

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
Tuesday, June 30, 1981

The House met at 3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government and indeed on behalf of all the citizens throughout our Province, I want to pay tribute today to a young Canadian, Terry Fox, whose short life ended on Sunday. Terry, especially this past year, represented a tremendous source of hope and inspiration for Canadians all across this land. Terry Fox was truly not your average Canadian. How many of us, I wonder, would have the capacity to withstand the trauma of the loss of a limb and think it not an obstacle but a challenge, a problem to be surmounted. Terry not only met the challenge, but he went on to pursue goals which most of us, who have no disability, would not have even contemplated. Throughout his Marathon of Hope across the country, all Canadians learned something of Terry's incredible courage and strength, qualities which in him seemed to be boundless and immeasurable. With his uncommon drive and determination, Terry Fox captured the attention of the entire nation and with it our hearts, our affection and our support. By any comparison, Terry Fox is a hero, for he has accomplished in a few months what few people achieve in a full lifetime. He has renewed our faith in the human capacity and

PREMIER PECKFORD: has demonstrated that even in the face of adversity there is always hope. It is after all only with hope and faith as mere human beings we are able to transcend human barriers and reach new plateaus.

Mr. Speaker, by his actions Terry Fox has achieved his own immortality, not of the physical kind, for this is beyond the reach of us all, but spiritually Terry's memory will always be with us an ever present reminder of human potential. The name of Terry Fox will always be synonymous with hope and courage.

On behalf of the government and the people of this Province, I extend our warmth and sympathy to the family of Terry Fox on this untimely occasion.

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I made some comments similar to those made by the Premier when we were participating in a salute to Canada, and I thought it was appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that on that great day, a day which we celebrated yesterday and the rest of Canada will be celebrating tomorrow, the glorious birthday for Canada was a day on which Newfoundlanders remembered her war heroes, the volunteers from the Royal Newfoundland Regiment. The Royal Newfoundland Regiment was almost wiped out on July 1, 1916 at Beaumont Hamel. And on this day in 1981 we mourn the death of another hero, Terry Fox,

MR. STIRLING: a young man who started in St. John's his cross-country run to immortality. A day when we are reminded of the limitations of the body, Terry Fox reminds us of the immortality of the soul and the spirit.

Mr. Speaker, including all of the politicians here in this House of Assembly and all of the politicians in Canada, Terry Fox was a young Canadian whose drive and determination did more to bring us together as one nation, one Canada, than all of the politicians and all of the constitutional meetings in the last hundred years.

As the Premier said, and putting it in another way, Terry Fox gave his love unconditionally. It was not his job to do what he did. Nobody expected him to do it, nobody would have criticized him if he had not done it. He did it out of an unconditional love. And maybe we can use the memory, and the best way that we can repay Terry Fox is to build a great nation of Canada in the spirit of Terry Fox's drive, enthusiasm and desire for a great Canadian nation.

I join the government and all those on this side of the House in extending our sympathy to the family.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have heard the motion. Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary, 'Nay', carried.

Further statements.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the hon. House of the action taken by my department following the emergency discharge of matacil from a spray plane last Thursday evening east of Sunday Lake near the Bay d'Espoir Highway.

MR. ANDREWS: Immediate instructions were given to increase the frequency of water sampling at the Gander and Glenwood water intake areas of Gander Lake on the remote possibility that some of the pesticide contamination of the lake may have occurred during the return of the aircraft.

Early Friday morning meetings were held between Forestry and Environment personnel and the pilot of the aircraft. Officials were immediately dispatched by helicopter to search the area for evidence of matacil residue. My colleague, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and I also met with officials of our respective departments and the pilots in Gander later the same day, and personally flew the area. During these flights no evidence of the pesticide was discernable.

However, based on information obtained during this period , a plan was prepared

MR. ANDREWS:

for the collection and subsequent analysis of water, soil and vegetation samples from the discharge area.

At 6:00 a.m. on Saturday, our Supervisor of the Environmental Monitoring Programme and my Chief Environment officer for Central Newfoundland departed for the area by helicopter and spent twelve and one half hours, during which sixty-five samples were taken from forty-two separate locations within the dumping area. All of these samples, together with those that were taken from Gander Lake on Friday and Saturday, were brought to St. John's Sunday morning where they are presently undergoing analysis.

The results of these additional fourteen water samples taken from Gander Lake show no measurable levels of aminocarb, which is the active ingredient in matacil. Nevertheless, water sampling will continue in the water intake areas. Three air samples taken by monitors that were operating in the area of Glenwood to Gander during this period, during the period the spray plane was airborne, also show no measurable levels of aminocarb.

Priority is now being given to analysis of the water samples from the spill area, following which soil and vegetation samples will be analyzed. And I intend to release the results of these as soon as they become available and will report to the hon. House accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about one and a half minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am again disappointed and surprised that the minister has chosen to give a very brief statement when he surely now should be giving the detailed information. He neglected to mention in his statement that although there was no room on the government aircraft to Gander, I did get to Gander in time to meet with the minister and that my colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who is also

MR. STIRLING: our spokesman on Forestry, and I were in Gander by the time the government aircraft arrived and we went with the two ministers to the area.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STIRLING: Yes, the ministers graciously allowed us to accompany them. Despite all the protest from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the two ministers did the honourable thing and took us along. And, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that nobody to this point knows where that was dumped, nobody. There is no evidence of it, there was no evidence of it on Friday, and it was not until I made the suggestion to the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) that the pilot was taken out into the area; 4:00 p.m. on Friday afternoon the pilot had not been taken out into the area by the officials of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) or the Minister of Forestry; the pilot had not been taken into the area to locate it. There are still many questions to be answered, Mr. Speaker, many questions that have not been answered to the satisfaction of the people in the area. Some of the questions; for example,

MR. STIRLING: have they now defined an area where the pilot says he thinks he dropped the load of 2,600 gallons of matacil? What kind of a definition has there been of that area? Is it ten miles long? Is it twenty miles long? Because on Friday, Mr. Speaker, nobody knew where that matacil was dumped. And at this stage there is no indication in-

MR. NEARY: Or why it was.

MR. STIRLING: -the minister's statement that they have any more information. I realize the time has run out, Mr. Speaker, and we will probably get back to it again in Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development I am pleased to announce the dates for the signing of the Canada/Newfoundland Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement will take place in Goose Bay on July 4, 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: And the signing of the Canada/Newfoundland Native Peoples of Conne River Agreement will take place in Conne River on July 5.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that these agreements represent the mechanism by which the federal government discharges its constitutional responsibilities towards the native peoples of this Province. The programmes and services covered by these agreements have been ongoing for the past twenty-five years.

It is important to note therefore that these agreements do not represent anything special for the Province and are not an new initiative. The federal government is constitutionally responsible for native peoples and in



MR. STIRLING: recognition of this responsibility the Province and the federal government has co-operated in the delivery of services and programmes to native communities for the past twenty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, the renegotiation process for these agreements have met with innumerable obstacles over the last twenty months. However, the agreements have now been reached which we have been prepared to sign for seven months and will provide greatly needed services for the designated native communities in Coastal Labrador and in Conne River.

The agreements are cost-shared between the provincial and federal governments and provide for a total expenditure of \$43.8 million over five years. The Labrador agreement will account for \$38.8 million, the Conne River agreement for \$4 million. The co-ordinating committee will advise government on the allocation of funds to various programmes, in total five programme will be delivered under these agreements and, Mr. Speaker, these are as follows: Community and Economic Development; this programme is designed to enhance the social and economic development of native communities through such activities as community development projects, road construction, recreation programmes, entrepreneurial training and the construction and operation of community council offices. Education programme; this programme provides funds for the operation of schools, construction of new facilities and the provision of special education programmes for native people. Fisheries programme; this programme assists fish plants which in some of the designated communities provide high levels of employment and ensures that fishermen have a ready outlet for their catches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: The housing programme assists natives in designated communities with the construction and maintenance of their homes. Northern Development programme; this

June 30, 1981

Tape 2867

PK - 3

MR. GOUDIE: programme provides a variety of special services and financial support to communities such as depot operation, administrative support, consultative planning services and implementation of economic development projects.

MR. J. GOUDIE: In Conne River, Mr. Speaker, the agreement will be concentrated on three of these programmes; Community and Economic Development, Education, and Housing. These programmes are similar in content to those in Labrador. The signing of the Labrador Native Peoples Agreement at this time is opportune following closely the signing of the DREE subsidiary agreement for coastal Labrador. These two agreements will represent an infusion of almost \$78 million in coastal Labrador communities over the next five to six years. While taken together these agreements represent a significant development thrust for the coastal communities, we must be cognizant of the differences. The DREE agreement is intended primarily for the Southern coastal communities and represents the commitment of both governments, both federal and provincial, to solving the economic problems of that area. The Native Peoples Agreement is intended for the Northern coastal communities and represents the constitutional responsibility of the Government of Canada to native peoples in these communities.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate my pleasure at the forthcoming signing of these two Native Peoples Agreements. Previous shared cost arrangements over the last twenty-five years have accomplished a great deal for the native people in this Province and significant strides have been made in relieving the special problems experienced by the Indian and Inuit people. There remains, however, a great deal more that must be accomplished before a desirable level of social and economic development is realized. The new agreements will resolve many of the constraints to development and provide a way for governments to meet the ever growing needs of native people for new and improved services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains has two minutes.

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it is surprising that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) can make such a fantastic statement in congratulating Ottawa when the Premier of this Province that is always confronting Ottawa nearly every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN:

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that this development, the Native Peoples Agreement plus the Labrador DREE agreement that was signed recently, we will take this \$78 million, Mr. Speaker, and convert it into federal and provincial monies, you will notice that 90 per cent is coming from Mr. Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is high time for this government to take a positive approach to Ottawa and look where all the money is coming from. Because, Mr. Speaker, only for Ottawa this Province, this government would not even recognize the natives of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. T. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a statement given the media this morning on the establishment of an Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission for the Province. It is a major step forward and certainly a great expansion to a very critical programme that will help a lot of people.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we are quite pleased in having this announcement but really, after 31 years and after 484 years of our existence, do you not think it is a little late.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to comment on a series of meetings which I attended in Victoria, B.C., last Thursday and Friday when representatives of all Provincial governments met at the invitation of the Government of the Province of British Columbia in order to discuss the present state of the Canadian economy and the subject of federal-provincial fiscal arrangements.

MR. STIRLING: Have you a copy of that for over here?

DR. COLLINS: It is over there.

As members undoubtedly already know, federal-provincial fiscal arrangements are currently under review and will shortly be the subject of extensive discussions with the Federal Government with the aim of putting in place new and more appropriate arrangements at the beginning of fiscal '81-'82. I reported to the House a short time ago on a submission which my hon. colleague, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and myself made to the House of Commons Task Force on the same subject matter.

