doing the same work as a van driver in another part, the two van drivers will have a different classification and they will have different pay. And we have said to the unions that are in dispute, 'Look, if you have workers here that you think are performing different duties, please tell us. We have looked ourselves; we cannot find those differences. If you can find your workers having different work, please tell us, we will re-classify them and then those workers will be eligible for a different scale of pay.'

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question, Mr. Speaker, was going to be the Premier. But unfortunately doctors have ordered him to rest for the past three or four days due to exhaustion. Therefore, I will have to refer the question to the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

With people on social assistance if they need, because of medical reasons, drugs or they have to go to the hospital or clinics then the government ends up looking after it. There are other people who are on unemployment insurance and very low income, people coming back and forth to St. John's to go on the dialysis machine, parents who are keeping a child, say, eighteen years and younger in their homes instead of putting them in government institutions thereby saving the taxpayers of this Province thousands and thousands of dollars: Does the Minister of Health have any programme in the new Budget coming up where people who are not on welfare but are making low incomes can get availability of a free drug card thereby helping them with their medical problems? And also, can the minister inform this House do they have

MR. HISCOCK: any intentions of bringing in a programme, particularly with the Year of the Disabled, with regard to transportation because many of these people are finding a great financial hardship of having to come in from Gander or coming in from various other areas of our Province.
 Could the Minister of Health (W. House) inform us if he is going to bring in such a programme?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the question is what recommendations we are making in the Budget. I am not going to address that question, but the point about in this Province where people cannot afford to come to a hospital or get to a hospital, it is looked after. People are not kept away from hospital by virtue of the fact that they cannot afford it. And we have situations, we have the ambulance programme now which looks after people in the case of emergencies. And, of course, even for people who are not emergencies, when it can be indicated that it is costly, too costly for them to handle, we have a situation where we will take stretcher cases at the ambulance rates of \$50 dollars.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision made also when we get the information that persons do have very difficult circumstances, we will refer it to the Department of Social Services and a social worker will make recommendations and we have had cases whereby people not on welfare have received assistance to get to hospital.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, by asking the question there are now, I would go as far as to say, hundreds of people who are affected, and thousands, in this Province that do not want

MR. HSICOCK: to give up their mentally retarded child, and are keeping the child in their home and have been for the past ten or twelve years, not receiving any money whatsoever. Then there are also other people that because of their finances do not go to the government and end up asking that they apply. They have gone to the social workers. I have several cases in my own district and now going out around the Province I am getting other cases.

Is there such a programme or will the government think of such a programme, implement such a programme, where if you are on a certain income you will at least get one quarter of your transportation cost or one quarter of your drugs? Why is it that you have to go through the social worker and then find out, and be almost humiliated because of financial pressures, have to go on welfare and then the social worker say, no, you cannot get it because you are not on welfare, Mr. Speaker. Can we bring in a new programme, a new programme altogether that will look after the low income but not necessarily on it because most of the people are seeing great hardship, their little bit of savings is dwindling and, Mr. Speaker, it is a great mental stress on these parents as well as patients themselves?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I can see now why the hon. member wanted to direct this question to the Premier because apparently he does not know which department to direct it to.

The Department of Health provide the services and do have some programmes, programmes with regard to drugs and so on for senior citizens and so on, but you are talking about respite care, care of the disabled with regard to mental retardation and so on, and that rightly falls within the ambit of the Department of Social Services, and there are programmes I am sure that the minister can respond to.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to addressing it to the Premier, I want to address it to the Premier because obviously some of the ministers in this government have not shown their competency. One would assume that the Minister of Health (Mr. House), and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) are in daily contact and bringing in new policies. So instead of turning around and saying which one I do not know to refer to, I am asking this government, do you have any plans to bringing in a whole programme to deal with this severe problem that is facing our people in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants some information I will give him some on a programme which is not new but already in place.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Premier I would like to ask the question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). Over the weekend Claud Moran, a minister in the Levesque Administration in Quebec, is quoted as saying that the other seven of the gang of eight support the re-election of the Quebecois in Quebec. Now we know that this is a separatist administration led by a separatist leader. Could the President of the Council confirm that the Premier of this Province in this administration does in fact support the re-election of the Party Quebecois in Quebec?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I am glad the hon. gentleman asked the question because I can refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) a few moments ago to the effect of the alleged exhaustion of the hon. Premier. The hon. Premier today is out at a giant rally which is about to take place in Norman's Cove -

MR. NEARY: Thousands and thousands!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and he is dishing out, Mr. Speaker, he is dishing out a large dollop of exhaustion to the hon. members there opposite when they see the results on next Friday.

But, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's question, I did not hear Mr. Moran. I do not listen necessarily or hear Mr. Moran. I just say to the hon. gentleman that I do not believe that the hon. Premier or any member of this administration has any vote in the particular election so I do not think they would have any opinion really.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). I might say very quickly that in talking to people around the Province I find total, complete and absolute support by the people who are looking to take advantage of the Super Chip programme-or take advantage of the Retro-Fit programme we are talking about, the conservation programme that the federal government is sponsoring, and I am surprised: I wonder if he would want to comment on the fact that he seems to be opposed to the idea of twenty or thirty new federal jobs being created in Newfoundland and Mines and Energy offices being opened up to give that department a presence and to employ twenty-five or thirty people to efficiently deliver a programme that most of the people in Newfoundland are looking forward to and most of the people want delivered by the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would agree and side with all those people in the Province who are in favour of having this Super Chip programme operational as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And it was that very point that I was stressing when I pointed out that we could have had the programme in place - we had the supervisors in place - where the citizens of this Province could have been receiving their cheques for this programme three months ago. The federal government still does not have a programme in place because they do not have the personnel ready to administer it. And my objection, Mr. Speaker, is and will continue to be wherever I see a duplication of personnel, wherever I see a waste of the taxpayers' dollar resulting from the way a programme is administered, I will object to any such waste.

MR. BARRY:

And here is a clear case where for nothing but gross partisan political reasons, because the federal government was afraid that it might have to share some of the so-called glory of this programme, this very good programme, with the provincial government, if our provincial employees were administering, were providing the funds and so forth, the federal government decided, 'No, we will create our own offices in the Province so that we can administer it ourselves, so that we can make some cheap political points, even though that is going to waste the taxpayers' dollar, and even though they will go so far as to try to hire away provincial employees, paying a higher salary when it could be done within the provincial government for less cost and more quickly.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: This sounds like a pure case of the fox and grapes, Mr. Speaker. If you cannot get the grapes you are sour. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister, he referred to some of his statements a duplication of services. Could the minister point out to me one programme administered by the provincial government that has the effect of conserving energy to the consumers - I am not talking about the industrialists - but to the consumers? Can he point out one programme to me that is administered by his department whereby the programme is made available to the consumers under insulation programmes such as CHIBS for instance, which the federal government has administered very, very efficiently for the people? So when we talk about duplication of service, identify one that up to this point in time he has been responsible for or his people have been.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one of the three which is now being brought in which the federal government has agreed will be administered by the Province, one of the three will be administered by the Province and the other two will be administered by the federal government.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about the federal government wanting to hire away his people. Would the minister stand up and indicate to the House whether or not the very people he is talking about have approached the federal government for a job in these new offices being opened up? It is not that the federal government have approached them. It is his own employees, recognizing a better job opportunity with better pay, have approached the federal department looking

MR. FLIGHT: for jobs and looking to get out of this present department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I will submit to members of this House and members opposite that the taxpayers of this Province, looking at a situation where they can have a programme delivered by employees paid at a certain level, and looking at a federal programme which will have the same employees delivering a programme for a higher wage level, they will consider that a waste of public funds.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, would the minister confirm also - he referred to negotiations going on between the federal government and his department back in November which was almost six months ago, back in November, to deliver this programme on joint basis -

MR. MOORES: Slave labour.

MR. FLIGHT: Is he prepared to confirm that it was because of his department's inability to come to some agreement with the federal government on this programme that finally the federal government, out of frustration and out of a desire to deliver the programme to the people of Newfoundland, pulled out and said, 'We will go it alone!'

MR. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Mr. BARRY: I say without equivocation that the hon. member cannot substantiate one jot, one tittle, one iota of that last asinine remark. He cannot substantiate any portion of it, Mr Chairman. As a matter of fact, we can

April 6, 1981

Tape No. 963

AH-3

MR. BARRY: document, we can document, Mr. Chairman, and I can personally testify to the fact that the federal officials were proceeding along merrily concluding an agreement and it was ready virtually for the signatures of the federal minister and my own when all of a sudden the rug was pulled out from underneath the feet of the federal officials and they were informed that they -

MR. BARRY: did not want, the federal politicians did not want the federal government to lose the credit that they might have to share with the Province for delivering such a programme.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had, by coincidence, the opportunity of speaking with the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) literally minutes before he went into the political caucus which decided that they would change direction, pull the rug out from underneath their federal employees who were negotiating, and had virtually completed negotiation of agreement and were satisfied that the programme could be delivered quite adequately by provincial officials.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes. We have time for one more question.

MR. HANCOCK: It is about time Ottawa smartened up, Mr. Speaker.

X
I have a question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. I would like the minister to confirm whether or not this Province is faced with a shortage of nurses.

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

X
MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have no statistics to show that we have a shortage of nurses at this particular time. That is not to say, of course, that possibly some hospitals would not like to have more nurses now, but as far as I can gather, and I do not have any information in from any of the hospitals, there is no shortage; that is taking into consideration the number of units that they are entitled to and the number of people they have. There may be certain advertisements for

MR. HOUSE: certain specialties, or, I believe, there may be O.R. nurses, or intensive care nurses where there may be a shortage, and in a lot of these cases we have people now in training on bursaries for these programmes.

I saw a few days ago that in the Atlantic region, that includes, of course, the Maritimes and Newfoundland, there in a shortage, I believe, of 400 nurses. Now, I do not know what particular portion of these are in Newfoundland, but at this point in time, from a general statement, there is no, Siree, a shortage.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The time for Oral Questions has expired.

It is a particular pleasure today, and I do so on behalf of all hon. members in the House, to welcome to the galleries twenty-five students from Alexander Galt Regional High School in Lennoxville, Quebec, and twenty-five students from Mount Pearl Central High School from the district of Mount Pearl, accompanied by teachers Mrs. Janet Angravas, Mr. Cameron Roger, and Mr. Harvey Hodder. We hope you enjoy your visit. Bienvenue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we give so many answers here the members cannot keep up with all the information they are getting. I would like to supply some information in response to a question from the member for

#37

April 6, 1981, Tape 964, Page 3 -- apb

MR. BARRY:

LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in

which he asked for a progress report on exploration and
drilling done by RioCanex near Burnt Island Pond for
gold and other minerals; and

MR. L. BARRY: the second part of the question is :when will a decision be made on the feasibility of opening a mine in the Burnt Islands Pond area? Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting the results of the company's last season's exploration programme and we have now received that information and I can deliver it to this House. RioCanex, which is the exploration arm of Rio Algom carried out a full Summer programme of exploration in 1980 at its Cape Ray gold project as it has done every year since the first programme started in 1977. Exploration work on this property up to the end of 1980 has revealed a one mile long mineralized area which has three potential ore zones totalling approximately one million tons of material grading at less than 0.3 ounces of gold per ton. Trenching and diamond drilling indicate that ground conditions will be extremely poor in an underground mining situation and therefore RioCanex has decided to suspend exploration work until the feasibility of mining this area is determined by the mine engineering division of the company. So we cannot expect to see a major exploration programme undertaken in this area in 1981. Environmental impact and feasibility studies have to be conducted before a decision is made to open a mine. And in this case, because ground conditions are so bad, it will be necessary to predetermine the feasibility of physically mining the ore reserves before any such decisions are made. The whole matter is currently under consideration by the engineering division of the company, and official company sources indicate that it is unlikely a decision will be there to go ahead with exploratory mining development until later and that there will not be time in 1981.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the opposition critic for mines has no interest -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: - in mining operations or -

MR. FLIGHT: - (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: - potential mining operations -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Answers to Questions.

MR. L. BARRY: - but the member for LaPoile has asked a question and I know is deeply interested, as are the people on the West Coast of this Province, and in fact all over the Province. So, the mines critic, if he will just keep quiet I will give him all this lovely information. Well, I am just about finished Mr. Speaker. So, the whole matter is currently under consideration by the engineering division of the company. And company officials indicate that they will have to have this engineering work completed before they will be continuing on with the exploratory work. But it looks, Mr. Speaker, with one million tons of 0.3 ounces of gold per ton that there will be sufficient interest there to put considerable work in on the engineering details and we are still hopeful that we will see some positive results on the West Coast. And there are copies that will be available for the hon. member, yes. X

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Funding Of Certain Pension Plans And Retirement Benefits Sponsored By The Province And Consequential Amendments Of Certain Pension Acts Related Thereto." (No. 58)

On motion, Bill No. 58 read a first, time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. member starts, I would just like to point out that we have used up eight hours and eighteen minutes. The time remaining is sixty-six hours, forty-two minutes.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: We still have sixty-six hours left, have we, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.



Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the students in the House this afternoon, what we are debating at the present time is a resolution asking that this House-

MR. WINDSOR: Do not be (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Development will get an opportunity to speak as soon as I sit down if he wants to explain why Arnold's Cove was brought into the House today. We would all love to hear that. It may have nothing to do, Mr. Chairman, with the by-election in Bellevue. I am waiting for the minister to tell us why it was brought in today. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, we are debating a resolution asking this House

MR. THOMS: to approve the spending for the next three months of some \$500 million, a half billion dollars. And of course, the Budget, I understand is to be brought in later, on March 14th, and we will get a detailed breakdown - April 14th, I am sorry - a detailed breakdown on what is being spent department by department. At the present time, all we have is one sheet of paper asking for a half billion dollars, close to \$500 million, and we have very little information provided for us by the administration, by the Tory administration of this Province as to where it is going to be spent. We have been asking some questions, a particular question asked by my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for some information on the use of the government aircraft by the Premier's Office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a short while ago there was introduced into this House a Freedom of Information Act, a Freedom of Information Act which I got on my feet and I supported. It can do with some amendments and maybe we will see some during the committee stage. But if this is this administration's attitude towards the Freedom of Information Act, then I fear for that Freedom of Information Act. I said at that time unless this government, unless the politicians, unless the public service wants the Freedom of Information to be effective, then there is no way that it can be effective.

MR. THOMS: We asked for information concerning the use of the government aircraft for a certain period of time by the Premier's office and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has flatly refused to give us that information. And I am concerned, because I do not think we will get that information with a Freedom of Information Act unless the attitude of this administration changes.

That is all we are asking for; simply asking, give us the information, Where did it fly from? Who did it carry? What were the purposes of the trips? Certainly goodness, the Opposition has a right to know that. The people of this Province who are footing the bill have a right to know that.

So these are some of the things concerning us. If I had my way, Mr. Chairman, this government would be forced to use closure to get the Interim Supply bill through.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only the Liberals would do that.

MR. THOMS: Oh, you would see how fast the Tories would do it too. You would see how fast you would do it if we decided to carry on this debate.

MR. HISCOCK: And we may.

MR. THOMS: Do not tempt us. We just might do that.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would like to get out a message to the public of this Province that things are not always as they seem to be, that the Premier of this Province is not the lily-white angel that the press has made him out to be. There are chinks in his armour. There is something rotten in the State of Denmark.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed and I was concerned when over the weekend I heard the Minister of Finance for Quebec say that this administration supported the re-election of a separatist party led by a separatist

MR. THOMS: premier in Quebec.

MR. HOUSE: Anybody up there campaigning for them?

MR. THOMS: Of course you were not up there campaigning. Nobody suggested that. But I will tell you this, Mr. Minister of Health, when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) answered my questions this afternoon, he did not say he did not support the re-election of a separatist government in Quebec. And I am not convinced that this administration would not like to see this Province being led down the paths of separatism. But I can tell the President of the Council right now that it will be done over my dead body. I will go to the battlefield to keep this Province in Confederation. And I would like for the students from Ontario to take this back.

MR. HISCOCK: Quebec.

MR. THOMS: I understand they are from Gault, Ontario.

MR. HISCOCK: Lennoxville, is it not? -
Lennoxville, Quebec.

MR. THOMS: Wherever they are from. Whatever part of Canada you are from, you have a Canadian here. You have a Canadian speaking in this House this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. You also have a Newfoundlander, there is no question about that. You also have a Newfoundlander, but you have a Canadian. I do not put them one/two or two/one. But when I hear politicians in other parts of the country saying that the Premier of this Province supports a separatist government and supports a separatist premier, a man who would tear this country apart, then that concerns me.

MR. CARTER: Do not go twisting it.

MR. THOMS: I am not twisting anything. The only thing twisted is the hon. member's mind, the only thing in this House that is twisted.

April 6, 1981

Tape 967

EC - 3

MR. CARTER:

You are twisting the facts.

MR. THOMS:

Those are the facts that were
stated and it concerns me.

MR. THOMS: As I said, we are being asked to approve \$.5 billion and I think a note of caution has got to go out, not only in Newfoundland but across this nation, across North America, across the world; there is going to come a time, Mr. Chairman, when the people are going to finally stop and say, We have had enough. We saw a certain bit of that with Proposition 13 in California.

As I stated here on Friday, Mr. Chairman, wives work today. They do not work because they want to work, they do not work because they enjoy having babysitters in to look after their children, they do not enjoy sending their kids out to day care centres, they are not working to buy yachts and Summer homes and gorgeous dresses and so on, they are working to buy groceries to put on the table. And what do governments do but squander? There is enough money squandered in the civil service and in government departments in this Province, and I would suspect in all Provinces. This is why we want to know what the government aircraft is doing. We want to know if the taxpayers' dollars of this Province are being wasted. Everything might be aboveboard, straightforward, but after the debacle we saw in this House in the past week where the Premier of this Province came in and assured us that everything was straightforward and honest in connection with the hiring of a lowbed, then, Mr. Chairman, we are going to doubt. Thank you very much. X

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

X MR. MARSHALL: Speaking of lowbeds, Mr. Chairman, look, I just want to make a few comments with respect to this bill. This is a bill for interim supply. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated that the budget will be brought down next Tuesday, within a

MR. MARSHALL: week's time. As is customary, a bill for interim supply to give enough spending money in the duration, there is nothing unusual about it, has been introduced into this House. Last year the time consumed on interim supply was two hours and fifty minutes. The year before that, under the same rules, it was within that vicinity. Right now, I believe, we are nearing the ninth hour. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not draw issue with the Opposition's right, of course, to debate supply, but I have to tell the House that the government needs this supply in order to operate effectively.

MR. NEARY: Answer the questions, then.

MR. MARSHALL: I will get to the question in a moment, Mr. Speaker, if I may. The situation is, Mr. Speaker, that there are millions of dollars a day that are expended by this government with this particular budget and there are already bills that should have been paid and would have been paid since April 1st. had interim supply gone through in the normal course of events within the time period that elapsed last year for the debate.

I can also say, Mr. Chairman, and I have to draw this to the attention of the Committee, that if supply does not go through today, if it is impossible to put supply through today, there will be salaries of public servants that will be delayed. Before payday, it is normal with people in the far Northern parts of our Province to mail them some days before payday and we have to get these cheques in the mail today or at the very latest early tomorrow morning, in order to do that you have to have interim supply. So I draw that to the attention of the Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the questions that have been asked in this nine hours and the things that have been asked of government, I wonder myself as to why the Opposition is digging its heels into and concentrates on things like aeroplanes, talking about separatism -

AN HON. MEMBER: And corruption.

MR. MARSHALL: - talking about how the Premier sits when there are other people getting pictures taken with the Premier, talking about mumblings and grumblings of ministers in elevators. It seems to me a sad indictment that that would be the subject of conversation or debate, Mr. Speaker, when we are considering some \$500 million.

The whole truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that questions such as unemployment should be brought up and should be the topic in a general debate of this nature. But the gentlemen there opposite do not wish to talk about un-

MR. MARSHALL: employment, Mr. Chairman, because it is a fact that despite the obvious reality that unemployment is still a very, very pressing problem to this Province, it has decreased by four cent since this government has taken office. That is why they do not want us to talk about that, Mr. Speaker. Neither do they want to talk about items like the life blood of this Province with respect to the fishery, and there has been no mention of that. They do not want to talk, Mr. Chairman, about matters of how the revenues of this Province can be immeasurably increase by us obtaining our rightful rights to the offshore in this Province, and they do not want to talk about that because of the fact that they are not at one with the government and I would suggest with the people of Newfoundland on that very topic and perhaps they find it embarrassing.

The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) asked me today about Mr. Moran, and then he asked about the government's position, he made certain reference to it when he spoke. I can only say that these questions are merely academic for this government because as I say we have no say in the outcome of it. But I could point out that on the basic issues in Quebec there does not seem to be a great deal of difference in certain areas which affect vitally the rights of the people of Quebec itself, whether it is the Liberal Party or the Union Nationale Party, or whether it is the Party Quebecois, on the basic rights for the people of Quebec they are one and the same. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal Party in Quebec, the Liberal Party in Quebec takes a different stand on these issues than the federal party, which is a lesson, I would suggest, to the Liberal Party of Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Chairman, the only -

MR. NEARY:

Your audience has gone.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Unlike the hon. gentleman, I am not speaking for the purpose of speaking to an audience or speaking from a grandstand. I am just trying to speak, Mr. Chairman, as to the effects of this interim supply and the necessity of having interim supply passed today if at all possible so that the government - so that Northern salaries of civil servants, can be paid.

As for the matter, Mr. Chairman, of the government plane, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated, and already indicated on Friday, that the situation is that the government plane has been used on business, on government business. Now why do the hon. gentlemen want to get into various other areas?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentlemen wish to get into certain other specific areas, I would say that the most appropriate place to bring it up are in the committees that this House has constituted with a detailed

MR. W. MARSHALL:

examination of Estimates where finer details like this could be questioned and asked for.

But the only reason, Mr. Speaker, - so the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) gets up and says the plane has been used for government business. Now what is the purpose of the question? The purpose of the question is that the Opposition is attempting to hurl spears, as it were, at the government and to look for things that are not there because they think that and they perceive that this is the only way that they can get at the government. They cannot talk about the basic issues that really matter in this Province such as unemployment, the necessity of a gigantic ~~or~~ immeasurable increase in our income and other matters, the fisheries, the offshore and transmission rights. All they want to do is to do this type of thing and to hurl, as it were, you know, to cast innuendoes and by this and aspersions attempt to sow the seeds of doubt and what have you. ~~Because~~ when they ask a question like that and they do not get an answer - well, they got an answer but the trouble with it is they want to be able, Mr. Speaker, to give the answer as well as the question. And they do it in their questions by innuendo. That is the way the hon. gentleman carried on opposition, Mr. Speaker, in times past and it still has gotten him in the same place, into opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of business to be transacted by the House, there is interim supply, which is necessary, as I say, to pay the bills, particularly the salary bills of this Province. There is a Budget coming in next week, on next Tuesday, there is going to be a full scale Budget debate, there is going to be detailed examinations of the Estimates in the Committees to the same degree as it has been in the past two years where ministers

MR. W. MARSHALL: actually come in before committees of this House and are drilled and are asked to justify various details of expenditure. So there is going to be this adequate opportunity and, Mr. Chairman, it is coming up in just one week.

Now in the meantime and in addition, Mr. Chairman, we have also on the Order Paper in this House a large amount of business, of public business that has to be transacted. The government would like to be able to see this business, these bills being debated in an orderly and in a proper course so that at the end of the day, at the end of the session we do not wind up, as we wind up every year, with numerous bills going through the House at the very end of the session with little if any debate and their going through in a meaningless manner. Because it makes the House or the Committee of the House very ineffective.

So I just draw this to the attention of the Committee, Mr. Chairman. We have given the answer that have been requested. They may not be the answers that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would like to hear, because they frame the answers by their questions. If they want to, I would suggest that all they are doing is just trying to cast their usual innuendoes. And the people of the Province, I say, have dealt with them by keeping them in Opposition to a large degree because of this. We require this interim supply, we require it today if we possibly can get it through today and I would like to get on, as I say, with the business of the Committee and the House and hope that this can be done. X

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

X MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the sum and substance of what the hon. gentleman just said is this, that the government is going to refuse to give the House, to give the taxpayers of this Province any information in connection with the use of the government aircraft.

MR. S. NEARY: Nobody has said, either through innuendo - and I could have stood in my place on a point of order when the hon. gentleman attributed motives to the Opposition asking simple questions and the government refusing to give answers, attributing motives to our asking these questions. But I did not do it, Mr. Chairman, because if we did that with the hon. gentleman we would have to do it every five minutes. So

MR. NEARY: then we have no intention of taking the bait that the hon. gentleman threw out.

Mr. Chairman, the House knows that the members on this side of the House through Private Members' Resolutions, through remarks made in their discussions in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, have raised the matter of unemployment. My colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) is at it every day. And the only answer that we get from across the House is that the figures do not lie but liars do figure. So, Mr. Chairman, what else is new? We brought in a Resolution to debate the cost of living in this Province. The government voted against it. They used their majority to vote it down. We have been trying to get explanations and trying to get the government to change their minds on increasing the cost of electricity to consumers in this Province. Now, why are we doing that, Mr. Chairman? Well, we are doing it first of all because we do not think that the consumers will get a fair shake from the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board first of all is a creature of the government. It is made up of political appointees. Newfoundland Hydro is a creature of the government made up of political appointees. And the government itself has approved the application for an increase. So when you combine all these forces, Mr. Chairman, how can you expect the consumer to get a fair shake? It is just not possible. So we brought that up.