In regard to the state of the economy in our country, at Victoria there was unanimous expression of concern on relations as they presently exist between the two levels of government. It was considered imperative that a spirit of co-operative federalism in our country must be renewed with the Federal Government joining with the provinces in a new round of consultations.

Canadian resources and skills are the envy of the world, yet economic performance remains far from satisfactory. The standard of living in Canada is not improving as it should, an accelerating inflation plus high interest rates are dampening growth prospects, allowing high levels of employment to persist, and imposing economic hardships on small businessmen and homeowners alike.

A number of areas for federal-provincial co-operation to improve the Canadian economy were identified. Energy issues must jointly be resolved as soon as possible. Measures to encourage investment and innovation must be put in

DR. COLLINS: place. The huge federal budgetary deficit must be controlled through expenditure rationalization without shifting tax burdens onto provinces and to municipalities.

Inhibitions to economic development initiatives in the various regions must be identified and overcome for the benefit of all Canadians. The economic policies of the federal and provincial governments must be co-ordinated. It was agreed that these measures would go a long way to restore investor confidence in Canada, justified by our vast economic potential, and which is of necessary prelude to the strengthening of the Canadian dollar with subsequent lowering of inflation and high interest rates.

On the matter of fiscal arrangements, there was unanimous agreement that a strong equalization system is and must remain a key element of Confederation. Although a number of innovative alternatives to the present method of calculating equalization payments were examined, agreement was reached that the representative tax system currently in place remained the most appropriate with certain adjustments made desirable in the light of experience.

Emphasis was placed on the fact that any reduction in payments to recipient provinces would be unacceptable and would lead to increased fiscal disparities. In regard to Established Programmes Financing arrangement important

DR. COLLINS: for the funding of health care and post-secondary education in all provinces, a unanimous consensus was reached on the basis that present arrangements had worked well, achieving all the federal objectives set out at their initiation in 1976. It was stressed that these transfers have not been a source of pressure on the federal deficit over the past five years but, rather, have already fallen below the cost increases necessary to maintain present levels of service. Accordingly, the expressed intent of the federal government to achieve a \$1.5 billion reduction in these programmes over the next two years was completely unacceptable and unjustifiable. This point is to be made to the federal Finance Minister (Mr. MacEachen) at an early date.

Other matters on which common viewpoints were developed included retirement income for aged Canadians and harmonization and non-fragmentation of the system of taxation in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that it is accurate to say that the Victoria meetings were productive for all those involved and should form the basis for useful and helpful discussions with the federal government over the next few months.

On behalf of our Province, I was particularly pleased to have the opportunity to present the lead paper in discussing equalization, and also to have received a very large measure of support from my colleagues in other provinces on the other topics that came up for discussion.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has approximately two and one-half minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should begin by noting that the minister has not done either the

MR. ROBERTS: Leader of the Opposition or myself the courtesy of sending us a copy of the statement.

DR. COLLINS: A copy of it went over to you.

MR. ROBERTS: A copy went over? Well, all I can say is my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, did not have it and I do not have it. I could not say it did not come over.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to say before interruptions came that I did not have the courtesy of a copy in advance, nor did my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, and as far as I know that is a truthful statement so I stand by it. But having heard the minister's statement, I can understand why he chose not to send this one because he said nothing in his statement.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. ROBERTS: What he told us was there has been a meeting of the provincial Ministers of Finance in Victoria, a lovely city, a lovely time of the year to visit that city, and I hope they all had a grand time and I am glad they did. Unfortunately, Sir, the minister's statement makes it quite clear that at least as far as he is aware, what was decided at Victoria, if anything, has nothing to do with the problems which confront the economy of this Province and of this country at this time.

Now, I am not allowed to debate in response to a Ministerial Statement so I shall not, but I will note in response to the minister's statement that he gave us a fairly comprehensive list - not a long one but a fairly comprehensive list of the economic problems which confront Canada and this Province today. He was great on that and he struck out completely in giving us any solutions. All he said is we must find measures to deal with energy, we must find measures to deal with the lack



MR. ROBERTS: of investment, we must find measures to deal with the fact that all governments are spending infinitely more than they take in and that is contributing significantly to the inflationary problems, to the increasing interest rates and to many of the other economic ills.

MR. ROBERTS: I must add, Mr. Speaker, in closing the minister was lamentably weak in dealing with what is probably the single most important topic that confronts him and his colleagues now, namely, the shape and the form that the federal/provincial financial arrangements are going to take in the next five year period. The minister referred to the two great programmes under which money is made available, the Established Programme Financing arrangement- the EPF programme-and the Equalization programme, both of them, I may add, cornerstones in the Liberal vision of a national government that serves Canada, unlike an agency of the provinces as some would have. But the minister was lamentably silent, hideously ineffective in presenting the Province's concerns or the alternatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect I am close to using up the brief time I am allowed by the rules, I shall not go no except to ask if the minister would permit, before this ~~tendentious~~ and tedious session of the House comes to a close, would make it possible, using the government time, to have a debate on these two important issues so we could have some understanding of the government's position, if in fact they have one, so we can have some understanding of what it means for this Province. Because I will say, Mr. Speaker, that these two programmes are the essential cornerstones of this Province's financial stability at least for the next five years and what happens to them is very relevant because it will greatly affect the lives of each and every one of us in this Province. So I ask the minister would he agree to cause time to be made available to allow this to be done. It is far more important than most of what he and his colleagues have brought before the House this year, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment ( Mr. Andrews). As was indicated in my response to his statement, I am not at all happy that the minister has not tabled all of the information relating to this whole operation. Would the minister agree, since I accompanied the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) and my colleague accompanied the Minister of the Environment that at the time we all gone on the two helicopters that his staff had not specifically found the site where the matacil spray had been dumped?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, being a new minister sometimes I may not know the rules, but I do not think it is very often that a minister or ministers do take the Leader of the Opposition, a man who has one ambition in life and that is to defeat this government, and give him as much information as we did on Saturday. We were very courteous, we gave you all the information that was available at the time, you had opportunities to talk, Mr. Speaker, the Leader did, with the personnel involved, the people who went to the site location. At that time it was decided on Friday afternoon, that the most important thing to do was to clarify what had happened, if anything, regarding some seepage into Gander Lake. And that is where the efforts of the personnel from

MR. ANDREWS:

the Environment Department went and fortunately were able to determine that there is no measurable amount of matacil in Gander Lake or in the water supply.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I do confirm that up until four o'clock the minister did co-operate fully. At seven o'clock when I called back those same people I was told that I could not talk to them any further, I could get no further information, that all information must come from the minister, and this whole area had now been clamped down because what we did find - and I would ask the minister now to deal with it specifically, what we did find: What we did find was that up until four o'clock is that nobody from his department or the Department of Forestry could pinpoint with any degree of certainty at all, had found no evidence of where that whole planeload of spray had been dumped; none had been found up until four o'clock. Would you confirm that since you were very co-operative?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to be sidetracking again. Up to that point in time we did know the general of the spill, but most importantly - to zero in on that spill site was not the most important thing to do. The most important thing was to monitor the water supplies of Gander Lake. In response to your other suggestion that I put the clamps on my department officials, that was done for the purpose which should be quite obvious: There were all kinds of rumours around Gander on Friday, that there was an oil slick, one

MR. ANDREWS: man phoned that something fell on his car in a crystalline form. There were numerous rumours. We checked everything out. I told our people to get to work, do not talk to anybody, just do the job. And the job was done and it was done very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult that we have a minister who will not table all the information, the information that he has and I had up until the time that he cut off the source of information. What I am trying to find out is what happened after that time. Up until four o'clock, what had been obvious is that a plane loaded with matacil, DC - 4 had gone out with two pilots on it, who were the contractors pilots - there was nobody from Forestry on that plane, there was nobody from Environment on that plane, and nobody knew precisely where that was dumped. I talked to the pilot and the pilot said he did not think he could find where he dumped it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am interested in finding out is what happened after four o'clock? Up until four o'clock we had established that his department had found no evidence of it, and then he cut off the information. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to tell us precisely are we talking about a hundred yard area, are we talking about a circular area or, the area that they are now working in, are they talking about a ten square mile area that was given to them by the pilot as best he could? The pilot said, 'I think it was in this area.' Would you tell us

MR. STIRLING: precisely what size area you have now identified as the area that you think the spray was dumped in?

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

MR. ANDREWS: To the best of our information, Mr. Speaker, the area would be and probably is a thousand to two thousand feet wide and possibly up to two miles in length. That would be the spillage area.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I would as the minister would he now confirm that at this point - because you did have the head of operations come in here Friday morning and presumably he reported to you Friday morning although that was not the impression that you gave us at ten o'clock - would you now confirm that at this stage there has been no evidence found in the area that you are talking about of this spray actually being dumped? There has been no evidence of matacil found in the area that you referred to?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition might have his own opinions. What I did say is that our first efforts were to confirm-or ensure to the people of Gander that their water supply was safe - hopefully it was and it was. The process of analyzing the sixty-five other samples of water, soil and vegetation is now underway.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to get precise information. Would the minister stop playing games and admit at this stage you have found no evidence in the area that has been referred to as the dump site, you have found no evidence -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

This has happened frequently since Question Period began both by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and by the minister where you are referring to each other back and forth. I would ask that you direct your remarks to the Chair and at least we may be able to keep order a little easier.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the question is can the minister tell us precisely, except for the information given by a pilot who was under contract, that we do not have anything at this stage from any of our officials, either Forestry or Environment, that indicates that in that search area that you are now searching, that indicates any precise evidence of matacil in that area at this stage?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the scientific evidence is not yet in. Our officials are quite competent, they are quite sure they have located the site, but I must repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the priority was to analyze the water samples from Gander and the Glenwood water intakes; that has been done. The process of analyzing the other samples began, I understand, last night. One difficulty we had it was a long weekend, as you know, and to get personnel back on Saturday and Sunday took some time but we did round up the necessary personnel.

Scientifically the only concern expressed by my staff is that there would be a localized insect kill. That would be quite natural because matacil is designed to kill insects.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Environment as well. I am wondering is this the first time in the history of the Province that we had to dump matacil? Is this the first time it happened or did it ever happen before, where a load of matacil had to be dumped?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge this is the first occasion, but I could check and find if there was another occasion.

MR. NEARY: It is not the first time- it is not.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Environment. When they had to clean up a diesel spill in Hawkes Bay or Hawkes River on the Labrador Coast last year, it almost depleted the Department of Environment's budget. Now that we only have a \$2 million budget and this major clean up, is this going to put



MR. HISCOCK: unnecessary strain on the budget of the Department of Environment?