We brought up the matter of strikes in the public service, the government's disaster course that it is on with regard to negotiations with the civil servants. We have brought up all kinds of matters raised in the Auditor General's report. And in addition to all of this, Mr. Chairman, I have forty-seven questions, written questions on the Order Paper, that I have written out. Counting today's Order Paper,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have fifty questions on the Order Paper, and out of the fifty so far I have got two answers. Now, how is that for performance from a government that said that they were going to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty?

MR. NEARY: Fifty, number 50 - a government that was going to be open and free and honest with the people. Out of fifty questions I have gotten two answers, and one of these answers I got today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a test of the government's sincerity in giving the people of this Province information, we put a simple question to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in connection with the government aircraft, and before Interim Supply is passed - and I can guarantee the hon. gentleman who just spoke and the Minister of Finance that there is no way they are going to get Interim Supply today, or tomorrow for that matter, until they give us the information that we want.

And what is the question?

Now, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) parroted what the Minister of Finance said the other day. He said the aircraft was used on government business. Well, we heard the Minister of Transportation tell us there two weeks ago that he paid the bill for the lowbed and we discovered that that turned out to be a lie. The House was deceived, the Premier was deceived and misled. And we have all kinds of other examples, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MOORES: Take their word!

MR. NEARY: - of where the ministers attempted to dupe the Opposition and dupe the people of this Province. Take their word for it, that is what they are asking us to do. Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I am like Saint Thomas, I have to stick my hand into the wound.

MR. NEARY:

I am like St. Thomas as far as this crowd are concerned. They have to show me, they have to prove it to me. There are no innuendoes, there are no charges, no accusations, it is just a simple request for information. And what is the information? Many is the time the member for St. John's East Extern (T.Hickey) asked the government, when he was in Opposition, for information. I do not know if the information was always supplied to his satisfaction but certainly he asked and he tried to get information. And the hon. gentleman was to be commended for that. That was his job and his duty. The hon. gentleman got a lot of information and now what we are asking for, Mr. Chairman, we are asking the government to tell us the number of times that the Premier's Office requested the government aircraft, the number of times it went aloft, the names of the passengers that travelled in the aircraft and the purpose of the trip. Is that unreasonable, Mr. Chairman? Is that an unreasonable request? So, if anybody is holding up the interim supply bill, it is the minister and the government.

Mr. Chairman, I may point out in connection with the red herring that the President of the Council (W.Marshall) just dragged in, it is the government's responsibility to govern this Province. It is the government's responsibility to get interim supply in this House. It is not our responsibility. Our responsibility is to see that certain information is obtained from the government and passed on to the people of this Province.

If this government wanted interim supply they could have had it the very day they brought the bill into the House-which was late coming in, I might add. The bill was late coming in, the government have stonewalled, are refusing to give us information and there is no way, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the people of this Province will understand, there is no way

MR. NEARY: that we would - as a matter of fact, the Opposition would be shirking its responsibility, would not be doing the people of the Province their justice. We would be doing them an injustice if we did not hold out for the information to the question that we have asked.

Now, the hon. gentleman says this is purely administrative, purely administrative. We asked the question on Thursday. We asked it again on Friday and we are asking it again today, and it would only take five minutes to get the information, Mr. Chairman. Why are the government refusing to give the House this information? The only conclusion that we can come to on this side of the House is that they have something to hide. They have something to cover up. It is a coverup and they have something to hide and that is why, Mr. Chairman, the minister and the government are refusing to give us the information. And I can tell the minister now, and the President of the Council (W. Marshall) who just took his seat, that they have high hopes if they think they are going to get this interim supply bill today. They have high hopes! And they can play on sympathy all they want: They are governing the Province, not us. We are only looking for information and if they wanted an interim supply bill they know what they can do. And if they do not do it, they are the ones who are shirking their responsibility.

And I am satisfied to stay here night and day until the seventy-five hours are used up to get the answer. There is a great principle involved here, Mr. Chairman, a great principle involved, the principle of the government - of the Opposition asking questions and the government refusing to supply the taxpayers with the information. And if they continue to stonewall, Mr. Chairman, then it is the government who is to blame.

MR. NEARY: If the cheques for Social Assistance recipients do not go out on time, if the employees in the North do not get their cheques on time, if the civil service are not paid on time it is the fault of this government and not the fault of the Opposition. We are not governing the Province.

MR. HISCOCK: We are doing our jobs.

MR. NEARY: We are only doing our duty as Opposition members, and we are asking for a very simple piece of information. And if I were the people of this Province, especially the ones who do not get paid on Wednesday, I would be up in front of Confederation Building demanding that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) supply the House, supply the people of this Province with the answer to a very simple question. And that is, and I will repeat it again, how many times did the Premier's Office requisition the aircraft since January 1st, 1980, the names of the people who flew in the aircraft, and the purpose of the trips?

MR. THOMS: If there is nothing to hide, there is no reason why you should not give it.

MR. NEARY: If we do not get that information then we can only assume, Mr. Chairman, that the government has something to hide. X

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in the member for Grand Bank's (Mr. Thoms) comments.

MR. THOMS: I do not believe there is a quorum in the House.

MR. CARTER: We have a quorum.

Look, They are all about, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A quorum call. Ring the bells.

Count the members. There is a quorum present. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, when I got up to make a few remarks, I was beginning to say that I agreed with some of the points or one of the points that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) made. I thought his few remarks were very good, particularly when he discussed waste and extravagance because I do know of one instance of government waste and extravagance that I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to address himself to. This amounts to a considerable amount of money and I do think as a responsible government we should try to curb this needless expense. And that is - and the press should take notice here - the luxurious quarters afforded the Opposition office. They are down there, Mr. Chairman, in a very large, extensive quarters, thick carpets on the floor, all kinds of sophisticated office equipment. I well remember the kind of quarters that we had when we were in Opposition. It amounted to, I think, it was two offices on the other side there and possibly one typewriter and one telephone. Now the government very generously and very naturally increased the Opposition vote. But now not only are there luxurious offices afforded to the Opposition, not

MR. CARTER: only are there generous travel benefits for all members, of course, to get back and forth to their districts, but there is almost unlimited use - in fact there is virtual unlimited use of long distance telephone without any charge whatsoever. Opposition members may telephone every single member of their district every day, if there were enough hours in the day, on government expense.

MR. HISCOCK: And the government also.

MR. CARTER: The government members, at least they show some discretion, I am sure, and will not overdo it. But the Opposition have an open-ended agreement and I think that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should address himself to this scandalous abuse of public funds because I well remember what they provided for us when they were in power.

MR. FLIGHT: You were over paid then.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would like the press to do a little survey and just go down there with their cameras and go around the Opposition office. I am sure the members would permit it, would they not?

MR. NEARY: They can come in with a heart and a half. They are in there every day anyway.

MR. CARTER: Now if the press find that there is a lot of dust in the air, that will be because of the hasty removal of some of the more opulent furnishings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: But I would suggest that the press -

MR. NEARY: They can come in any time they want to and see my files on scandals. I have my office filled up with scandal files.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: I would suggest that the press hurry because the Opposition will be very quick to put up a poor mouth. But it amounts to this, Mr. Chairman, many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on furnishing luxuries for the Opposition, and in my view are misspent, so I would like to hear the minister address those complaints. X

MR. THOMS: I get a two by four office, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and myself.

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

X MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), when we talk about the waste, when we talk about those pictures that are put up in public buildings done by Rostotsky,

MR. HISCOCK: I thought we were belong to the Commonwealth, I did not think we were a republic. The Prime Minister for Canada does not even have his picture up in the public building, and here we have the Premier having his picture in public buildings.

MR. THOMS: President Peckford.

MR. HISCOCK: So I would like to know -

AN HON. MEMBER: President Peckford, that is it.

MR. HISCOCK: Or emperor. So I would like to know there how much that is, and these scrolls, and now the medals. And as I said, he must be reading Plato's Republic.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say with regard to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) with regard to the Opposition space we as a Province are looking after a billion, or a billion and a half dollars a year. Only for the interim supply we are asking for a half a billion. And here is the government in its arrogance - I believe that every member of this House of Assembly should have their own secretary, research assistant, two combination, the same person would do both things, everybody should have their office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: If you are going to run a business and it is over \$1.5 billion, if you cannot turn around and have that, Mr. Chairman, then we are not in a very good way of managing the affairs of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I do not have Manpower offices and various other government offices. I had to do a thing in my district when I went down, I had to bring back a watch to get a battery, I had to turn around and send it back to the person because they would not get them down there in Williams Harbour and other areas.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Chairman, rural areas in particular, the members are called upon to do a lot more than the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) or St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who may get three or -

MR. THOMS: St. John's North (Mr. Carter) does not get any.

MR. HISCOCK: - four phone calls a year.

So when it comes to waste, I would even go so far as to say as an investment.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the question why we are hanging this down. We are asking a simple question, the truth, the honesty, and the justice, and a new image, the new step forward into the 1980s, the new Freedom Of Information Bill, the conflict of interest for ministers and public servants: surely. Mr. Chairman, if we had this, surely it is not going to be shallow, the freedom of information, like Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia got their freedom of information and they do not even use it. You ask the press over in Nova Scotia when they go and want to get information from the government, can they get it? It is a wash job. It is a great publicity tactic, Mr. Chairman. That is what it is. And the press and everybody are lapping it up and saying, boy, we are finally getting freedom of information.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) got fifty questions, fifty questions, he cannot even get any answers to them now. Do you mean to tell me that as soon as that legislation comes in the member can expect the next day to get the answers? They will be on this Order Paper and the next Order Paper and the next Order Paper until we form this government and then find out for ourselves, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HISCOCK: But what I am rather surprised at is the chain of events in the past week where I have been in the district of Bellevue -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: - with regard to the resignation of a minister, and we were asked there by the hon. the Premier to accept his words. Now we are being asked by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to accept all the aircraft by the Premier were used for only professional business jobs. If that is the case table it, if the administration intends table it and we will slip it right through now and -

MR. NEARY: If you have nothing to hide, tell us.

MR. HISCOCK: - go on and get it. But no, Mr. Chairman, we are told that, the Liberals, you know, their innuendoes, and they are going on with the questions, and the reason why we are in Opposition. Our job is to ask questions and the government's job, particularly with the freedom of information is to answer. And, Mr. Chairman, I say this is a snow job, again another image, another tactic to put this former Cabinet that belong to Mr. Moores, the former Premier, one of the most corrupt governments, one of the most corrupt Cabinets -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - that we ever had in the history of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And now the majority of them are still in this administration. And the Premier is trying to give the impression, because he is the new man, he is the new Premier, even though he was in the Cabinet, he is trying to give the impression that he is lily white

MR. HISCOCK: and that. What ended up happening in the past week? The man almost had a nervous breakdown. Ordered by his doctor to turn around and have four days of rest, and never even attended the meeting out in Grand Falls, which is the equivalent to the meeting of all the Conservative people and delegates etc. And I would say, Mr. Chairman, when you have the Premier, who will not even go on television with regard to the flatbed incident, and now is suffering from exhaustion, here we have the former Premier -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: I would say both.
- here we have the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood, over eighty years old still working sixteen hours a day. So what we are seeing from our Premier is that he wants everything and whatever, but his energy is going, he is cracking, actually cracking.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) sit down!

MR. HISCOCK: Rhetoric. And, Mr. Chairman, when we ask something, what do we get? Arrogance. We are told it is innuendo, when we actually ask a question with regard to the Premier's Office. So we find out now that after two years, and with one week of pressure put on him, he cannot take the pressure. If he cannot take the pressure he should get out of the kitchen.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HISCOCK: And, as I said, our former Premier, eighty years old and still working sixteen hours a day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighteen.

MR. HISCOCK: Eighteen or sixteen. It is absolutely ridiculous.

So, Mr. Chairman, with regard to one question, I think that is only one question

MR. HISCOCK: we want on interim supply. We have said time and time again we will give interim supply for the wages. You asked for the wage package, \$50 million or whatever, we will give you that, pass it on through now. We said it the week before last when I was here. We will give you that, but surely, as an Opposition, Her Royal Majesty's Opposition, we have a right to expect an answer for one simple question. But no. 'Take my word'. The President of the Privy Council says take his word. We took the Premier's word for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and what was it worth? Our job is not to take words, our job is to turn around and answer it.

So, Mr. Chairman, if this government and this administration, even though they were still part of the old administration and would like to put as much distance in it as possible - you cannot change the captain and have the same old crew and expect everything to go on the same old way. Yet, for whatever reason, our people in the Province are beginning to think, 'No, Mr. Peckford is different, that all the Cabinet, they are all new people, that they were not in with Mr. Moores, Mr. Moores was the only who was guilty, Mr. Moores was the only one who did it'.

And I must say, one of the things, when Mr. Moores went before the Public Accounts Committee, I admired very much about him, and it showed that he was a former Premier, he said members of his Cabinet had selective amnesia, selective amnesia. I would go as far as to say now that the Premier has selective amnesia, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)

MR. HISCOCK: has selected amnesia. So, Mr. Chairman, this House is going to pass an Interim Supply Bill of \$.5 billion, and we want one question, one question and we will give the Province \$.5 billion, and what are we getting? It is too tedious, it is too administrative, you know, ask in that area and whatever and that. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, it is just as well for this Opposition to give up and walk out of the House and leave it. Because as far as I am concerned we have a government that rules by tyranny and arrogance. X

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

X MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my hon. colleague for the excellent points that he just made in his few remarks. Now the government, especially the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) now all of a sudden they become mute. They are like dummies now. They will not even defend themselves. They are just laying back now and taking it hoping that the Opposition will run out of steam, run out of speakers, that we will get tired and give up.

Well, Mr. Chairman, look at my hon. colleague here, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms); does he look like a man and act and behave like a man who gives up very easily? My hon. friend from Carbonear (Mr. Moores), does he look like a quitter? My hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), with the eloquent remarks that he just made, lively, exciting, dramatic, now hon. members over there think that we are going to give up? Well if they do, Mr. Chairman, if they do they had better think again. And if I were the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) -

MR. THOMS: Only one minister in the House now.

MR. PATTERSON: You will never be the member for Placentia.

MR. NEARY: If I were the member for Placentia, who is now trying to send the poor old people back to the islands who came in with their -

MR. PATTERSON: You are the people who rooted them out, drove them out into the water and gave them \$2,000 to move to Placentia. Do not tell me about resettlement and all of that. If you want to know about resettlement, I am here until six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: I enjoy hearing the hon. gentleman speak, Mr. Chairman. I wish he would get up and say something to give us a break.

I am sure the hon. gentleman would like to know the same information that we would like to have and that is in connection with the government aircraft. I am sure the hon. gentleman's constituents -

MR. PATTERSON: I was never on it yet.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman may not have been on her.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you on it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, once in my life. I was on once when a minister - yes, I was. A minister was going the same direction I was going. We were both going to my district -

MR. THOMS: I am glad you were not going in opposite directions.

MR. NEARY: Well, according to the Auditor General's Report, where you have two pilots - the same pilot flying two different aircrafts the same time, anything is possible.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the time you were on it.

MR. NEARY: No, I was on it, Mr. Chairman, I do not drink so I did not enjoy the hospitality of the hon. gentleman, but it so happened that the minister was going to my district, he asked me if I would care to go along and I did.

MR. NEARY:

And I am not ashamed of it, not a bit ashamed of it. I am telling the House now, that was about 1976, that must be about five years ago, I would say, five years ago there was some business to be transacted in my district and I went and that is the first and only time I was ever on the government aircraft. But I hear a lot of reports and a lot of stories about the government aircraft that I am not prepared to believe, because I do not want to be accused of innuendo or slander or libel or making false accusations, Mr. Chairman. I am not that kind of a fellow. All I want to know, I want the government to tell us - and I am not prepared to take the President of the Council who said the aircraft was used for government business. Well, the hon. gentleman also told us that while he is representing the Bank of Montreal in his law practice that when the Bank of Montreal is doing business with the government, when they are advising the government on their finances, that the hon. gentleman removes himself from Cabinet meetings. I claim it is a conflict of interest. But the hon. gentleman stands up in this House and says, "Can you imagine that scum from Bell Island, can you imagine that low-life creature on the other side looking at me and saying that I would do something wrong? I can

MR. S. NEARY: tell this House," that is what he says, Mr. Chairman," I would tell the House that I would do nothing wrong." But how do we know that, Mr. Chairman? How do we know? We heard a number of ministers tell us they would not do anything wrong. The latest example is the former Minister of Transportation who got up and misled this House, and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and the former Minister of Transportation who is now Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The Public Accounts Committee found him guilty as charged, guilty of deliberating violating the Public Tendering Act. And what did the Premier do then, what did he say to this House? It was just a misunderstanding between the minister and the Public Accounts Committee, A unanimous decision of the Public Accounts Committee, seven members, four of which are Tories, Tory members, government members: The Premier tells us it is just a little bit of a misunderstanding.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier that is a poor track record for a government that has been telling us all along that they are going to be honest and open and aboveboard. Now how can the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) sit there and listen to the hypocrisy. They are going to be an open government and all we do is ask -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) listening to that now.

MR. S. NEARY: Listening to what now? Open government? Do you think that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance are open with the people of this Province when they say, 'Take our word for it, the government aircraft was only used for government business?' Is that being open? Or are we entitled to have the dates the aircraft went aloft and

MR. S. NEARY: the names of the passengers on the aircraft and the purpose of the trip? Are we entitled to have that? Are the taxpayers entitled to have information? Are the taxpayers entitled to know how much booze was consumed on that aircraft when she went aloft? I believe we are, Mr. Chairman, I believe as taxpayers. Not even as members of the House but as taxpayers I think we are entitled to that information. And if the government refuses to give the taxpayers that kind of information, then the only conclusion, rightly or wrongly - and I hate to have to say this - the only conclusion that we as members of the Opposition can come to and the taxpayers and the people of this Province can come to is that the government have something to hide, the government do not want the people to have this information, the government are covering up for something or other. Otherwise if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is right, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is right that the government only used the aircraft for government business, well then why do they not give us the information? It only takes five minutes to get that kind of information. They have had now, they have had since last Thursday to get the House the information.

There are all kinds of other things, Mr. Chairman, that we could ask the minister in connection with the Auditor General's report. We could ask him about the fees paid to public relations firms on behalf of the Special Action Group of which \$169,000 has no supporting documents. We could ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) about the police vehicles raised in the Auditor General's report where there seems to be a little bit of abuse going on there. We could ask about the \$1.5 million transferred between various accounts in Public Works for capital expenditure without the approval of the House. We

April 6, 1981

Tape No. 977

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: could ask about the overpayment of \$57,000 for rental of office space downtown, overpayment of \$57,000. We could ask about the parimutual betting procedures down at the Trotting Park that has been raised by the Auditor General. We could ask about cheques that are issued without agreements. We could ask again about the Traffic Court where an audit could not be completed for the last fiscal year. Even though they put in a new system the audit could not be completed because the Traffic Court is in such a schmozzle, in such a mess. And is it any wonder that people are getting tickets for the second and third time, that people are getting tickets that they should not have to pay, they are forced to pay. The Auditor General tells us that 'the review of the Traffic Court shows an extensive deficiencies' and he says

MR. NEARY:
complete audit.

it was impossible to do a

Mr. Chairman, we could go on and on. We could dig in our heels and say we want information on all these matters, but we realize that time is of the importance here; time is important in this particular matter that we have under debate now, so rather than ask all these questions on the interim supply, we picked one question that we thought the government could get an answer to in about five minutes, and that has to do with the government aircraft. Now are they ashamed to show us the log? Do they have something to hide? Why will they not show us the log? And, Mr. Chairman, let me say this right now before my time runs out and I have to take my seat, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can have the payroll expenses. The Minister of Finance - and I want this to be recorded up over my head and I want it recorded in such a way that when a reporter approaches me and says, 'Are you going to let the government have interim supply?', it is not up to us, we are the Opposition. We are not governing. If the government wants interim supply let them get it and let the blame fall on the shoulders that are responsible, the government. So if they want it they can have it. And we are prepared to give the government money for essential services for the next three months, but not for non-essential services unless they give this House the information that we are asking for about the government aircraft.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, time is getting on and I thought I would like to make a response to a few points that are brought up.

DR. COLLINS: You know, one would have expected interim supply to have been through by now, because there really is not much point in holding it up much longer. One of the difficulties has been that there is such disarray among our friends opposite.

MR. HISCOCK: Do we have the answer to the question?

DR. COLLINS: The front bench opposite, I think last Friday said, 'Yes, we will ask a number of questions, we will get what information is really germane and then we will let interim supply go,' and then any more detailed questioning can be done when the main Estimates come down and the mechanism that has been put in place, special committees who sit for long periods of time and then they come and report to the House and then their report is debated and so on and so forth, a very elaborate mechanism put in place so that hon. members and the public can get a good feel of what the Budget is about. So the front bench said, 'That is alright. We know that interim supply is just like a down payment, it does not really commit government to anything; it is just ongoing programmes except for those specific ones that are new and therefore have to be told to the House specifically.' And that is what I did when I introduced this bill. So that is what the front bench said, and one would have expected if there had been any cohesion amongst our friends opposite that that would be the end of the matter. But rather than that, then we finally have the back bench getting up and saying, 'No, we are not going to go with the front bench, you know, we will do it a different way now.' And then, of course, the front bench is so sparse these days and has such little weight that it really cannot put things into place. So that is one of the problems.

Now, the other point that can be made about this aircraft. You know, the hon. member opposite

DR. COLLINS: is a great one for coming up with fishing trips, he is a great fisherman. I think he probably is in real life even, but certainly in the House here he is a great fisher. He does not ask for a specific question, 'Look, I have a specific point that I want information on.' He does not know what he is looking for so he just casts out a net broadly and says, 'Just give me any information you have and if it is something that I find useful I will use it, if it does not mean anything I will not use it,' and, you know, that is his approach to matters.

Now, just think what he is asking for. He is asking for details about the use of the government aircraft. Now, the government aircraft is not an aircraft that one goes out and hires for 'on a trip' basis. If that were the case, I think there might be a point in saying, 'Alright, document every trip now because every trip that is made costs the public a certain amount of money.' But that is not the case at all.

DR. COLLINS: the aircraft is owned by the government, and is out there whether it is used ever through the year, it is out there. There are pilots employed to run the government aircraft. They are out there, if it is never used by anyone, they are out there and they have to be paid. Now, the government aircraft is not used only for administrative activities although it is very important to have it for that. As a matter of fact, the government aircraft is used, I would say, more than fifty per cent of the time for emergency medical services. Many times when it was to be put to administrative use, that has to be put aside because the people wanting to use it for legitimate administrative use are bumped aside and told, no, we have to go wherever, Deer Lake or St. Anthony or Labrador or whatever for emergency medical services. So the aircraft has to be there and if it is never used by a single minister or a single member of the government it would still have to be there to take care of those medical services.

The fact that it is there and it is used once a month, fifty times a month, a thousand times a month, does not increase, except for the gas used, does not increase cost to government by one iota.

Now, certainly if the hon. the Premier wants to make a trip for administrative purposes, government administrative purposes to Deer Lake and he goes by himself in the aircraft or he takes an elephant with him, or he takes anything at all with him or any person with him, it does not increase the expenses to government by one iota. It does not have any impact whatever upon the exchequer of this Province. So this question being asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is totally frivolous, it has no weight to it at all, it is totally spurious. And, of course, he is just looking to fish for something and if he can get a name that he can think is related

DR. COLLINS: in some way to something that he might, by association, bring some doubt about it, he would be absolutely delighted.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I have let the hon. gentleman ramble on now, Mr. Chairman, imputing motives, and Your Honour knows the rules of the House that that is not permitted under the rules of this House and I would ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw these statements that he is making, these foolish silly, childish, ridiculous, untrue statements. We are merely looking for informatio, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member himself has stated that there is something to hide there. He is making an accusation, I am responding to that accusation. There is nothing that I have said that is imputing motives that the hon. member himself has not brought forward. He said, 'There is something to hide in the use of the government aircraft', and I am responding to that.

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

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman just made another untrue, incorrect statement, Mr. Chairman. What I said was this, that if the government continues to stonewall, if the government continues to stonewall and does not give the House this information, then the only conclusion that we can come to is that they have something to hide. Now, that is different than what the hon. gentleman is saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, merely a difference of opinion.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr.Chairman, there is every good reason why many things that are necessary for the administration of government are not brought out in all their stark details at the drop of a hat. If that were so, if this House had to pass on every administrative move made by this government, government would very quickly seize up. If every time that an administrative move is made, it was to be questioned in the House, soon administrative moves would have to be made only with the permission of this House. And this government

DR. COLLINS: could not act, Therefore it is a principle with this government, with every government, the federal government itself has the same attitude toward this type of thing that all the provincial governments have as well as our provincial government, that is that for the efficient operation of government the government must have certain prerogatives to get on with the job and must not be hindered and hampered by spurious and frivolous questions in the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are many larger issues here, and I think my colleague the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) brought this up, there are many issues of substance that could be brought up in regard to this Interim Supply Bill, issues related to the use of the natural resources of this Province for the betterment of the citizens, issues brought up in relation to the social services that this government is exhibiting for the benefit of the citizens of this Province, and so on and so forth. These are the issues of importance, not whether someone takes a trip that might be questioned, is that worth the trip for the benefit returned to the government? These are judgement calls. An administrative decision may be made to use the aircraft to go somewhere, to do something, and one person may say it should not have been used for that purpose and another person would say it should have been used for that purpose, it is purely a judgement call. And in regard to the Premier's office, I would think that hon. members in this House, and the public generally, will agree and say that the Premier has very, very good judgement ninety-nine times out of a hundred.