And the second part that I would like to ask, in the Estimate Committee in asking the minister questions about his department, one of the things that we suggested was that the Department of Environment have a nerve centre or a control centre to co-ordinate the Federal Department of Environment, the Coast Guard, the oil companies, the Department of Forestry, the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Municipal Affairs; has the minister now, because of this spill of matabil, been re-enforced of the need to have a nerve centre, to put more money into the Department of Environment instead of \$2 million, that basically what we are seeing here is that we are a Johnnie-Come-Lately, after the fact, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ANDREWS: The last point first: There is a co-ordination effort, if the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) would read the contingency plan that is quite evident. As far as the budget for the department, Mr. Speaker, no expense at all was in our minds when this emergency happened. We spared no expense at all. The necessary procedures were taken, overtime is being paid to people over the weekend to ensure that the environment is protected.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environment. It relates to the problem that we experienced on Thursday, and also to the contingency plan that he tabled in the House on, I believe, it was June 8. I understand he also tabled another one on Friday morning. I would like to ask the minister, my question to him is, has he made any changes in that contingency plan since the accident on Thursday?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

June 30, 1981

Tape 2874

PK - 3

MR. ANDREWS:

knowledge.

No, Mr. Speaker. No, not to my

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Fogo.

A supplementary the hon. member for

MR. TULK:

I would like to ask the minister, then, if there has been any changes made in that plan since June 8 when I asked him the original question and he tabled the original contingency plan?

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

MR. ANDREWS: On that point, I think there were some minor additions to it, if I remember correctly, because I did see two copies and I think on the last page there were some minor additions to it but nothing of any significance, I do not believe.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the minister that there have been some changes in the plans. But I would like to ask him to tell me as the minister responsible for the environment in this Province just what those changes were.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I have tabled it twice. For the members of the Loyal Opposition, I have tabled that contingency plan twice and if they can read, they can certainly understand it for themselves.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I can assure the minister that I can very well read, and one of the things that is in this new contingency plan is that the matacil will be dumped on a flat area as far from water as possible. But I would like to ask him another question. Did he issue the spray permit on the basis of his first contingency plan or did he issue it on the basis of the second one?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Why did the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) make the changes in the

MR. TULK: second plan? Was it after the spray permit was issued? And why did he make it? Was it at your request?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the permits and the licences to spray matacil issued to the company and the pilot is not based on any contingency plan, it is based on the capability and the competence of the people doing the job.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile yields to the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Is the minister now saying, then, that he is not following one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission which said that a contingency plan had to be in place before that spray permit was issued? That is recommendation number thirteen, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the contingency plan was in place before permits were issued.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) put a question to the Minister of Environment as to whether or not on previous occasions when there was spraying done by matacil in this Province, if a load of matacil had to be dumped and the hon. gentleman said, to his knowledge, no.

Well, now I am going to put the same question to the minister who was responsible at that time, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, Would he tell the House if on one previous occasion it

MR. NEARY: was necessary to dump a load of matabail in this Province? If so -

MR. TULK: 'Morgan'. 'Morgan'.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. Morgan) rather, if he would give us the information.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
The hon. member -

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) can give it to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, is it to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries or the hon. the Minister of Forestry?

MR. NEARY: Well, whichever. What I am trying to do is to -

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
My point is, the hon. member knows that he cannot ask the hon. the Minister of Fisheries that question because you can only ask him a question that comes within his current jurisdiction and that certainly would not come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will stick with the original minister then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Could he tell the House why this matter was concealed, why the information was withheld from the public? There was one previous occasion in 1978 that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) apparently does not know about and could not care less about. So would the Minister of Forestry bring us up to date on that situation and tell us exactly what happened on that occasion and why the information was withheld from the people of this Province?

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

MR. C. POWER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am glad you clarified the title of the department. It is not Forestry and Agriculture, it is Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, whatever it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, there are rules. We do have certain departments which are responsible -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. C. POWER: The members opposite, even to critics, obviously do not even know the departments are supposed to be criticizing.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to 1978 programme, I will be glad to take that question under advisement and find out for the member opposite.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I think I can state categorically there was a load dumped in 1978. I am amazed, flabbergasted, that the minister did not know about it!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Well, there may have been two loads but there was certainly one load that I know about dumped in -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Well, whenever the last spraying took place. Yes, it was 1978 or -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

They do not even remember the year, Mr. Speaker! Well, I would like to ask the minister now if he has had any complaints from the company that is doing the spraying, that underbid the other company or companies that bid on the spray programme - they underbid by \$300,000 - are they disgruntled? Have they made any complaints about not being able to break even or make any money off this contract? Is it possible, for instance - the reason I am asking the question - that the load of matacil may have been dumped deliberately? Is that possible? Because so far we do not have a report on the condition of the aircraft, we do not have the maintenance report in this House, so we can assume all sorts of things. We do not know whether it was a crisis situation,

MR. MORGAN:

Are you trying to say it was intentional?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:

- we do not know whether there was panic on the aircraft. But is it possible that the aircraft may have circled and dumped the load deliberately? Is that possible?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Which minister?

MR. S. NEARY:

The Minister of Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

The question was directed to me, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

I suppose it is possible, anything is possible. But our information is that the pilot did develop a fire in one of his engines, engine number one, I believe, and he considered it an emergency situation.

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman prepared to table in this House the maintenance report? When that aircraft returned to Gander, obviously somebody checked the engine because the aircraft was airborne again with a matter of hours. So what I am trying to determine is how serious was the situation? Was there actually flames coming from the engine or was there just smoke coming from the engine? I know these are technical questions -

MR. J. MORGAN: He was not there.

MR. S. NEARY: No, but he talked to the pilot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: People on this side of the House talked to the pilot and the co-pilot and the hon. gentleman must have talked to the pilot. Was there just smoke and noises coming from the aircraft, the engine of the aircraft, or did the pilot actually see flames coming from the engine?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Not being there myself, Mr. Speaker, I only have to go by the pilot's word. He said he saw flames, he saw smoke and oil leaking out, he jettisoned the load and he began his return flight to Gander. He waited and circled around and made one complete circle while another aircraft in the area could inspect the damaged aircraft from the outside to give the pilot some information on the condition of the aircraft before he returned.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the minister on the airplane flight. When we were on the helicopter with the minister, and I thank him again for taking us along, his official had a flight pattern traced on a map for that aircraft which he said he had taken from



June 30, 1981

Tape No. 2876

DW - 4

MR. B. TULK: Forestry. On that flight plan the airplane had circled somewhere, approximately halfway between Gander Lake and the area where he was supposed to have dumped. Now how does the minister - or has he sought any explanation of why an airplane pilot would circle halfway between his destination

MR. TULK: and the place where he dumped when he was not even in the spray area?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I explained that. The circling route of the aircraft was taken after the jettisoning, not from Gander to the location but after the jettisoning. There was another aircraft in the area that flew up and they contacted each other and the pilot made a circle around so that the other aircraft could inspect the damaged plane.

MR. TULK: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: So is the minister saying then that his official on Friday morning had been given the wrong information in saying that that was the route that he took into the dump site? He is now telling us that it was after the airplane had dumped and was on his way back to Gander that it circled. Which is the right information and why would he be circling anyway?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious to me now that the Opposition do not understand the facts of life. I was onboard the helicopter with the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and that was not my impression of what my official told me and that was not the fact at all. That circling was done after the emergency jettisoning on his return back to the runway and that is what the pilot told me and that is what my officials told me and that is a fact.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a question for the

MR. STIRLING: Minister of the Environment.  
Has the minister reactivated the Environmental Monitoring Committee and was this incident under the management of the Environmental Monitoring Committee?

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

MR. ANDREWS: You mean this accident?

MR. STIRLING: The whole operation.

MR. ANDREWS: The Environmental Monitoring Committee has been established, Mr. Speaker, for some time. It is an ongoing body. I can give the Leader of the Opposition the names of the people involved there. They are mostly scientific people. They do not necessarily react to an incident like this. They are an ongoing group of environmental monitors. However, I did talk with some of them today.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the minister correctly, he is saying that the operational end of this is not controlled by the Environmental Monitoring Committee and therefore, Mr. Speaker, there does not seem to be anybody in control of the actual operation. In view of the accident that happened on Thursday night, in view of the continuation will the minister now change the procedure so that there is one of his officials, either Forestry or Environment, onboard the plane that actually carries the matabail?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I will certainly consider that, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if the fact that one of our

June 30,1981

Tape No. 2877

ah-3

MR. ANDREWS: officials or Forestry officials  
are onboard an aircraft is necessarily going to prevent  
a fire in engine number one on any of the aircraft.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that has not been  
established yet just how serious the fire was,if indeed  
there was a fire.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. members know there are aircraft technicians in this Province who can determine and should have determined the extent of the damage if there was that much damage. If the airplane was able to circle before returning to Gander, obviously there was no emergency situation of the magnitude that we are led to believe in this House. Could the hon. gentleman tell us if he has seen the maintenance report on that aircraft? Because my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is this, that there is a firewall between the engines of the aircraft and the cockpit, and the pilot can shut off all the valves and within a matter of seconds, if there was a fire it would go out, the engine would stop and it would go out. Now, has the hon. gentleman seen the maintenance report to confirm whether these procedures were used, if there was indeed flame, how much fire damage was done to the engine when it landed in Gander?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, not being in the aircraft when it was on fire, I really do not know what went through the pilot's mind other than the fact he told me he had 2,600 US gallons of a petroleum based product - that was the maticil spray-plus 1,500 gallons of aviation fuel, and he had an engine fire in his aircraft and he dumped. I would have too.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: A supplementary question to the minister. Recommendation 13, as I understand it, of the Royal Commission also said that there should be simulated exercises of the minister's contingency plan. Now on June 8th the minister promised to table them in the House; it has not yet been done.

AN HON. MEMBER: He tabled that plan.

MR. TULK: No, no. The simulated exercises, reports of the simulated exercises, Is he now ready to table those?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I tabled just about everything; twice I had to table the contingency plan. I also did say at that time, I think it was June 8th if I remember correctly, that the recommendations in the Royal Commission Report were recommendations. Some of these activities that you refer to were deemed not necessary; for instance, the hospital in Gander did not think it was necessary for us to have practice ambulance runs from the runway of the airport because they have ambulance runs every day, they know how to handle those situations. So to the best of the recommendations in the Royal Commission Report were followed; some of them were not necessarily acted upon because we did not feel that they were necessary; for instance, things like the ambulance runs.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The minister has now told us, I take it, that he did not carry out the simulated exercises as was recommended by the Commission before a spray permit was issued, or he did not require that they be carried out. My question to him is then, if he had carried out those simulated exercises, would he have not perhaps set up a situation or run across a situation, perhaps one of the situations that he should have set up, would he not have run across a situation like occurred in Gander on Thursday night and perhaps been much better prepared to see that the matacil spray area had indeed been marked by some sort of marker?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I do not quite get the gist of that question, Mr. Speaker, but I can only say that any precautions that are taken are not necessarily going to prevent an accident. This was an accident. It could have been a very, very serious accident. I realize the Opposition are against this whole spray programme; they want, I suppose, 20,000 jobs in the labour force in Newfoundland to go up the spout with the budworm. If they are not, they waste one half hour of this House's time on silly, inane questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Let us deal with that business about the whole operation. I presume that when the Minister of Forestry (C.Power) said in the House on Friday that contaminated area will be treated with caustic soda or farmers lime depending on the type of ground, whether it is dry or wet, that Mr. Speaker, is being done this morning. When the minister said that on Friday morning, I presume that now that that was incorrect and at that stage they were not putting caustic soda or farmers lime on the contaminated area. Is that correct?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, there was a chemical used on the runway. I do not know if it was caustic soda. There are other chemicals that you can use to neutralize this product. That was done on the airport and the tarmac in Gander, yes.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a supplementary. Unless some of my colleagues have a supplementary, it is a new question.

MR. SPEAKER: A new question, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I will direct it - it is a different topic - I will direct my question to the Premier. It has to do with a visit yesterday to the Summer Games Park by 100 Huntley Street, A Salute to Canada. It is my understanding that these people who did this programme televised from coast to coast



MR. NEARY: wrote the Premier or his ministers or his officials and asked for the use of Confederation Building for that salute to Canada. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what response was given by his office to 100 Huntley Street in connection with A Salute To Canada?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I will check it out for the hon. member and let him know. I do not really know. I do not know.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDER OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

We are now debating the Gasoline Tax Act. The Government House Leader (W.Marshall) has twenty-three minutes left.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I would have remained seated. I see the hon. member for LaPoile (S.Neary) get on his feet. I was speaking, Mr. Chairman, for a few moments last Friday before I was interrupted. So I think it is worthwhile to say it once again.

This Bill has been debated, fully debated by everybody, I feel at this particular time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it has been over debated. It has debated for many hours, many things mentioned but for the gasoline tax. The gasoline tax was announced by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in the Budget Speech and it is now being collected.

June 30, 1981

Tape No. 2879

EL - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

I would hope that the House would see fit to be able to proceed on to other bills so I will refrain from making some of the comments that I might have otherwise made. I see the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) is ready to jump to his feet, but he can wait just a few moments and possess his soul in patience. I will refrain, as I say, from making some of the comments except to say this, that there has been a criticism of this bill with respect to the nature of the tax itself. It is on an ad valorem basis. I say again that is on the same basis as every

MR. MARSHALL:

province of Canada which levies a gasoline tax but one, which is Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, I do not believe, has a tax on gasoline. I do not know. But eight of the provinces of Canada levy tax on an ad valorem basis and this government is doing exactly the same thing. I also understand that the federal government levies its tax on the same basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would be able to proceed on now with the business of the House and make some progress. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has anything further to add. If he has we will listen in anxious anticipation, as we always do.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Baird):

The hon. the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

No doubt, before the afternoon is over, Mr. Chairman, we may be able to proceed to other bills. But there are a few points yet that we have to make in connection with increasing taxes in this Province, and the expenditure of the revenue that is collected from these taxes.

Now, during the debate so far on this bill, which is really second reading - that is really what we are debating, second reading, except we are using a different procedure; we are in Committee of the Whole which give us the right to talk as often as we want on this particular bill - some members on the government side of the House dragged up the past as they usually do when they are trying to defend themselves. When they are trying to create a smoke screen for their own inaction, for their own ineptness, for their being unable to cope with the problems of the

MR. NEARY: economy, for their explanation, for their excuses, if you like, feeble excuses for not doing anything in ten years of Tory administration in this Province, they have dragged up the past. And they keep slapping the past at us across this House.

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I dealt with one of the items on Friday and so far there has been no response from the Premier about Mr. Smallwood's house, no response from the Premier on that item. I am not going to dwell on that again, I am just going to leave that as a matter of public record and deal with some of the other items.

This government has been in office for ten years, Mr. Chairman; not the present administration, but we have had a Tory government in this Province for ten years. And during the ten years, despite the fact that taxes have gone up substantially - the gasoline tax now being converted to a percentage, on a percentage basis - taxes have increased substantially and the debt, the public debt, is now \$3.2 billion. That public debt in 1972, on January 18 when the Liberals were kicked out after twenty-three years in office, the public debt was three-quarters of a billion dollars, \$750 million, approximately. Now, at the end of this fiscal year, it will be \$3.2 billion, \$3,200,000,000, or an increase in ten years by \$2.4 billion.

Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely astounding. It is incredible! And not a thing to show for it. And \$200 million, every year, going outside this Province to pay the interest on the debt, \$200 million that is lost to Newfoundland every year, that goes into the United States, into Europe and on the Mainland, and to Alberta, to pay the interest.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, they do not have a thing to show for it. But what did the Liberals have to show for their twenty-three years with a debt of only \$750 million? What did they have to show for it? They had quite a bit to show for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) breach of contract.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will tell the House what they have to show for it. There is no Liberal in this Province or on this side of the House, at least, that should ever hang his head, should ever cringe, or he never should express disgust or embarrassment any time a member stands in this House and hurls the dirt and the filth and the smear tactics that they use. Nobody in this House or not a Liberal in this Province should ever hang his head in shame. As a matter of fact, he should hold his head high and walk proud in this Province and say, 'I am proud to be a Liberal.' Because, Mr. Chairman, during that twenty-three years, when the debt was only \$750 million, what happened in that twenty-three years? Well, I will tell the House what happened. Mr. Chairman, under Education and Culture what happened in this Province? What kind of a revolution took place under that Head in that twenty-three years? And I am comparing that twenty-three years with the whole period that we have had Responsible Government in this Province, from 1885, I believe, up to 1981, almost a hundred years of Responsible Government. You can take all the administrations before 1949, Liberal and Tory, and go right back to Premier Little and you will find that during that twenty-three years under the Smallwood administration, more things happened in Newfoundland than happened in its whole history, taking all the administrations and lumping them together, Liberals and Tories.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: More things happened. More schools were built, 1,200 of them, more colleges, medical schools,

MR. NEARY: nursing schools and engineering schools were built, more fisheries colleges and technical colleges were built, more special schools were built, more regional and central high schools were built than the whole period put together; more universities - and there is only one of them - that was built by a Liberal Government; more trade schools and vocational schools were built. Every vocational school in this Province today was built by a Liberal Administration, by the Smallwood Liberal administration. More deaf children's schools were built - the one down at Torbay; more retarded children's assistance than in our whole history, more school bus services than all the Premiers and all the administrations put together, more scholarships and bursaries than all the other administrations put together, more strengthening of the NTA. It was a Liberal administration that gave them the check off in this Province that made them strong; more upgrading of teachers' qualifications by the Smallwood Liberal administration, more teachers' housing, more public libraries, more university residences, more radio, films and television in schools, more arts and culture centres, more arts and culture awards than in our

MR. NEARY: whole history, than all of the other administrations put together. More was done in the field of arts and culture by the Smallwood Liberal administration, more art galleries were built, more museums were built,

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) twenty-three years (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will come to that later. More paintings and statues of notable persons were made, created, more archives were built; more of each and all of these items than by all other premiers combined, from 1855 to 1981, Mr. Chairman. That is only under Education and Culture, so what about Public Health.

There were more hospitals built by the Smallwood Liberal administration than by all the other premiers and all the other administrations put together. More medical clinics were built, more air ambulances were established, more land ambulances established by the Smallwood administration than all the other premiers and all of the other administrations combined, more hospital boats, more medical, dental, optical services in schools, more doctors, dentists, nurses, training programmes were implemented by the Smallwood Liberal administration, that is under Public Health.

Now, what about Transportation?

Well, Mr. Chairman, under Transportation more miles of roads were built by the Smallwood Liberal administration than all the other administrations and all the other premiers in our whole history. More roads, more settlements were taken out of isolation than all of the other premiers put together. More paving was done in this Province. More roads to resources were built, more modern bridges were built, more highways and overpasses were built, more highways and underpasses were built, more causeways were built, more modern ferries were built and put into operation, more airports were built, and more airplane landing strips were built, All of these items,



MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, more of each and all of these than all the other premiers combined, since 1855 to 1981.

And what about in the fishery. I hope hon. gentlemen are listening to what I am saying. In the fishing industry, Mr. Chairman, fresh fish processing plants, more built than by all the other premiers and all the other administrations put together, by the Smallwood administration.

MR. MORGAN: Too many (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: More fresh fish plants, processing plants, more salt fish processing plants, more longliners, more draggers, more Danish seiners, more midwater trawlers, more nylon nets, more bait depots, more community stages, more electronic fish finders, more mechanical haul out equipment, more marine service centres and service depots, more shipyards and boat yards, organized salt fish marketing, representation in fish markets, fact finding missions to fishing countries, fact finding royal commissions on fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: More, Mr. Chairman, more of each and all of these items than ever before, by any other premier or by all the premiers combined and all the other administrations combined, more by the Smallwood Liberal administration.

And what about in the field of economic development? More mines were opened under the Smallwood Liberal administration than ever before in our whole history. More industrial plants, more drilling for minerals, under water and on land, started by the Smallwood Liberal administration than ever before in our whole history. More mineralized drilling in Labrador, more water power surveys done in Newfoundland, more forest surveys done in Newfoundland and Labrador, more electricity brought into production, more forest fire fighting facilities, more hotels and motels, more land clearing, more bogland reclamation, more community pastures, more

MR. NEARY: hog breeding and hog production, more egg production, more broiler production, more sheep production, more agricultural work done in community pastures and in development of agriculture, more cold storage facilities, more blueberry production, more of each and all of these items than all other Premiers and administrations put together or combined since 1855 to 1981.

Mr. Chairman, these facts speak for themselves. These facts are a matter of public record. And what about Municipal Affairs? Well, under Municipal Affairs, under that heading what happened? Were we slackers? Were we remiss in our responsibilities? Should we hang our heads in shame as Liberals? Should we be ashamed to admit we are Liberals? Well, what happened in the field of Municipal Affairs that we should be so proud of? More municipalities were organized and incorporated under the Smallwood Liberal administration than ever before in our whole history, with all the administrations combined. More water and sewer systems implemented, more fire fighting facilities were set up, more town halls were built, more streets were paved, more municipal incinerators were built and more municipal control dumps were constructed than ever before in our whole history put together, combined. And that takes care, Mr. Chairman, of Municipal Affairs. Now, what about Recreation? In that particular field should we duck, should we get under our desks every time somebody on the other side slaps a bit of dirt at us? Should we crawl under our desks? Should we look for a hole to crawl in? Should we hide our heads?