On the passing of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members will appreciate that government, despite what the hon. the

DR. COLLINS: member for LaPoile
(Mr. Neary) says, will not be blamed for what is going on if this Interim Supply Bill is held up. Everyone in this Province knows why this Interim Supply Bill is being held up; it is being held up because of a frivolous matter and the people who are going to be hurt directly are the public servants of this Province.

And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that the public servants, some public servants in this Province have already suffered, they will not get their cheques when they should get them. There are certain mechanisms that have to go through to get the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is your fault now.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - cheques out and in outlying areas those steps have to be put in place a number of days before the actual pay day. There is no way that certain public servants in this Province can get paid on Wednesday. Now, if the Interim Supply Bill does not go through today, there will be a large number of public servants who will not get paid on Wednesday so that -

MR. NEARY: Why not tell us what we want to know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - there are already public servants in this Province who are suffering and will suffer, and their families will suffer because of this delay. And the hon. members opposite have made a lot of debating points recently about how they are concerned about the public servants in this Province in terms of their pay. Well, Mr. Chairman, there are public servants in this Province presently suffering, and their families will suffer, because of the actions of the Opposition in regard to this Interim Supply Bill. And the people who are suffering, and the public themselves, will be well aware of who caused

DR. COLLINS:

that difficulty.

So I would trust that hon.

members opposite will not cause undue suffering to the public servants of this Province and will let this bill go through.

DR. COLLINS: The hon. member, I think, also brought up about the Auditor General's Report and he read off a long list where the Auditor General quite rightly brought certain points to the attention of the hon. members of this House. I think that if one reviews this, it is probably the mildest report that has ever come into this House from the Auditor General. And, secondly, at the time that the Auditor General's Report came in, government tabled with it this document which laid out in detail our response to every single item brought up by the Auditor General. So that, you know, talking about the Auditor General's Report again is a nice debating point but really has not got very much substance to it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would move that this resolution be passed. ~~X~~

MR. L. THOMS: Some chance. Some chance.

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

~~X~~ MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised by what I just heard. When the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) turns around and says that if the government here has asked for administrative details, if the Opposition asks something to do with the administration of government, if we ask for some information because it is of an administration nature we cannot get it. Mr. Chairman, what are we here as a government and opposition and spending the taxpayers' money when we, both sides, can ask questions about administration and how things are going and how money is being spent and how it is being wasted and how it is being saved and X number of other things. So, Mr. Chairman, we have asked the question. We could turn around and keep asking, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked fifty, we could turn around and ask fifty more and not get them. It is the principle of this matter now that it has come down to. We have turned

MR. HISCOCK: around and asked one question with regard to the government aircraft, and that is basically the question that we are asking, and I am amazed at the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and this government turning around and not providing us with the number of flights, not providing who was in the aircraft, not providing us with where they were going. And, Mr. Chairman, I do not think for \$1 billion - you often hear of a \$1 million question, well, that is a \$1 billion question, ask a \$1 billion question. All we need is that information. And when it comes to innuendo, we are not reflecting anything on the Premier, we are not questioning the Premier's integrity. But I will go so far as to say this, Mr. Chairman, one of the rules of Opposition is you never ask a question unless you know the answer. So we know the answer but we want the public to know the answer. If we turn around and give the answer, then the government will turn around and say we are trying to muddy, stain, give innuendoes and go on a character assassination of the Premier so, therefore, let the facts speak for themselves. We know the answer to the question, Mr. Chairman. But with regard to the other question, I was amazed at the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he actually said that the Premier was right ninety per cent of the time. That is fine.

MR. NEARY: Ninety-nine.

MR. HISCOCK: Ninety-nine per cent of the time. Our job as the Opposition is to make sure it is ninety-nine per cent of the time and not the fault that will come with one mistake. The Premier is not infallible, as much as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) would like to think, and particularly the advice he is giving. The Premier is not infallible. And our job as an Opposition is to make sure that the Premier, all the Cabinet, the backbenchers, the Opposition and all the civil servants are kept on their toes. And when we ask a question in this House, if we cannot get

MR. HISCOCK: the answer to one particular thing because the Premier is right ninety-nine per cent of the time-we have a Premier now who not only knows what is right but does right. But somewhere along the line he might make a mistake one per cent of the time. And we /

MR. HISCOCK: as an Opposition, are told to forget about it, forget about that 1 per cent whatever it may be. That 1 per cent, my dear Mr. Chairman, in this House, could cost this government and these people \$.5 billion or \$200 million.

The Premier told us, Mr. Chairman, that Come By Chance was going to be opened up in ninety days. He said he was right on that. But, Mr. Chairman, here it is now, over six hundred and something. The Premier also told us that we were going to get the oil in off the Grand Banks by pipeline. Is the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) telling us that now?

So, Mr. Chairman, it is not our job as the Opposition to accept the words of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall), as true as they may be or any minister or any premier or any civil servant. Our job is not to accept them on their face value, our job is to get the facts and know the facts, Mr. Chairman. So when it comes to this government trying to say that the Opposition is the reason why the public service and the other people will not get it, we have already stated that we will pass enough interim supply to make sure that these people will get paid. Has the government decided this? No, the government said, 'All or nothing,' again dictatorial tactics, going on and having their own way. And, Mr. Chairman, this Province is expecting to have good government. The government can only be as good as the Opposition. Now, we are being told that the Premier only will make mistakes 1 per cent of the time so therefore, 'Do not ask questions; we know what we are doing and what we are doing is right,' Mr. Chairman.

I would ask the people who had the community pastures that were turned over to private enterprise, do they think that was right? I would ask the school boards, with regard to Grade XII coming in, do most

MR. HISCOCK: of the school boards think that is right? With regard to the nurses, there is going to be a shortage of nurses here in this Province. We need over 300 nurses, and here is the government going away to Ireland, England and Scotland and having-what? - recruitment. And here we have Alberta coming to Newfoundland and recruiting people to go out to Alberta because this government here will not give them a decent wage. So when the people do not get their cheques, Mr. Chairman, do not go on the fact that we are making people suffer. We find ourselves now in a Province where our students with their B.A.s and want to go and do their Masters or their P.H.D. at Harvard or Yale or the London School of Economics, are they getting any help from this government? No, we are going to London and we are going to Washington and we are going to Ottawa and Montreal and bringing them here. So, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to asking how this \$.5 billion is being spent, this question that we are asking of the Premier's office is only one technical question that we want from an administrative point of view to find out if this government is concerned about the conflict of interest and a great big show - the snow job. You can bring in all the conflict of interest legislation that you want and if one Cabinet minister or one backbencher wants to do something he is going to do it or she is going to do it. And you can bring in all the freedom of information you want and give the rosy picture that we have an open and honest government. Here now, we want one question answered, and are we getting it? Are we getting the answer to only one small, minute administrative detail that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) calls frivolous? Frivolous, yet we are not getting it.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the people will not be paid, it is not from the point of view of the Opposition. The Opposition's job is to oppose and

MR. HISCOCK: point out that we need good, honest government and representation and if we are going to have this good, honest representation, that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) supports 100 per cent, then I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Stephenville also wants to know the answer to that question, wants to know as well as all the other people in this House.

So, Mr. Chairman, to say that the Opposition is actually holding up the interim supply - if the government wanted, it would have had it long, long ago.

MR. STAGG: Where have you been all the time?

MR. E. HISCOCK: And, Mr. Chairman, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) asked where have I been all the time? I would assume I have been in the same place where all the Cabinet ministers and all their (inaudible), but I have done the work. The work is done. So I am back now with the work done, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the interim supply and with regard to a half a billion dollars, surely the citizens of this Province who elected this government over one of the best men in this country and decided to give this young, bold, aggressive, new-style Premier a chance - now the Premier is being put to a test, he was being put to the test with the Minister of Transportation, he was put to the test with the Minister of Fisheries and now he is being put to the test through his own office. And where is he? As I said, the doctor's ordered him four days rest because of exhaustion. He cannot even keep up with the pressure, a young man and here we have a former Premier eighty years old who is still working sixteen hours a day.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we cannot have an answer to one simple question then I can this, it is just as well for the Opposition and it is just as well for the people of this Province never to have an election, just throw it on over to the government and turn it over to the Premier. Because the Premier knows right, the Premier does right and the Premier will always be right and he is infallible. I should say, Mr. Chairman, that our Premier should turnaround and go on to Rome and take up a new office and not take up the office of the Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.
Shall the resolution carry?

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I am never otherwise but statesman like. And there are some questions that I would like to raise in the few minutes that are available to me.

Mr. Chairman, I, first of all, just want to allude to a statement made by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). It is unfortunate that he is not here. But I do want to allude to a statement that he made recently concerning the display - the performance I should say - by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) on a recent television programme with respect to the squabble, or with respect to the argument that is presently going on between the government and the Nova Scotian Government re the Northern cod.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting that the Leader of the Opposition did go on that programme to state what this party's position was with respect to ironing out that squabble. And the Premier himself, Mr. Chairman, would not show on that programme. I think that is the programme that the Premier would not go on to demonstrate to the people of Newfoundland his very concern for what was happening with his minister, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Fisheries in the Nova Scotian Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the point that I want to allude to because we cleared up that position. What I want to talk about is the employment - or the odd employment figures used by the minister at that particular time. Now, Mr. Chairman, we know that we can play around with statistics and do anything, practically, we want with them. But I want to put some accuracy to these figures because naturally the minister will use the statistics in a way that is most favourable to the government.

MR. LUSH: What the minister stated, Mr. Chairman, was that the unemployment rate had dropped from 17.7 per cent to 12.7 per cent since Premier Peckford took over the administration of the government. In other words, there was a drop, or there was an improvement of 5 per cent in the unemployment rate in this Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not accurate. That is totally inaccurate. What the minister was using, number one, was the seasonally adjusted figures. And, Mr. Chairman, you do not use seasonally adjusted figures over a long period of time, what you use over a long period of time is the actual figure or the average figures for the year because they are available. The average figures for the year are the ones that we would use when talking about a yearly unemployment situation. And what the minister did was to take a figure a month, take a particular month in 1978 when the Premier assumed office, took that unemployment rate, which at that time was 17.7 per cent and then for the comparison again took the unemployment rate for the month of February, and as all hon. members know, these monthly statistics are completely unreliable, they give us no idea about the direction of the economy. And it is not the thing to do, to use these monthly figures, number one, and number two, seasonally adjusted, when we are trying to give the people of this Province some idea of the direction in which the economy of this Province is moving.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just let me tell hon. members what the actual figures were and these are the ones, as I have said before, that indicate

MR. LUSH: the way the economy of the Province is moving. In 1978 the actual figures, the figures averaged out for the year, showed our unemployment rate to be at 16.4 per cent. In 1979 it was 15.4 per cent, a drop of an improvement of 1 per cent over that one year period.

In 1980, Mr. Chairman, and that is as far as we can go to show any accuracy, in 1980 it had dropped to 13.5 per cent, an improvement, Mr. Chairman, and one that we on this side of the House welcome. Any improvement in the unemployment picture, naturally it has to be greeted by all Newfoundlanders with some degree of delight, shall we say. So in 1980 the unemployment rate for the Province was 13.5 per cent which demonstrates that from 1978 to 1980 there was a drop, or an improvement in the unemployment rate by 2.9 per cent, just under 3 per cent, and not the 5 per cent that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) talks about. So there was a drop, an improvement from 1978 to 1980 of 2.9 percentage points.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we are telling the people, if we are trying to demonstrate to the people of this Province anything at all about the unemployment rate, we should at least be accurate and take the figures which more clearly demonstrate the position of the Province. So, Mr. Chairman, rather than 5 per cent we are talking about 2.9.

MR. LUSH: And we cannot use the figures of February and March and April because they mean nothing, it is the yearly figures that we have to look at.

And the other point I make is, and maybe the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can answer this query, it is an important one in that the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), every time a monthly statistic comes out and it looks like it is improved, Sir, he jumps up and down in his place, you would not know that the world was coming to an end, proud that we have an unemployment rate of 12.7 or some outrageous figure like that.