Well, Mr. Chairman, listen to this: Under Recreation more public parks built by the Smallwood Liberal administration than all other administrations

MR. NEARY:

combined, since 1855 to 1981, more public campsites were built, more public picnic sites, more arenas and rinks and stadiums built, more swimming pools, more national parks, more athletic centres -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order. The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is obviously reading a speech and it obviously has a very familiar ring. I quote Your Honour page 101, paragraph 309. "It is a rule in both Houses of Parliament that a Member must address the House orally, and not read from a written, previously prepared speech," and this is generally known. The hon. gentleman is obviously reading from a speech. He has been turning it over for the past two or three minutes. As I say, Mr. Speaker, it has a very familiar lilt and ring to it, that particular speech. And, of course, the hon. member would not only that, would have to speak in his own words and not somebody else's. He cannot come in and read a speech and that is what the hon. member is doing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman to that point of order-

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

MR. NEARY: - which is not a point of order, Mr. Chairman, because I can tell the House and the hon. gentleman that I am not reading a speech. I have not read a speech in this House since I made my maiden speech back in 1962 or 1963. I am not reading a speech. All I have in front of me is a list of projects, Mr. Chairman, and these are my own words to describe these projects, very powerful stuff, very potent. I am sure the hon. gentleman

June 30, 1981

Tape No. 2883

ah-3

MR. NEARY: does not like to hear it but I am quite prepared to table the list. I will be proud and happy as a Liberal and as a member on this side of the House, to table the list when I am finished referring to my list of notes. There is the speech, Mr. Chairman, a list of projects and if I listed them all I would not have room enough in the Assembly, the paper would stretch from the door right up to the Speaker's Chair. So there is no speech being read.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To that point of order, it has been the practice of this House to allow members to read their speeches from time to time.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, when I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. gentleman, I was dealing with Recreation. Under Recreation more public parks, more public campsites, more public picnic sites, more national parks, more rinks and stadiums and arenas, more swimming pools, outdoor and indoor, more athletic centres, more recreational centres and more gymnasiums, or gymnasia, as some people prefer to call it, were built under the Smallwood Liberal administration than all of the other Premiers and administrations combined. More of each and all of these than by all other Premiers combined, since 1895 to 1981.

And what about under social reforms in this Province?

MR. TULK: How much (inaudible)?

MR. S. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. TULK: How much was the public debt at that time?

MR. S. NEARY: My hon. friend reminds me that I should probably interject at this particular point that all this cost a public debt of \$750 million, three quarters of a billion dollars. And I am coming to what happened with the \$2.4 billion now when I am finished with my list.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about under social reforms? More public housing by a Smallwood Liberal administration than all the other - I am not talking about ten years of Torism add it all together! Combine it all! More public housing, more urban renewal developments, more slum clearance, more senior citizen homes, more rural electrification, ending isolation of 800 settlements by roads, reduced air travel to residents of Labrador. More of this,

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, more of each and all of these items than by all other Premiers or administrations combined since 1855 to 1981. Mr. Chairman, that is only a sample. I have barely scratched the surface. I have not, for instance, boasted about one of the great reforms that was made in this Province by the Smallwood Liberal administration, and that was doing away with the demeaning vulture in the Department of Welfare, as it was known, the Department of Social Assistance. And started paying people, giving people dignity and pride by paying them by cheque. One of the greatest reforms in Newfoundland's history!

MR. CARTER: Tell us about Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be distracted. The editorial in the Daily News adequately took care of the hon. gentleman this morning. I thought, Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in this House was the ultimate in rudeness and nastiness, until I heard the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) the other day in this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, take that record! And I could go on and on but I am not going to. I do not want to bore the House with everything that was done by that Smallwood Liberal administration, but I could, Mr. Chairman, But I want to say this, I want to take that now and I want to compare it or make a contrast between that twenty-three years - take the first ten years if you want to, forget the other thirteen, take the first ten years or take the last ten years of the Smallwood administration, take either one, go on either end, take the first ten years after Confederation or take the last ten years of the Smallwood administration and compare it! Take any ten years and compare it to ten years of Torism in this Province. Mr. Chairman, I will even go further than that, I will say this, take one, pick any one of the twenty-three years of Smallwood Liberal administration, pick one year! I defy any member on the government

MR. NEARY:

benches to pick one year and compare it and contrast it to ten years of Toryism in this Province and see, look at the contrast. Compare it and see what you have. You have ten years of inaction, ineptness, inactivity. You have ten years that will be lost to Newfoundland forever. Ten years when not one item, not one thing has happened. They cannot point a finger to one major accomplishment in ten years, except that they have trebled the public debt. The public debt in ten years has gone, risen by 2.4 billion or \$2,400,000,000. That is the only thing that can boast about, Mr. Chairman, in ten years. And you can take that ten years, pick whatever year you want out of the Smallwood Liberal era, one year, and compare it. By contrast, Mr. Chairman, it is the Liberals - and Mr. Chairman, I hope nobody misunderstands what I am saying. I hope nobody thinks that I am saying that the Smallwood administration was perfect. I hope nobody thinks that I am saying that the Liberals were all perfect. I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman. No, I am not even going close to it, because, like all human beings, the Smallwood administration made errors and mistakes. But I guarantee you this, -

MR. HISCOCK:

It was not for the want of trying.

MR. NEARY:

It was not for the want of trying, as my friend says.

But, Mr. Chairman, no Liberal, whether he be young or old, whether he be middle-aged or whether he lives in rural Newfoundland or in the urban part of this Province, or on the mainland part of the Province, in Labrador, no Liberal, no Newfoundlander alive today, whether he is a hard-core Tory or whether he is a Socialist, will deny the fact that the Smallwood Liberal administration did their homework and they produced and they have something to show for a public debt of \$750 million,

MR. NEARY: now, at the end of this year, \$3.2 billion. After ten years of Toryism in this Province, they cannot point a finger at one major accomplishment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WARREN: The new flag.

MR. NEARY: All the silly, foolish stuff, nonsense, but I am talking about major accomplishments that would put bread and butter on the tables of the ordinary people in this Province. I dare them and I challenge them to stand in this House or outside the House, and point a finger at one major accomplishment that they have had in this Province in ten years.

Mr. Chairman, all they are doing is building on a foundation, or trying to build, and they are making an incredible mess out of it.

MR. HISCOCK: Put her on hold.

MR. TULK: They have weakened the foundation.

MR. NEARY: They have weakened the foundation. They have opened a couple of jails and a few incinerators. Now, that is the extent of it.

Mr. Chairman, we used to hear a lot of criticism about the golden spade, about the scissors that cut all the ribbons in this Province. Well, we have not seen too many sod-turning ceremonies in this Province in the last ten years, or we have not seen too many ribbons being cut

MR. WARREN: I believe you are getting to them, Steve. You are getting to them.



MR. NEARY: because, Mr. Chairman, there were and are no developments. They have made a shambles out of the economy of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, by the time we get back in again, which will be soon, I hope, we will have to learn to use the scissors over again, and we will have to learn how to use the golden spade for sod turning in this Province.

But, Mr. Chairman, what a shameful performance. What a shameful track record. It does not exist. And they have the face and the gall to stand up in this House, for the last couple of years, day in and day out, flinging the mud and the dirt across this House at the Liberals. 'Oh, look what you did, you gave this away and you gave that away'.

Mr. Chairman, who should hang their heads in shame in this House? Who should? Should it be the Liberals of this Province, or the Liberals on this side of the House, or should it be the turncoats on the other side of the House? What a proud record, Mr. Chairman, and what a contrast between the good old days, when this Province was on the march and on the move. What a contrast to what it is today, when everything has ground to a halt.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member mind if we rise the Committee? The Lieutenant-Governor is here.

MR. NEARY: I will move that the Committee rise and report no progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Chairman.

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

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit presently, by leave.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

All rise, please!

Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour bills for the appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

A bill "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses In The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Two And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service". (Bill No. 81).

HON. GORDON A WINTER (Lieutenant-Governor): In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): May it please Your Honour,  
The General Assembly of the Province has at its present  
Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on  
behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request  
Your Honour's Assent.

A bill, "An Act To  
Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Advisory  
Council". (Bill No. 31).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Public Libraries Act, 1975". (Bill No. 35).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Mining And Mineral Rights Tax Act, 1975". (Bill No. 10).

A bill, "An Act Respecting  
The Garnishment Against The Remuneration Of Public  
Officials". (Bill No. 9).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Local School Tax Act". (Bill No. 7).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act". (Bill No. 8).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Judgement Recovery (Nfld.) Act". (Bill No. 16).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Attachment Of Wages Act". (Bill No. 53).

A bill, "An Act To Enable  
Insurance Corporation Of Newfoundland Limited To Become A  
Federal Corporation". (Bill No. 51).

A bill, "An Act To Repeal  
The Income Tax Discounters Act". (Bill No. 27).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Change Of Name Act, 1978". (Bill No. 26).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Newfoundland Human Rights Code". (Bill No. 23).

A bill, "An Act Respecting  
Private Investigation And Security Services". (Bill No. 22).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Tobacco Tax Act, 1978". (Bill No. 85).

HON. GORDON A. WINTER (Lieutenant-Governor): In Her  
Majesty's Name, I Assent to these Bills.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that  
the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

On motion, that the House  
resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 86,  
Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile has six minutes remaining.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I doubt if I can say all that I have to say, when I am comparing the two administrations in six minutes, but I will try. We have plenty of time, Mr. Chairman. And I might say this, that one of the real reasons, of course, that more progress is not being made in this House at the present time is because of the discourtesy of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). I do not want to embarrass His Honour, and I hope His Honour does not hear what I am going to say, but even if you take today, it is maybe a small example but it is quite big as far as we are concerned, that we did not know that His Honour was due to come to the House this afternoon.

MR. WARREN: What? Boy, oh boy!

MR. NEARY: That is how discourteous the Government House Leader is, Mr. Chairman. He is so high and mighty. The hon. gentleman is so high and mighty that he feels he does not have to talk to our House Leader over here (Mr. Hodder). Well, that is fine with us, Mr. Chairman, because hon. members know, and I do not have to remind them how these things are done, they are done behind the curtain quietly and without fanfare. And if the Government House Leader persists, Mr. Chairman - and he can go on radio and rant and rave all he likes that the Opposition are stalling, so he says. Nobody believes him. I was on Open Line this morning. I did two hours this morning on an Open Line programme. I found it very interesting and very informal. It was one of the best so they told me. I was swamped with phone calls after. It was one of the best programmes that have been done in a long, long time. And I ended up by chastizing

MR. NEARY: the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) for his high and mighty, condescending attitude. He thinks that everybody has to bow down to him, kiss his feet, kowtow to him. The hon. gentleman is so high and mighty and so big and so small and narrow-minded, that he thinks that the Opposition are going to come crawling to him. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have plenty of time. We are not going to rush the people's business. We are going to debate the bills as we are doing today. We are going to make sure that every bill is debated thoroughly. There is going to be no more of this last minute stuff of ramming a whole bunch of bills through the House. And if that means that we are going to be here all Summer, well, we will stay here until Labour Day and we will take a holiday on Labour Day and we will come back and go at it again, Mr. Chairman. There is no hurry. The people's business has to be discussed in a proper way.

Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with the Smallwood era and I was mentioning the twenty-three years - and I might say, by the way, there was another record established by Mr. Smallwood. In that twenty-three years he borrowed \$750 million, which was more than all the other administrations in Newfoundland's history put together. But that record, Mr. Chairman, did not last very long. That record was smashed by the Moores administration and by the present administration. From January 18, 1972 up to the present time, Mr. Smallwood's record of borrowing \$750 million

MR. NEARY: was smashed by ten years of Toryism when they increased the public debt in this Province by \$2.4 billion to make the total public debt of Newfoundland today \$3.2 billion, \$3,200,000,000 in a ten year period - \$2.4 billion and not a thing to show for it.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely disgraceful. They should hang their heads in shame. There are eleven or twelve of them over there who have been in the government, ministers of the Crown, since 1972. Some of them have been there since '72, and others for varying periods from 1972 up to the present time - eleven or twelve of them. And they have the face of a robber's horse to stand in this House and point their finger at the Opposition and say, 'Oh, look what you did, look what the Liberals did'. Yes, well, I just told the House what the Liberals did and, Mr. Chairman, they will be hearing more about it in the future. Not that I believe in dwelling on the past, but we have something to be proud of, we have something to boast about, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: And never again should any member of this House on the Opposition benches, or any Liberal in Newfoundland or any young person in this Province who may not know what happened in the last ten, fifteen or twenty years in this Province, who may not understand what has happened, never again should a Newfoundlander, if he voted Liberal, hang his head in shame. It should be just the opposite, Mr. Chairman, it should be the reverse. No wonder the Premier has five or six bodyguards escorting him around this Province, no wonder, Mr. Chairman, unjustified as it is.

MR. WARREN: A good industry.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, is that the only way they can create employment in this Province?

MR. WARREN: Well, that is one of the ways.

MR. NEARY: No wonder they have bodyguards, no wonder they have insulated themselves from the ordinary people of this Province, they are too ashamed to meet people and look them straight in the eye.

Mr. Chairman, I fling out the challenge again to the Premier and to his colleagues, pick one year of the Smallwood administration, any one year from 1949 up to 1972, January 18th, pick one year and I will put that one year up against ten years of Toryism in this Province. And that is something to be proud of, Mr. Chairman, that is something to boast about and that is something to record in the history books of this Province. I am so proud to be a Liberal, Mr. Chairman, that I could talk about it all day and I will deal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is just about up.

MR. NEARY: - I know my time is just about up but I want another half hour or so so I can deal with a couple of the blunders that this hon. crowd made, and deal with the aluminum smelter they are talking about for Labrador and deal with the Upper Churchill and deal with the Lower Churchill and deal with the transmission of power across the Province of Quebec. I intend to deal with these matters before this bill goes through, if it goes through this day, Mr. Chairman, it will only be after I have had ample opportunity to thoroughly debate these matters in this House.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, is this a private harangue or can we all get involved? Because, I suppose, it is just as well that we let the hon. gentleman say all that stuff because if he did not say it in this House, he would probably write it all over the walls.



MR. J. CARTER: So perhaps we are saving the the confines of this House from being defaced.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) on standby or (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. gentleman asked us to pick a year. Well, I will pick the year that Valdmanis went to jail, I think, that is probably the best year to pick, and that was the year that the former, former premier showed either extremely bad judgment or something much worse. And I am just amazed, absolutely amazed that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) can find anything to say in praise of the former premier. Because last Friday, I believe it was, when I got up to speak I pointed out quite clearly that obviously the two former premiers got together in 1975 and caused the Liberal Party to be defeated. Now, I am very glad they were defeated but I think it was an unworthy, mean - those were worthy means to use. And if the Liberal Party had not been defeated by Mr. Smallwood, the hon. member who just sat down would probably be a minister in the government today, the Minister of Welfare, in which he could try and repair some of the damage he did on Bell Island, or he could be Minister of Justice and he could perhaps disbar all the lawyers whom he loves so well, or perhaps he could be Minister of Finance and then he could, perhaps, show us how to generate the vast sums that he says the Liberal government would spend.

I would like him to get up - he says he is going to jump up in his seat again, he is the eternal jack-in-a-box -

MR. HANCOCK: There will be a certain movement in the Province.

MR. CARTER: I would like to hear him say, I challenge him to deny that his hero torpedoed the Liberal Party in 1975. It is quite clear what they did. Any fool with a pencil and paper and a bit of a back of the envelop arithmetic, can very quickly see that is exactly what was done.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what?

MR. CARTER: So what? So you love the man who defeated -

MR. HISCOCK: Democracy.

MR. CARTER: Democracy! Democracy to split the vote.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: And as for the Open Line this morning, I do not make it a practice to listen to the Open Line but it is very, very easy to salt it. And I would say that Alma Badcock and a few of her creatures got on the Open Line this morning.

MR. NEARY: Now the (inaudible) in the Province.

MR. CARTER: Those are political names, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. NEARY: Alma Badcock was (Inaudible) one Open Line.

MR. CARTER: - those are political names and if a person chooses to put his name down, to put their reputation into the political field, they have to take what they -

MR. NEARY: Are you making a speech for the government now? Are you the government spokesman?

MR. CARTER: No, I am not the government spokesman. I am merely a backbencher voicing my opinion. A backbencher with a good memory, I might add, and I can well remember -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: I can well remember what a snivelling toady the hon. gentleman was when he sat over here, the former premier used to snap his fingers calling him to new depths of subservience,

AN HON. MEMBER: Just look at the pain on your colleagues (inaudible) when you get up making a fool of yourself (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER:

But, you know, Mr. Chairman, it is not for the big things that I despise the Smallwood administration, it was for the little things they did, the small things. He was a small man, he is well named, Smallwood, because he is a small man with a small mind and a small horizon, and I think it is just incredible that hon. gentlemen opposite can find anything about those years to praise.

And I would just like to see how the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he gets to his feet again, as he certainly will, can justify being torpedoed in 1975

MR. HANCOCK:

(Inaudible) rich man's university  
(inaudible)

MR. CARTER:

- by the most disgraceful politician that ever held power in all the history of this nation, and I would include in that even the Beothucks whom we know very little about. They may have had a tyrant or two and I would say that Smallwood out-classed even them. So there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said, that it is for too long, Mr. Chairman, in this House Liberals throughout the Province, or after ten years hearing propaganda, particularly our younger people - ten years ago people who were ten years are now twenty- or aged eight- are now voting. What they have heard, they have heard continually said in this Province that the Liberals - the definition of a Liberal is they will sell the resources down the drain.

But in those ten years, Mr. Chairman, before I go on, being a young Liberal boy myself, one of the things that the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) ended up saying, the year Valdmanis - well I do not, and I do not think anybody on this side wants to get into mud flinging and that, we do not want to bring up

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. A. B. Walsh and various other documents that have gone on in the past.

So as I said, if we want to get into that it is quite easy to bring it down to that level. But one of the things I do find is that discourtesy is being done in this House, not only finding out the Lieutenant-Governor is coming, but not getting copies of Ministerial Statements, and as I said, we are seeing the top and the level, the decorum of this House.

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is always chastizing us and saying that we should uplift the standards of this House, and yet the Speaker says this is one of the better Houses of Assembly or of Parliament that he has seen in the nation.

But I want to talk about the ten years that we have seen the government - the ten years of no jobs, the ten years that have had the impact upon education, the creation of the university and free tuition, and as soon as Mr. Moores and Mr. Crosbie got in, because they were from very wealthy families, they ended up cutting it back. And now we find out that students at the university or the trade schools or the fisheries college are finding it even harder.

The youth of this Province again have got very, very little from the administration.

I was rather surprised at the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) when he tabled Alcohol and Drug Dependency in Newfoundland and Labrador. When he tabled it, he was very, very brief and he did not say that from 1970 to 1978, the Tory years, the consumption of alcohol went up from 1.3 gallons to 2.4 gallons in 1978, higher than Saskatchewan, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

MR. HISCOCK: Teenage drinking in that period increased by 90 per cent, between 1970 and 1978, and there are an estimated 20,000 alcohol addicted individuals in Newfoundland, increasing 7 per cent each year, and over 10 per cent of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador, adult drinkers, suffer from alcohol-related disabilities, a population of approximately 50,000 individuals.

A number of individuals who died in 1980 in Newfoundland and Labrador of alcohol-related conditions is estimated at 500. Of these 500 deaths, 100 were due to cirrhosis of the liver, the incidence of which is increasing approximately 40 per cent since 1970. Also, upward of 50 per cent of violent crimes are alcohol-related and it has been estimated that the life expectancy of the native population is reduced by thirty years below the national average on account of excessive drinking and that within two years, Newfoundland will exceed the national average consumption which is 2.6 per cent.

In those ten years, Mr. Chairman, with no jobs in this Province of ours being created, no wonder our people are turning to drink. No wonder they are on unemployment insurance. If we had no unemployment insurance what a state the economy would be in! If we did not have U.I.C. and if we did not have Canada Works projects - take all those things aside and take the number of people who are on unemployment insurance or other related social services and you would find, Mr. Chairman, that this Province of ours basically after 484 years, has almost come to a standstill. There are bankruptcies upon bankruptcies upon bankruptcies in this Province. We are finding our construction companies declaring bankruptcy, we are finding our small business, we are even finding Avco Finance and other companies like that, lending institutions, going bankrupt.

June 30, 1981

Tape 2891

EC - 3

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Chairman, after ten years, what do our people have to look forward to in this Province?

MR. HISCOCK: The idea of the future, tighten your belt and we will have Hibernia coming onstream in five or six years time. Well, Hibernia is not going to help the student in Cartwright who wants to go to Labrador who cannot afford it this year. Hibernia is also not going to help put various other educational facilities in the schools around this Province. We have seen the institution of Grade XII, For what reason? I still do not know. And I also believe, and I will go on record now as saying, that within two or three years we are going to find out that our education system—and our educators are going to find out—that we made a mistake like we made with the new math. And what we have found that we are creating a monster and we are not giving them, we are not giving our school boards or our communities enough money to run these schools and enlarge them and give them the facilities and we are going to have a drop in our level of education within two or three years. And I see that coming and I know it is coming.

But, Mr. Chairman, one of the main things, as I said, after ten years, Mr. Chairman, of Tory administration in this Province, what have we seen? We have seen a continual taking out from time to time, the skeleton out of the closet and shaking the Smallwood years upside down hoping that Valdmanis will pop out and Mr. Doyle will pop out and Mr. Vardy will pop out. Well, two of those people are dead and I believe very strongly that the dead should rest in peace. I also believe very strongly, as the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) said, that Mr. Smallwood's home, he knows where his home is going to be. I would go as far as to say that if the President of the Council (W. Marshall) and the member for St. John's North had their way, they would not even allow them to be burried. They would probably put them out on the Strait of Belle Isle rocks or something and leave them there and let their

MR. HISCOCK: bones blow away in the wind over the centuries.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it, that what is going to remain are going to be his monuments and this is one that we are standing in now. The university is another. The social services is another. The highways are another and various other related ones. And I, as I said, Mr. Chairman, one of the things I would like to remind this House and I would like to remind the Province that Liberalism did not start, as great as Mr. Smallwood was, Liberalism did not start with Mr. Smallwood. He was only carrying on the tradition of Little, Bond, Squires and various other - and Coaker - and various other great leaders of our party.

This government would like to think that -and a lot of people in this Province might like to think, particularly St. John's - that Newfoundland started in 1949. We had 484 years and only thirty-odd of those belong to the Confederation years. And I think we have a tendency to forget about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, after ten years, what have we got? What do we have? We hear - all we hear is about the Linerboard Mill. But I would go as far as to say, if that blunder was not done by the former Minister of Finance for Canada, Mr. Crosbie, and had logs come down instead of chips maybe Linerboard would be operating. But put that aside. At least the building is there. At least the people in Stephenville, who show no gratitude whatsoever, at least the people in Stephenville are working in a building and in an industry that was put there -

MR. NEARY: By the Liberals.

MR. HISCOCK: - by the Liberals themselves.

And with regard to the Churchill Falls Corporation



MR. E. HISCOCK: and the problems related there, if that was not nationalized we would have had the Lower Churchill and Muskrat Falls created now and we would not see all the waste of money going in the Strait of Belle Isle with the tunnel that was drilled for \$150 million. All the other ones that we have a tendency to bring out from time to time; we bring out, I believe, the rubber factory in Holyrood and we bring out some other silly things of the past. Even with that, and I think our people are beginning to realize that even with all the mistakes that Mr. Smallwood made, and even with all the mistakes that Bond made and Squires made and Coaker made it all added up to \$750 million. All the mistakes! All the mistakes, even with the good points! But now we have \$3.5 billion and we are seeing them add up more and more and now we have the saviour of our Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, our present Premier, that he is going to solve all these problems, that all these other people never, never did before. And the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is going to be his chief advisor, that after 484 years this is what we have come to.

Well, as I said, Mr. Chairman, we talk about the arrogance of the Prime Minister of Canada but not so much arrogance as we have in our own Province here. But after ten years, as I said, Mr. Chairman, I think the skeleton is beginning to wear thin. There is a very little bit of bones left on it! And I think their act is becoming rather redundant and that the people would like to see more than the past! We have skipped over the eight years of the Moores' administration, we have skipped over all the contracts and the idea that a lease-when they brought in the Tender Act they claimed that the great - this is one of the things that I am amazed at with this government, and I am again surprised that the press do not see through it that all the time they are into the cosmetics, they are into the facial aspects of government,

MR. E. HISCOCK: the public opinion, the Arts Council, the Labour Relations Board, the Status of Women. Give them all a little crumb, \$150,000 here, \$100,000 there, \$40,000 here, \$50,000 to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, creating the image that we are going ahead but in actual fact we are not doing anything. We are just trying to keep them quiet. And, Mr. Chairman, after ten years that is basically what I find that we are after putting this Province on hold. Just putting it on hold and expecting that the pie is in the sky. How many times have our people in this Province had to wait? 'Oh, as soon as the pulp mill is built in Corner Brook, Newfoundland is going to get on its prosperity, as soon as the one in Grand Falls, as soon as we have the Come by Chance, as soon as we have the linerboard, as soon as we have the Lower Churchill and the Trans-Canada'. Now, we are hearing, 'As soon as we get Hibernia'.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased that the Premier has now created the image in this Province that we are going to get the billions and the billions. Even now he is saying Hibernia is not going to be the dream, that it is not going to solve all our problems in this Province. After three or four years of building them up, now he realizes that it is not going to solve the problems and now he is trying to prepare our people that this Hibernia is not going to be the be all and the end all. But in the meantime what has he done? He has completely neglected the rural areas of our Province. And I was rather surprised by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) getting up and announcing the native programme. I would like to have him get up in this House and announce the uniform rate for electricity for all the Province, particularly his own native Labrador. I would like to see the places of Pinsent's Arm and Norman Bay end up getting power.

MR. HISCOCK: I would like to see the schools along the Coast built up to a provincial standard. According to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) they are below sub-standard. I would like to see the housing along the Coast of Labrador improved and various other projects. I would like to see the start of the Freedom Road that was supposed to start back in 1972. But this government is great in getting up and taking credit from the federal government with regard to the money. And the minister stated that it is the federal government's constitutional responsibility to the natives. How many times do they also get up and say, 'Oh, we cannot do this, we cannot do that even though it is our provincial responsibility of constitutionality but no, we cannot afford it'. So as I said, you will hit them with one side and they will whack you back with the other. But ten years of no jobs, Mr. Chairman, ten years of depression in this Province, ten years of telling our people that this Tory government is good for you, that basically we got rid of the corruption, we got rid of all the things and that. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are now beginning to find out that after eight years of the Moores' administration a few cracks are beginning to come in the seams. And people in this Province are beginning to ask how come the present Premier has not put out the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), what is it that the Minister of Fisheries knows that if he gets out— he is known to have a big mouth now— but if he gets out of the Cabinet, was put out, then what is he going to get on with. We know the smear campaigns he did on the former Leader of our Party, Mr. Rowe. And they also the question, Mr. Chairman, they ask with regard to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), why again is the Premier keeping him in. And the Premier is keeping them in and everybody is keeping tight together so that they can keep their unity among themselves. But there are cracks

MR. HISCOCK: appearing and the cracks are becoming bigger and bigger all the time and our people are becoming disillusioned after ten years, Mr. Chairman, of saying that the pie is at the end of the rainbow. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have been waiting now for that for ten years and we still do not have it. But as I said, the fraud that is perpetrated on our people by this ten years of propaganda, in the Evening Telegram and part of the CBC and also St. John's. St. John's has a strange effect on one's mind. And, I suppose, it is like any area. once you live in it you become assimilated. This is why a lot of the Liberals, when they go out to Alberta, after a couple of years they vote Tory because of peer pressure. But with regard to St. John's here, after you live here for a while and you come into the area and you are back and forth, you have a tendency to think, because of the Tory mentality in St. John's and it has always been there - and I do not say that is negative or positive, it is just there, just like parts of Labrador and parts of rural Newfoundland are Liberal. But what you do have in that attitude, you have an attitude that nobody can do anything right for Newfoundland, that it is only the St. John's people that know the way. And as Mr. Clyde Wells, a former MHA in this House said, St. John's is a parasite on the rest of Newfoundland and Labrador. I would not say it was necessarily a parasite on Newfoundland and Labrador, because we need a capitol and it is just as well to have the capitol here as anywhere else. But with regard to it, Mr. Chairman, if St. John's had its own way, not one cent would be spent out in the outlying areas. St. John's wants to grow larger and larger and larger, but there is nobody, Mr. Chairman, as good to St. John's, as good as the Moores administration was and the Peckford administration is, there was nobody as good to St. John's as the Trudeau

June 30, 1981

Tape No. 2894

GS - 3

MR. HISCOCK: Liberal government in Ottawa and Mr. Smallwood when he was here. He created the Confederation Building; he made St. John's a service centre for the university, the Fisheries College, the Trades School; he got into Northeast Atlantic Assembly; he got into Newtown-Mount Pearl area and developed that. We have the White Hills;

MR. HISCOCK: we have the Health Science Complex, we have the engineering, we have the Taxation Data Centre, the Sir Humphery Gilbert Building, X number of other things that were put here by the Liberals, the Cross-Town Arterial Road coming in from the Trans-Canada, lit now by Mr. Trudeau.

After all these things pumping into it, you would think St. John's would start waking up like most urban areas, like Montreal and Toronto and Vancouver and Halifax and St. John, of returning some Liberals so that they could get more money. Historically it has been a fact that the Liberals have been in power more in Canada than the Tories but does St. John's get in that way? Do they put somebody on the side? I find it rather amusing that in the last election the main campaign or slogan in St. John's area, 'Let us not have another Newfie joke, Let us make sure that we have a Tory government in Newfoundland now that we have a Tory government in Ottawa'. We got the fish and chips.

Well, the people in St. John's bought it but they would have bought it anyway and that was the main slogan that was going around. But I am saying when this government got to go into election within the next year and a half, and hopefully before, will they be saying now, with the Liberal government in Ottawa, that we need a fish and chips relationship, that we need to have a Conservative government here to fight for our rights? That is what they are going to say now. We need a Conservative government here because we have to fight Ottawa to protect our rights. But because there was a Conservative government, well, you had to work in co-operation.

And I would say, Mr. Chairman, that Ontario has shown that it can co-operate with a Liberal government, and also New Brunswick, but this government has shown it cannot co-operate with anybody. Not with their own problems

MR. HISCOCK: with Nova Scotia or with their other problems with Ontario.

But, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the years, and the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) mentioned the Diefenbaker years, he also failed to point out, with the Diefenbaker years in regard to Term 29, what Mr. Diefenbaker felt towards Newfoundland. And if you want to see anybody who stood up and fought for Newfoundland then, St. John's, even Tory St. John's, turned against their Tory Prime Minister in Ottawa and all of St. John's was draped in black. So, Mr. Chairman, when it came to fighting, the Conservatives or the Tories or whatever name the people want to use on them, had no monopoly in standing up for the rights of this Province.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. HISCOCK: But after ten years, Mr. Chairman, after ten years of Tory administration, there is no question that this country is coming to a standstill. But, also another policy another policy that has happened, and Mr. Crosbie was very good in planting it, is saying because of Mr. Trudeaus' strong tactics, Mr. Chairman, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: - because of Mr. Peckfords' strong tactics with regard to Ottawa, that somehow or another, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister was going to punish Newfoundland. The Prime Minister of Canada is not that small. Not only not that small, but when the Conservatives were in there, and let not the press, particularly, forget

MR. HISCOCK:

about this, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this bill -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised  
by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentlemen there opposite  
can filibuster if they want to but they have to be relevant,  
Mr. Chairman. We are on a tax bill -

MR. HISCOCK: I know we are on a tax bill.