The question that needs to be answered is this, since the government have predicted an unemployment rate for the Province, the 14 per cent over the next five years, and now the Minister of Labour and Manpower is very proud that it is down to 12.7,

MR. LUSH: does that cast any error on the figures projected by the government in their Five Year Plan? Is there a combination of new circumstances now which demonstrate that that figure is not accurate, that indeed over the next five years the unemployment rate will not be fourteen percent but that it is going to go down to ten per cent or that it is going to go down to nine per cent?

But, Mr. Chairman, if I were an hon. member sitting on the other side, I would take no great delight in telling the people of this Province that we still have an unemployment rate of 12.7 per cent, just below thirteen per cent, an outrageous figure, Mr. Chairman. Nothing to be boasting about. And I would not be talking about it at all, Mr. Chairman, except that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J.Dinn) seems to take such great delight in the fact that our unemployment rate is just below thirteen per cent. But the question that needs to be asked now is is there any accuracy to the government's forecast of the fact that our unemployment rate over the next five years will stay at around fourteen per cent or is it going to go down, let us say, over the next five years to a figure of ten per cent?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. LUSH: That is what I would like to have the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) answer and to tell this hon. House and to tell the people of Newfoundland what we can expect with unemployment over the next five years. Is the government accurate with their forecast, or are they all wrong and indeed can we expect an unemployment rate to go below ten per cent or be at 10 per cent?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY:

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

X
MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, we have not reached the stage yet where we have been given the information that we asked of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in connection with the use of the government aircraft by the Premier's Office. And we are going to keep asking, Mr. Chairman, we are going to keep asking until we get the information.

MR. BARRY: There is only one name goes on the (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: One name goes on what?

MR. BARRY: The minister's name is the only name that goes on the (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand what the hon. gentleman is saying. What is the hon. gentleman saying?

MR. BARRY: I do not think there is any requirement to log the names of passengers. We have never been request to log the names of passengers, that I am aware of. You just log the number of passengers and you sign the -

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) should be the Minister of Finance. Maybe the Minister of Mines and Energy can get us the information. The Minister of Finance has stonewalled and refused to give the House some information that we want in connection with the number of times the government aircraft went aloft and surely, Mr. Chairman, surely for security reasons, if nothing else, the names of the passengers who fly on that aircraft have to be recorded. What would happen if the aircraft went down? How would they know who was on board the aircraft? There has to be a log.

MR. HANCOCK: one, two, three, four.

MR. BARRY: They count the feet and divide by two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

They count the feet. In that case, they would have to count three for the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, somehow or other, I believe the government are trying to leave the impression that we are going to lose our nerve, we are going to lose our nerve over here. They are trying to leave the impression that it will be our fault, it will be the Opposition's fault if the payrolls are not met, if the social assistance recipients do not get their cheques. How silly! How silly and how foolish can you get, Mr. Chairman? This government- it is the government who governs and not the Opposition and if the government wants the interim supply they can get it. But they will get it today over my dead body.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is an idea.

MR. S. NEARY:

Now, what have they attempted to do? What have they attempted to do, Mr. Chairman, in this debate? Well, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tried to divide the Opposition there a few moments ago by saying the front benches were for it and the back benches were against it. That is not true, Mr. Chairman. What our spokesman, our critic on Finance said the other day, he said, the government could have their supply bill by Friday at one o'clock providing providing they give the Opposition the information they want.

MR. STAGG:

Why do we not resign and hand the government over to you people.

MR. HANCOCK:

That would not be a bad idea.

MR. NEARY:

We have not gotten the information, Mr. Chairman. So that little tactic, that little piece of strategy is going to backfire because my hon. friends will remember over the weekend our critic

MR. NEARY: on Finance was on the television and on the radio saying that it was the government's fault that we do not have the Interim Supply Bill, not the Opposition. The Opposition are merely asking questions, we are not governing the Province. If we were, if I were the Premier of this Province, I would have the Interim Supply Bill, if I were sincere. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, they are being very insincere and very hypocritical about this whole matter. And I hope the word will go out in this House today that it is not the Opposition. It is not a filibuster. I have seen that even reported, it is a filibuster. It is not a filibuster, nowhere near it. In case they do not know what a filibuster is, I will be glad to spend an hour or so explaining, or they can watch Channel 12 and see what the Tories are doing up in Ottawa; that is a filibuster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the Interim Supply Bill is not passed by six o'clock this evening, let it be known to all and sundry the reason it is not passed is, first of all, the government does not want it passed; if they did they would give us the information we are asking for or they would resort to some other measure to get the bill. It is just as simple as that.

I mean, Mr. Chairman, not only that, not only did they try to divide the Opposition, but the other day the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) made a statement in this House that was quoted widely by the media, and in the Daily News it was quoted again and it says, "Government wants budget on T.V. Neary taking the House on his back, Marshall". So when they cannot divide the Opposition they resort to the little

MR. NEARY: personal attacks. And in that same newspaper, Mr. Chairman, where Mr. Marshall says in the headline here, 'Neary taking the House on his back, Marshall', in that very same newspaper is an article quoting the Speaker of this House - which is most unusual, I might say, but it is there. And what does the Speaker of the House say? The Speaker now, who is completely independent and impartial, a man who sits in the Chair and observes both sides of the House, what does he say about that, Mr. Chairman? Did Your Honour read the article? In case Your Honour did not read it, I will read it. It says: "Our M.H.A's are well behaved". That is the Speaker of this House.

The President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) trying to undermine the credibility of the Opposition says that Neary has the House on his back, and the Speaker says our M.H.A's are well behaved, in the same newspaper, page one and page three.

MR. HOUSE: It is misleading because it says, 'Speaker takes House on his back' and somebody phoned in and said that it was me.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HOUSE: It says, 'Speaker takes House on his back' and not the House.

MR. NEARY: 'The Speaker of Newfoundland's House of Assembly' - just listen to this - 'the hon. Len Simms -

MR. MARSHALL: A difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I see. Well, I would be more inclined to take the word of the Speaker than I would of the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY:

Here is what it says:

" The Speaker of the Newfoundland House of Assembly, the hon. Len Simms, has kind words for the M.H.A's whose discussions he directs and guides every day the House is sitting. They are a well-behaved bunch, he told the Daily News Friday and he added, 'After visiting most of the other legislatures in Canada while they were in session, including the Commons in Ottawa, I would say that our Legislature is one of the best behaved in the country'." Well, you would never say it according to croaking bullfrog every morning, talking about how ill-behaved we are. Somebody should take this and bring it down to him.

Mr. Chairman - and he added, 'Some observers hold that Mr. Simms' firm hand at the helm contributes a lot to this kind of situation'.

MR. STAGG:

Who is the recipient of that kind remark?

MR. S. NEARY: The croaking bullfrog? Everybody knows who the croaking bullfrog is.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not have - hon. gentlemen should be familiar because I might say, Mr. Chairman, about -

MR. STAGG: The member (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - I might say about this government, they have a new law in this Province, by the way, in the way that they have lined up the Open Line brigade.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: They have a certain lady out there -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) people get some (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: - they have an Open Line brigade - now, just listen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - I hope nobody thinks -

MR. STAGG: Well, boy what the Open Line (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: - I hope nobody thinks that they will get a fair shake on an Open Line programme because the moment I go on or the Leader of the Opposition or any of my colleagues go on a certain Open Line, or any of the Open Lines for that matter, the Open Line brigade is alerted and then phone calls are made and they are told to call in; call in, Neary is on, call in, Hancock is on, call in, Rod Moores is on. The Open Line brigade.

DR. COLLINS: What do they say?

MR. S. NEARY: And they call in -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: They are not told what to say but some of it is slanderous and libelous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: And so, Mr. Chairman, this is an all-time low. For a government that has to resort to that strategy, that tactic, I would say that that is the sign of desperation. And they also have another brigade writing letters to the paper. This is a hangover from the Moores days. They think this is great, that this is smart. If you cannot make your point -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Surely, Mr. Chairman, if the civil servants are to have their cheques delayed, it should be on some relevant point and not on the points - if the hon. gentleman wants to make some relevant points about a very serious matter, obviously it is his prerogative to make it, but these remarks can hardly be deemed to be relevant, Mr. Chairman, so, you know, that is the point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: This debate is a wide-ranging debate Mr. Chairman, as Your Honour knows.

MR. MARSHALL: (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: If I wanted to I could bring in the Bible and quote from the Bible and it would be in order. So, Mr. Chairman, we are completely in order, As a matter of fact, this debate is more wide-ranging in some respects than the Throne Speech debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! To the point of order I would have to rule there is not a point of order. I might

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): just point out that in Beaulieu, paragraph 299, "Relevancy is not easy to define," particularly when you are on a money bill and in borderline cases the member speaking should be given the benefit of the doubt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the hon. member for LaPoile has about fifteen seconds.

MR. S. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, let me say in that fifteen seconds that we are prepared to give the government approval to meet their payrolls for three months. We are prepared to give the government the money for the essential services but we are not prepared to give the government money for non-essential services unless they give us the information that we have requested -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: - in connection with the government aircraft.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth-

AN HON. MEMBER: Youth and Culture and Environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: - and the Environment.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything but I was getting a little bored here and we do have another forty minutes or so. I would like to comment on some of the points just raised by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Thoms) a few moments ago. And I think the statement by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) last week concerning the statements by the Leader of the Opposition are very important ones. We saw this Spring in Newfoundland, in a very few short weeks, a number of deep sea trawlers, sophisticated vessels from Nova Scotia - and they could be based anywhere but these happened to be based in Nova Scotia - come down here off

MR. ANDREWS: the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and the Southern part of Labrador and just off here off the Funks, and that one company alone, their vessels landed 11,000 metric tons of codfish. It was taken - they caught more than that, but that 11,000 metric tons is what they brought back to Nova Scotia - and using the figures quoted by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) that 11,000 metric tons of raw material, which is, I imagine, head-on-gutted fish, would produce eighteen man-years of direct labour in this Province or anywhere else. Therefore, 11,000 metric tons of Northern cod landed in Newfoundland would produce 200 man-years. And using the figure of \$12 thousand for that type of employment, we are looking at a direct loss of \$2.4 million to the Newfoundland economy, by one company in two, three or four very short weeks.

MR. ANDREWS: This government's position is that should not happen. Two hundred man-years, two hundred years, it is an industry that would employ 200 people. A sizeable little fish plant.

MR. STAGG: One man for 200 years.

MR. ANDREWS: For one man 200 years. Two of you for 100 years.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank God there is only one of him.

MR. ANDREWS: This is just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Chairman. This is what one company can do with the blessing of the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. LeBlanc) and the federal authorities who have not opened their mouths about this type of activity along our coast, who say that it is a stock that is owned by all of the provinces, that anybody who has access to it—if you use that type of thinking, you could go to Thunder Bay, Ontario, up the lakehead and have a fish plant there and sail down the Great Lakes and out the St. Lawrence Seaway and go up in the Strait of Belle Isle and off the Northern tip of Newfoundland, take your fish, bring it back up the Seaway, up the Lakes right into Thunder Bay.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: Why not?

MR. ANDREWS: That is not what we want to happen here.

MR. ANDREWS: But this is a policy -

MR. STAGG: That is the Liberal policy.

MR. ANDREWS: That is the Liberal policy. The hon. Leader of the Opposition got very upset about the fact that the Minister of Fisheries for Nova Scotia was upset.

MR. ANDREWS: Certainly he is going to be upset if he is any kind of a good Nova Scotian,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: -when he sees the possibility of 200 jobs coming to Newfoundland. But I am not going to get upset about him not in the least.

He talked about how Nickerson's and National Sea were good corporate citizens, and I am sure they are good corporate citizens.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, sure.

MR. ANDREWS: National Sea certainly is a good corporate citizen.

This is not an argument with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in Newfoundland or the Minister of Fisheries in Nova Scotia, this is an argument with the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and one fishing company that is also in Newfoundland. And where they operate in Newfoundland they are good corporate citizens too.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) their own government right (inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: But we just want them to be a little bit better and next year have those 200 jobs here down in St. Mary's-The Capes, down in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir, wherever, but not across the Cabot Strait. This type of policy that is being fostered by the federal government, I believe is very detrimental to Newfoundland. The licencing policy of the Federal Department of Fisheries is also a very sad situation. And I had a call over this -

MR. NEARY: They do not licence fish (inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: - past weekend, I had a call from three fishermen in Burgeo, and I thought I was understanding this federal licencing programme, I thought I had a handle on it, but obviously I did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: You will not either.

MR. ANDREWS: No, I cannot say, they keep changing it so much.

Three fishermen, two of them are middle-aged men, in their fifties, fifty-five, and they are fishing alone, in two boats, cross-handed. One fellow has had a very good season, he has made several thousand dollars since the end of January when the fishery really picked up down there, and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I am sure knows what a lucrative fishery can be on that part of the coast at this time of year.

But now the bait situation is getting a little bit low, and bait is rather expensive. So they want to go and set some herring nets for bait -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) must have been delighted.

MR. ANDREWS: - but because they are classified by the Federal Department of Fisheries as part-time fishermen - and they were quite satisfied to take that description of themselves too because they are semi-retired, one gentleman is a widower and he does a little bit of part-time, and he works in one of the provincial parks along the coast there

MR. ANDREWS: because he was classified as a part-time fisherman he is not permitted to get a herring license to catch bait to fish. He is allowed to fish part-time but he is not allowed to procure the wherewithal, the bait to do his part-time fishing. A most ludicrous situation, Mr. Chairman, and one that I am certainly going to make representation to the Minister of Fisheries and local authorities here on behalf of these fishermen. And I am sure these are the only three that have come to light in my district - I am sure there are more and I hope to make a few calls over the next few days to find out if there are any more. I am sure that -

MR. FLIGHT: Are you going to make any representation to the federal minister of Fisheries?

MR. ANDREWS: I certainly will. Yes, I am going to do it tomorrow morning. I am sure that the federal Minister of Fisheries, when this licensing policy was put forward, did not cynically mean to stop some middle-age or elderly fishermen from trying to make a living, but this is what is happening. Because of bureaucratic bulldozing by the federal authorities, this sort of thing is happening.

So, Mr. Chairman, these few comments on fisheries, I think, were worthy of being said in such a debate about money, because we need \$450 million now. Well, we just lost \$2.4 million, not very much, but we could lose \$450 million. When our fishery gets back and the Northern cod stock and the herring stocks and all the other stocks rejuvenate, we could see \$450 million lost in one fell swoop. This \$2.4 million referred to here was the direct loss in labour. And with the spin-off and the trucking and the gas that would be sold and the groceries bought, I am sure that that would be considerably more. These are the things, I think, that this government is watching over better than any government we ever had in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

The hon. member for St. Mary's-
The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of getting into this debate but the minister there talked about some interesting topics and I would like to make a couple of comments on what he did say, Mr. Chairman. It just goes to show that I am expecting another Cabinet shuffle in the next few days because the Minister of Recreation, Youth and Culture (Mr. Andrews), who was just appointed, seems to know more about the fisheries than the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), but that does not surprise me.

MR. ANDREWS:

I represent a fishing district.

MR. HANCOCK:

Yes, I know you do, Mr. Chairman, and you should be Minister of Fisheries not Minister of Recreation, Youth and Culture. That is beside the point. But, Mr. Chairman, it just goes to show how much intestinal fortitude this government does have. Mr. Chairman, we are in a situation now where we have Nickerson's who are going up catching our Northern cod stock and taking it to Nova Scotia to be processed. I can see that, Mr. Chairman, but who issues the licenses to Nickerson's? Is that not the responsibility of the provincial government? And if you want to see it stop, and you are so concerned about it, forget the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, forget about him for a second, look at the responsibilities that are invested in your own government for a change and do something about it. If you are so concerned about it, as you appear to be, why do you not get your own Minister of Fisheries to cancel all licenses that are issued and being held right now, presently, by Nickerson's? That is something that is the responsibility of the provincial government and you can do something about but you have not got the -

DR. COLLINS:

Then we will be put out of work.

MR. HANCOCK: No we will not be put out of work you can start up your own. You can take over the plants from Nickerson's, buy them out, get rid of them, if you are so concerned about them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Buy them out, give them away.

MR. HANCOCK: No, you do not have to give it away, Mr. Chairman, but you are in a position to do something about it and you do not want to, you have not got the intestinal fortitude to do something about it. You will come out in the next few days, and the Minister of Fisheries will come out, and do the same thing about it, criticize the feds again, once again. But I am sure that you should look after your own house before you criticize someone else's, Mr. Chairman.

I agree that the fish should be landed in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, but how do you tell a Newfoundland cod from a Nova Scotian cod? It gets very difficult.

MR. ANDREWS: Nova Scotia (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: No, we fish off the Nova Scotian banks, Mr. Chairman. We bring in fish and land it here in Newfoundland.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) in his own district.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, in the member's district who just spoke, Mr. Chairman. So I think we have to compromise on those issues, Mr. Chairman. We have to get our act together and for God's sake let us invest and do something with the powers that are invested in the local government and stop criticizing Ottawa for once in our lives.

Mr. Chairman, this -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) and go out in Bellevue and find (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: You have no worries about Bellevue. You have one stronghold in Bellevue and that represents about eight per cent of the total population in Bellevue, Mr. Chairman, you can win that and still lose by - I would estimate

MR. D. HANCOCK: when Premier Peckford got elected I watched the whole campaign on T.V. Mr. Chairman, I was so proud because there were a lot of people in my district who worked in the past in Come by Chance and who sought employment and fed their families by means of Come by Chance. And then the Premier, Mr. Chairman, built up the expectations of those people and myself. And I got sucked in pretty good! I got sucked in as well as the rest of the people in my district, Mr. Chairman, that Come by Chance would be opened within 90 days. And I have heard that from - if I did not hear he himself say it, then I would not believe it, Mr. Chairman, that Come by Chance would be opened within 90 days. It is now, I think, 626 days overdue, Mr. Chairman. So the Premier cannot go out in Bellevue and make any commitments or any promises to the people of that area because they will never let him forget Come by Chance. So from day one in this election the Premier could not go out and make one commitment or one promise to the people in Bellevue. He could not, Mr. Chairman, because he put his foot in his own mouth on the very first day he became Premier of this Province by saying that Come by Chance would be opened within 90 days.

Now, this is one of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, that the people will not put any more confidence or give the Premier a vote of confidence in this election. I am sad to say that we are going to pick up - and I know Wilson Callan - I do not mind saying that he is no Don Jamieson, but I have an awful feeling that Mr. Callan is going to outdo the number of votes that Mr. Jamieson got in that riding. As a matter of fact, I have a wager on him with a very close friend of mine, Mr. Chairman. I will not say how much.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I have travelled the district extensively in the last week. I know the feelings of the district. The Tories have one stronghold in that whole riding, Mr. Chairman, and like I said, that represents 8 per cent of the district.

MR. E. HISCOCK: And that depends on the roads.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) from small beginnings grow.

MR. D. HANCOCK: There are some bad - I thought I had the only district in the Province, Mr. Chairman, that had some bad road conditions, but there are some terrible road conditions in Bellevue as well. As a matter of fact, they are not as bad now as they were because - they are amazed, they do not know where the graders are coming from in Bellevue, especially down in Southport and that area. They have not seen graders all winter and now since the by-election has been called, Mr. Chairman, they have counted as high as ten passing along in front of their doors each day. But I will say, Mr. Chairman, we are stronger in Bellevue than we ever have been.

But, Mr. Chairman, this government really sucked me in in those householders that we talk about. We were promised that we could send out - or we were told by government that we could send out four householders a year - was it three or four, 'Steve'?

MR. S. NEARY: Four.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Four householders a year. Mr. Chairman, what did we get? I went down the other day to send out a copy of a speech that I recently made in the House and it cost me in the vicinity of \$2,200 to have that speech sent out to the constituents of mine who expect to hear from their member, Mr. Chairman.

MR. D. HANCOCK: And what do we get paid for? We get paid for a postage stamp, Mr. Chairman. It is an insult to the intelligence of members on both sides of this House to tell them that they can have four householders a year and the government will pay for the postage. Pay for the postage, Mr. Chairman! It is ridiculous! I brought the matter to the attention of the Speaker and I intend to follow up on it, Mr. Chairman. And if there is not something done about it I intend to raise this matter on a point of privilege in the House of Assembly in the upcoming days.

We are also forced into a situation, Mr. Chairman, I know all members of the Opposition are, where we have two members in a room, in one room. I have often been downstairs in my office and if the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), whom I share an office with, has had a delegation here, or if I had a delegation, he would have to work out of another office for sometimes as high as two or three hours. Mr. Chairman, this is not good enough. I think people expect more from their members than this. It is something that should be looked into immediately and something should be done about it.

MR. R. BAIRD: Agreed.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Agreed. I agree, Mr. Chairman. The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) agrees, Mr. Chairman, and he has an office down there almost as big as the House of Assembly with carpet up to your knees. He should come down and have a look at what we have to work out of, an eight by ten. I am sure it is not an eight by ten when you take in the desk space, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you get many delegations from Torngat Mountains?

MR.D. HANCOCK: He does not get too many, no, Mr. Chairman, because the cost is so high but he does get a scattered one. I get a lot from my district, Mr. Chairman.

But, Mr. Chairman, we look back over the last twelve years and what has happened in this Province? And here we are looking to pass the Interim Supply Bill today, Mr. Chairman. If I had my way I would not pass this bill until I got the commitment from the government that they would look after the real needs of the people of this Province. When the Smallwood administration left office back some ten years ago, Mr. Chairman, we had a public deficit of \$300 million.

MR. HANCOCK: But what is the public debt today, Mr. Chairman? It is over three billion dollars, Mr. Chairman, with nothing to show for it, and here we are asked now to pass another half a billion dollars. We do not know what we are going to get - or the poor civil servants will not get paid for two or three days. It is a big deal, Mr. Chairman, if they do not get paid for two or three days. This is the first time since I have been here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: - that the government is really relying - I do not care if they are hung up for a week, Mr. Chairman. The social services cheques do not go out in the mail until the thirteenth.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the principle of the thing.

MR. HANCOCK: It is the principle of the thing, Mr. Chairman, that we are concerned about right here, and the government have got measures they can use if they want to get out this interim supply but I would say, Mr. Chairman, they are using it as election bait in Bellevue.

MR. STAGG: It is a brand new discovery in you fellows.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, I have my own mind, Mr. Chairman, and I think in my own mind, not in the majority of the caucus who are out working to try to get a delegate elected to this House. But, Mr. Chairman, they do have measures that they can use. They can bring in closure if they want to, Mr. Chairman, if they want to get this bill through but, no, I would say they have something up their sleeves. We are not going to be sucked in by their trickery this time, Mr. Chairman. It is about time that the people out there realize, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since I have been elected, a year and a half ago, that the government is really getting on their knees to the Opposition to try to

MR. HANCOCK: get something through,
It is the first time, Mr. Chairman. The
Opposition plays no role in this House of Assembly.
I have heard it so many times from government members
opposite but, Mr. Chairman, now we know what kind of a
role the hon. members opposite play in this debate.

MR. NEARY: And we are not even the
government.

MR. HANCOCK: The paycheques will not go out
unless the Opposition say so, Mr. Chairman. What a pile of
baloney! That is a mouthful, Mr. Chairman. Who issues the
cheques, Mr. Chairman? I have not signed any cheques for the
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I am sure hon. members
here opposite have not. It is the government's responsibility,
Mr. Chairman, to get those cheques out on time. It is their
responsibility, Mr. Chairman. It is about time they lived
up to the commitment they made to the people of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) sucked in
(inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: We are not sucked in, no,
Mr. Chairman. I need to sit down, boy, I got ten minutes to -

MR. NEARY: Keep her going, boy.

MR. HANCOCK: It is a big deal, Mr. Chairman.
For once in our lives we have seen it, Mr. Chairman, and I
hope the press picks up that the government is relying upon
the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, relying upon the Opposition
for something they need in order to get this Interim Supply
Bill through so that the poor, old civil servants, who I
am sure have no money in the banks, cannot live for two
extra days without a cheque, are not going to suffer.
Well, I would say let them suffer, Mr. Chairman. We have let
this government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Here we have it!

MR. HANCOCK: Here we have it. Yes -

MR. BARRY: Here we have it!

MR. HANCOCK: I am concerned -

MR. BARRY: 'Let them suffer', he says.

MR. HANCOCK: It is the principle of the thing here, Mr. Chairman. It is the principle of the thing, Mr. Chairman. Here we go, poor old St. John's again, Mr. Chairman, poor old St. John's. If I had it as good in my district or the people in my district had it as good as the poor old people in St. John's, Mr. Chairman, I would not worry about the poor old people around the bay. Well, Mr. Chairman, St. John's has too much. They have too much, Mr. Chairman. You look at the facilities in this city, and I know the population is here to warrant it, but you go out and base the population in ridings outside of this city and see what they have compared to what St. John's has got. I am in the process now, Mr. Chairman, with my two kids. I have to take them back 120 miles a day so they can take swimming lessons, Mr. Chairman, 120 miles a day. I take turns - well, there are four or five families in the area, that their kids will not be able to achieve the same things as people in St. John's if we do not transport them back and forth to town two days a week, Mr. Chairman, for 125 miles a day. And this government has wasted so much money -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: - on outdoor swimming pools, Mr. Chairman, it would make your head spin.

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

MR. HANCOCK: No by leave, Mr. Chairman, it is too long: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. X

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. MOORES:

Mr. Chairman, between the jigs and the reels there is a fundamental principle involved in what is going on in the House of Assembly today and what has been going on for the last couple of days of sittings. Every time that the government of this Province gets tired of the Opposition, gets tired of debate and wants something which they cannot get, they start pointing a finger at the Opposition and saying, 'You are to blame. You are the ones who have to take the responsibility. You are the ones who are impeding the public purse, obstructing cheques and that type of thing from going out. But the fundamental principle involved here, Mr. Chairman, is that we as an Opposition have a role to play and that role is exactly the opposite of what the government is proclaiming and that is we have the right,

MR. MOORES: we have the duty, we have the responsibility not to give the government what it wants, regardless of what it might think.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. MOORES: Now, any person in this Province, whether he is in the public gallery, the press gallery, or on this floor of the Legislature, who in any way however remote, accuses the Opposition of filibustering this debate, it just shows their gross ignorance of legislative proceedings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: You cannot filibuster, you cannot filibuster a debate which has an automatic closure. This is part of the seventy-five hour budget debate, and it is up to the Opposition whether or not we use five hours of it on interim supply or all seventy-five of it. You just simply cannot filibuster a debate which has an automatic closure rule.

MR. MOORES: We have only seventy-five hours, therefore, how can you filibuster something which already, under the rules of the House, has a closure motion which prevents you from filibustering. It is just simply gross ignorance, Mr. Chairman, on the part of anybody in the Province who gets on with that nonsense and trash. They should not be here covering the Legislature and they should not be here in it, and they should not be here looking or listening to it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They should not be, period.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

I mean, filibustering in the very technical sense is where you manipulate the rules of the House, and by manipulating the rules you avoid debate. That is a filibuster. You cannot filibuster by debating.

MR. MOORES: It is our right to debate. It is our right to continue to ask the government for answers to questions.

MR. HISCOCK: What questions?

MR. MOORES: And we will continue to do so, and this is not a filibuster, in simple terms it is a stand-off. We are not going to give in on it. The government has deliberately and negligently decided that it is not going to give answers to questions.

MR. NEARY: That is right, this open and free (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: And there is the principle, the very simple principle that the government under law, legislative law, must provide answers to the taxpayers through this Chamber, and when it refuses to do so, then it is violating a basic and fundamental trust which the voter places in them at the time of an election. And the balance, the inherent balance in the system when that occurs, when the government becomes irresponsible and refuses to give answers, the inherent balance in the system is that the Opposition must take upon it its responsibility and force it to give answers to questions. That is the simple, political science factor of it. And any member of the press, any member of this Legislature who says otherwise is either ignorant of the facts or is completely biased toward the government point of view.

AN HON. MEMBER: No (inaudible).

MR. MOORES: And we have seen here, Mr. Chairman, all sorts of chicanery,

MR. STAGG: Chicanery?

MR. MOORES: - all sorts of hypocrisy, of deceit on the part of the government to try to weasel their way out of this, to try to cause the public of this Province to see that, it is the Opposition who is delaying payments

MR. MOORES: and cheques. So what if the civil servants and the social assistance recipients have to wait for a few dollars until this fundamental principle is restored? They have a responsibility too. The civil servants and the social assistance recipients, the employees of this Province are also taxpayers. You cannot shrug off a democratic principle so basic and so main to our very existence all because of a few dollars. It just does not happen that way, Mr. Chairman, and besides, if you listen to the government you would think that this is a crisis. You would think that nobody out there is

MR. MOORES:

going to get paid and everyone is going to be broke.

MR. HISCOCK:

Starvation (inaudible).

MR. MOORES:

Our responsibility as an Opposition is to allow this interim supply to go through without any harm to the public and the taxpayer. And we will do that when we see fit.

MR. HISCOCK:

Then give them the money now.

MR. MOORES:

And there is nothing irresponsible in that, nothing at all.

MR. HISCOCK:

Give them the money for the salaries now.

MR. MOORES:

But there is something, Mr. Chairman, irresponsible about a minister who comes into this House and makes a Ministerial Statement that Arnolds Cove is going to be a preliminary site for offshore oil development three days before a by-election, that is irresponsibility, while half the Cabinet is out in the district of Bellevue pumping in the promises and the money for which they have no commitment for from this House. Now, there is inconsistency for you. They go out and they are going to pave roads, build hospitals, open Come By Chance and they are going to do it with money which they are arguing here on the floor of the House they do not have the right to spend because we are holding it up. There is logic, good logic! That is the type of logic that we on this side of the House have come to expect from the government and to ignore in most cases. In fact, it is in itself counterproductive, if not redundant, that I am on my feet now defending the role of the Opposition from the foolishness that we hear from the government side. We have seventy-five hours of debate and we will use what portion of it we see fit to discuss interim supply. And when we feel that we are overdoing it, when we feel that we are imposing some harm or hardship upon the taxpayer in this Province, unlike the government,

MR. MOORES: we will assume our responsibility
and we will allow this bill to go through.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) people of Bellevue
do not get paid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The real reason is coming up now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the
type of statement, and I am

MR. R. MOORES: so glad that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) interjected. Because that is exactly the statement to which I am referring, the deliberate attempt by the government to have the press and the public see us as being the evil in this situation. And one of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why the public does not see the absurdity of that statement is I do not believe that they really know how the system works. I do not believe that they really understand what the role of the Opposition is in this debate.

MR. S. NEARY: If they want the interim supply let them go over on the other side and we will get it.

MR. R. MOORES: Sure. I mean you either do one of two things, you accept the system that we have or you reverse the roles of the individuals within it. I am not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I am not at all impressed. I am not at all impressed, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, it looks like we are not going to get our interim supply through today so I am going to pass a few words on some of the comments that have been made. I want it to be underscored here that we got up in the beginning of this debate and we indicated that it was necessary in order to get interim supply and if interim supply was not through today there would be inconvenience to people in this Province. And there will be inconvenience to people of this Province, inconvenience already started and harm as well.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I told hon. gentlemen there opposite, through Your Honour, that the fact of the matter is that there are people in the more remote areas of this Province where cheques have to be sent out in the mail for them to reach them in time, the district of the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), in the district of the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) specifically. Now the fact of the matter is their cheques, Mr. Chairman, as a result of this will be delayed.

MR. NEARY: You are the government, so why do you not get the money?

MR. W. MARSHALL: I am the government, 'we are the government' says the hon. member. The hon. member obviously does not understand this function. The function of this government and the function of the spending of money is determined by the Legislature. And we bring it before the Legislature, Mr. Chairman. And all that we are met with from the opposite side is -

MR. HANCOCK: You have a majority, You have a majority.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he proclaimed

MR. MARSHALL: very loudly from the Opposition benches to the people of Newfoundland, "Let them suffer". So I would appreciate it if the hon. gentleman would suffer me and allow me to have my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Chairman, that is the situation and it is a legislative function to pass money, to vote money and vote supply, it is the major function of the Legislature. And this government above all other governments - the hon. gentleman said that another Premier got supply and got supply easily. He got supply very, very easily, Mr. Chairman, I realize this. But this is a government that respects the legislative function and respects a Legislature. And despite the fact that the hon. gentlemen are acting in the way that they are acting we will continue to respect it because, in our view, closure would, in effect, make a mockery of it. The hon. gentlemen are not going to force the government into a position of this nature, which, by its very nature, can derogate from the type of atmosphere that we have tried to create in the Legislature and the bolstering of the legislative function.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why is supply being held up? Because allegedly there are no answers that have been supplied by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to the questions. Over nine hours of time have passed, Mr. Chairman. And, you know, we were entertained today with talks about the Bellevue by-election by one member. We were entertained by talks of Open Line programmes, and what have you, by another member. We have had discussion as to how the Premier looks when his picture is taken with a group of people. We have had such elevating discussions about alleged grumblings and mutterings of ministers and what have you. And if that is the way the hon. gentlemen want to play the game they can.

The one question, Mr. Chairman, that they come back to, that they allege, is with respect to the government aircraft. And they want, Mr. Chairman, a list

MR. MARSHALL: of the people on the government aircraft. Now, before I make this statement, Mr. Chairman, let me say that before I make it, I checked to be quite sure as to the position. There is no list. And the hon. gentlemen can get this through their heads, there is no list existing of people who have travelled on the government aircraft. The procedure, Mr. Chairman, is purely and simply that the government aircraft is used for official business. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has said in his place, Mr. Chairman, that the government aircraft has been used only for official business.

Now, the hon. gentleman wants to go further. He wants to know who was on the aircraft. We have to say we cannot give him that list because that list does not exist.

MR. MARSHALL: The procedure is, when the aircraft is used for government business, that the Premier or the minister, if they happen to be on it, one of them will sign the authorization. Before the aircraft is authorized there has to be a signing of the authorization. There is no list, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite know it. So that is the position we have given.

Now, they have raised no other question that requires answering.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: The member of the Privy Council said that there is no list of the people who are flying on the government aircraft. I would like to ask the minister the question, when -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot rise on a point of order to ask a question.

MR. HISCOCK: I contend that there is a list.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is a difference of opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a difference of opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh,

MR. HISCOCK: When one was flying with the Flag Committee, the pilot checked them off each day. Mr. Chairman, there is a list.

MR. MARSHALL: There is no list, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: We are on a point of order now,

Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, this is an example -
this is an example, Mr. Chairman, of -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - how the rules of the House
and this Committee are abused by the hon. gentlemen. I did
not interrupt them when they were speaking.

MR. HISCOCK: You interrupted me.

MR. MARSHALL: And I would, Mr. Chairman,
ask them to afford the same courtesy. So that is the
situation, Mr. Chairman, and we are told here -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Your Honour did not
did not rule on the point of order yet.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is nothing to rule.

MR. MARSHALL: There is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, there is obviously no
point of order.

The hon. President of the
Council.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Chairman, let me
say that the attitude of the hon. gentlemen there opposite
is, and let it be known, it has been said by a member of
the Opposition, let them suffer. Another Opposition says,

AN HON. MEMBER: Let them suffer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good enough for them.

MR. MARSHALL: - you cannot filibuster.

MR. MOORES: No way.

MR. MARSHALL: It is up to the Opposition -
and the member for Carbonear said, and this is true, you
cannot filibuster in this debate, because, he said, it is
up to the Opposition to determine how much time will be

MR. MARSHALL: spent on interim supply. And that is it exactly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in their judgment the hon. gentlemen there opposite have agreed to the fact that in their particular judgment they will get to this particular stage where people cannot be paid, where salaries cannot be paid, where there will be gross inconvenience to people, to public servants, all purely and simply, Mr. Chairman, after the Opposition had indicated last Friday in a responsible fashion that supply would be given. So what has happened in the meantime?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: It is not the questions, Mr. Chairman, it is that the responsible in the Opposition are not in their seats -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and this is one of the problems and they are running adrift, they are obviously adrift Mr. Chairman, they have X leaders and prospective leaders and present leaders and what have you, and they got in the tug a man who will never be a leader of anything, Mr. Chairman, and they are running on.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they should really consider the situation. This government, Mr. Chairman, is not going to make a mockery of the House of Assembly. This government, Mr. Chairman, is not going to sit back and see the hon. gentlemen carry on this way and make insinuations that questions have not been answered. If they asked any questions of any quality, Mr. Chairman, in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: -like about unemployment and what have you, we would have a much more meaningful debate than we have. You will note, Mr. Chairman, there have been

MR. CHAIRMAN: no questions about this -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - or about revenue. 

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) is the question (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Chairman, with a great deal of regret, Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

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

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 6, 1981

1981 04 02

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Mines & Energy in reply to a Question put forward by Mr. Steve Neary (M.H.A. LaPoile) in Order Paper 17/81 dated March 26, 1981.

QUESTION:

- (a) A progress report on exploration and drilling done by RIO CANEX near Burnt Islands Pond for gold and other minerals;
- (b) When a decision will be made on the feasibility of opening a mine in the Burnt Islands Pond area.

ANSWER:

- (a) Riocanex, the exploration arm of Rio Algom, carried out a full summer program of exploration in 1980 at its Cape Ray Gold Project, as it has done each year since the program first started in 1977.
Exploration work on this property up to the end of 1980 has revealed a one mile long mineralized area which has three potential ore zones totalling approximately one million tons of material grading at less than 0.3 oz. of gold per ton.
Trenching and diamond drilling indicate that ground conditions will be extremely poor in an underground mining situation and therefore Riocanex has decided to suspend exploration work until the feasibility of mining this area is determined by the Mine Engineering Division of the company. Therefore we cannot expect to see a major exploration program undertaken in this area in 1981.

Environmental impact and feasibility studies have to be conducted before a decision is made to open a mine and in this case, because ground conditions are so bad, it will be necessary to predetermine the feasibility of physically mining the ore reserves before any such decisions are made. This whole matter is currently under consideration by the Engineering Division of the Company, however, official company sources indicate that it is most unlikely that a decision to go ahead with exploratory mining development will be made in time to commence such work in 1981.