MR. MARSHALL: - the imposition of a gasoline  
tax and the hon. gentleman is talking about things with  
respect to the Prime Minister of Canada and going all around the  
circle everywhere. I mean, there has to be, surely, some  
bounds of relevancy to this debate. It is not the  
Throne Speech, neither is it the Budget Speech. Now,  
I know his friend is going to get up and speak to it,  
but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, he is not  
being relevant.

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

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

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman,  
I would submit that there is no point of order. Your Honour  
should rule that relevancy is very difficult to define,  
that when you are debating a money bill in this House  
the debate is extremely wide-ranging, there is ample  
precedent for it. Your Honour can go to Hansard and look  
back over the years and see that in this House on any  
money bill, debate is wide-ranging. You could get up if  
you wanted to on a money bill, for instance, and read  
poetry - if you wanted to - as long as you can relate it to  
revenue or expenditure on the part of taxes collected by  
the Public Treasury, by the Minister of Finance or by



MR. NEARY: the Newfoundland Government.  
So in actual fact, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order. The hon. gentleman may be getting overheated; the hon. gentleman may be sweltering in the heat over there, but it is going to be a long, hot Summer. He may as well sit back and relax and not try to influence the Chair in any way, shape or form. My hon. friend is in order and in keeping with tradition and precedent in this House. In actual fact, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To that point of order, whilst relevancy is hard to define, in borderline cases a member must be given the benefit of the doubt. However, I would like to refer all members back to Erskine May, Page 783. Whilst some degree of flexibility has been allowed, I would ask members to come back a little bit closer to the gasoline bill.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to that, Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make was because of all the taxation that has been collected by this Province, even with all that we still find that we do not have enough money and that the former Minister of Finance, Mr. Crosbie, has stated that Newfoundland is being punished. And the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the government would even go as far as to say the reason why we are being punished is because of our nationalistic stand and therefore we are not getting as much money out of Ottawa and we need to increase the taxes. So that is the point I was trying to make. But, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath were in government in Ottawa, there was a freeze put on for six months.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Okay, they needed to get their house in order, I will even buy that. But three months after that, Mr. Chairman, not one DREE agreement was signed, not one new proposal was put forward, nothing,

MR. HISCOCK: For the nine months, Mr. Chairman, nothing was done with regard to that fish and chips. We got very little fish and we got even less chips. But with regard to it, Mr. Chairman, he has now stated that Newfoundland is being punished because of the strong tactics of the Premier. Well, I would like to say with the \$40 million for the Native Agreement, and \$47 million for the coastal Labrador DRFF agreement, and the \$13.5 million for helping modernize the Abitibi Price mill in Stephenville, and the \$33 million for bringing in the modernization of the Corner Brook and Grand Falls mills, and the \$40 million for the Gros Morne Park area, and also for the airports in Goose Bay and in St. John's and in Wabush, and with regard to the \$50 million for the railway, and with regard to the \$50 million for the C-core project at the university, and also the cost-sharing arrangement with regard to the Trans-Canada, does that sound like the Liberal Government in Ottawa is punishing Newfoundland? No, it does not, Mr. Chairman. What it does say is that they had a little bit of trouble in communicating back and forth with Ottawa.

And with regard to the Prime Minister giving the rights to transmit power through Labrador, was that given, Mr. Chairman, because of this Premier of ours for fighting for Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: The Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Chairman - Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) always states that he likes to be heard in silence. I would like to have that same courtesy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: But with regard to the present situation, with regard to our country and our Dominion Mr. Chairman, we are finding that the reason why Prime

MR. HISCOCK: Minister Trudeau stood up to Quebec with regard to its independence and fought that and basically won that himself - do you think, Mr. Chairman, that a Premier of our Province is going to frighten that Prime Minister of Canada: The man, the Prime Minister of Canada, operates on principles and that is something that is foreign to this government. And with regard to transmitting the power through Quebec, it has been proven and it has been shown that the Smallwood years never asked for it because they did not need it, because Brinco was going to develop the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls, bring it down to Newfoundland and the surplus was going to go to Quebec as well as the smelter in it. But no, we had the Conservative Government end up scraping that and nationalizing it. But even with that, did the Moores years have any communication asking for a power corridor through Quebec? No.

And then in those years the former Minister of Mines and Energy, the Premier, being in under that, why did he have to wait for

MR. HISCOCK: the Premier to ask him when he was Minister of Mines and Energy himself. As I said, Mr. Chairman, with regard to having order in this House and speaking, I would go as far as to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister of Canada is quite pleased and proud, as he stated to his Liberal supporters - and the majority of the people in this Province are Liberal supporters - and said to them we only go by the five seats that the Prime Minister has received and the popular vote - we only have to look at that. So, with regard to his position with regard to Newfoundland, he is fighting for the Liberals and the well-being of all Canadian citizens in this Province, whether they are Tory, NDP or Labrador or Newfoundland, and with regard to the other parts, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be done on principles and only done on principles. But I am rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, that here we have the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) getting up - I know the word 'Smallwood' sticks in the man's craw a bit and it is hard to say it but then, again, as I said, I suppose we all have our shortcomings, but there is no question about it that he is in the minority and I would like to find out today that after he prevented Mr. Smallwood - from the televisions coming in this House - well, I would like to see the day when Mr. Smallwood does pass away and that is a fact - the true feeling, the true feeling of the member for St. John's North because I do not really think that is it, this is a facade, that deep down he does realize that he is one of the greatest Newfoundlanders and one of the greatest Canadians that Canada has produced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Chairman, in concluding - and giving it over to some other member of this House - but in concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would only like to say that

MR. HISCOCK: if we are going to have justice in this Province, we not only have to have justice but to have it seen. And I cannot see how the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) can remain as Cabinet ministers in this government. We have had ten years of total disregard and chaos, and there is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, that our people are now beginning to tire of it. Mr. Moores ended up saying at one time, Mr. Chairman, 'The tide is going to come in and take -'. Well, I would say, Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Pratt has said, 'Here the tide flows and here they ebb'. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, that the tide is now turning and it is turning in our direction.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I really do not have to read Wick Collins to find out what is going on in the Province. I had to get up to say a few words in this debate, Mr. Chairman. Obviously we had two speakers on the opposite side, we waited for them to say something, they have not said anything yet, so I decided to get up and at least talk about some of the things that they did talk about, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had the gall to get up and talk about the teachers in the Province, the teachers negotiations and what happened there. Mr. Chairman, he was in the government that did not allow them to negotiate. They came in and they asked, they begged several people in the government, they put their proposals forward. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in 1970 or 1971 -

MR. HISCOCK: See what you will do in the Health strike.

MR. DINN: - the teachers in this Province - and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) now is interrupting in the debate and breaking the rules of the House again. He cannot seem to stay quiet in the House. He gets up and says nothing for a half an hour and then when somebody gets up to speak to enlighten the hon. gentleman, he interrupts in the debate, like a little cracky, a little dog. Well, Mr. Chairman, the teachers dispute in 1970-71, the teachers came in and they put their proposals forward to government - and this is how they negotiated - and the government looked at it and said 'No, not getting that, out'. So, Mr. Chairman the teachers had enough, they went on strike, they rotated here in St. John's first and then the call came down from the great white father who said to them, Mr. Chairman, who said to them, Mr. Chairman, 'Come on in, we got three ministers who will sit down and negotiate with you, we will negotiate in good faith and we will conclude a collective agreement'.

MR. J. DINN: So, with that, on faith after twenty-three years of being beaten down by that administration, the teachers came in in good faith, called off their strike, went back to work, came in and sat down with the three ministers. And did they say, "Well, let us sit down and negotiate now"? They said "No". They said "Here is what your getting, take it or leave it, out of the office". That is what they said. So you had the three ministers, Mr. Chairman - there was kind of a benevolent dictatorship. They could not do any more. The great white father just said, 'Do it this way', and they had to do it this way and that was it. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is no joke when the hon. former Minister of Finance in this government stood up here in the House and said, 'Every once in a while Mr. Smallwood held a Cabinet meeting down in front of the London window'.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) talking yourself now.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members got up on the opposite side and they talked about the highest unemployment rate ever in Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Chairman, they know that is not true. Hon. members know that that is not true. They know it is not true. I have indicated to them Statistics Canada have indicated to them.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Be specific the hon. gentleman calls,



MR. DINN: the hon. leader number one of the Opposition. Leader number two was here for a short while and he left, leader number three is sitting in the back seat and will soon be a Senator, leader number four who just got defeated in a leadership convention is sitting in the wings waiting for his crack at it again. Mr. Chairman, hon. members opposite have been told in this House time and time again, they are not my statistics, they are statistics made by Statistics Canada, the people in Ottawa make them. Their friends in Ottawa send them out every month. And the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not want to hear it. He does not want to hear that the employment growth rate in this Province is higher than any province in Canada last year, the year before, and will be this year. I think the employment growth rate last year was 6.2 per cent.

The hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talked about \$750 million in debt when they got thrown out by the people of this Province. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is kind of an ironic little tale. \$750 million is about what we are losing per year on the Upper Churchill, just as one little shot, Mr. Chairman. We are losing about \$700 million a year; the total debt of the Province when they got in, we are losing that every single year. Hon. members - great deal, you know, the great big giveaway on the Upper Churchill, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: We are not losing anything on the Lower Churchill. We are not losing a penny on the Lower Churchill and we will never give it away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. DINN: We will never give away the Lower Churchill. Never, ever, ever while this government is in power will we give away the Lower Churchill like the Upper Churchill was given away. The hon. members have the nerve to stand in this House and talk about the Linerboard mill. Well, how did the Linerboard mill come about? Mr. Smallwood in one of his very famous Cabinet meetings, issued an Order-in-Council saying, 'Here, Mr. Doyle, is \$100 million or so. See if you can go over and get a few more shekels and put a linerboard in Stephenville. Whether they want it or not, let us put a linerboard in Stephenville.' Knowing full well that it could not work, he wanted to put it there anyway, Mr. Chairman. A hundred million dollars to Mr. Doyle - 'Here, Mr. Doyle, is an Order-in-Council for \$100 million or so, or however much you need. Here is \$100 million, go on over and see if you can get a linerboard mill started.' A little bit of loose change, \$100 million. Hon. members want to know the facts. The Come By Chance refinery - hon. members talk about the great accomplishments of Mr. Smallwood and that former, former administration. Well, let us look at the Come By Chance refinery. 'Here, Mr. Shaheen, is a couple of hundred million dollars, go out and build us a refinery and see if you can get it to work,' Mr. Chairman. And what would have happened now if we had lived with that contract that was in place when the former, former administration was in? What would have happened to the people of this Province? Well, Mr. Chairman, we would have been on the hook for \$600 million but for the fact that that contract was negotiated. Look at all these great accomplishments.

MR. DINN: Now, that is not to mention the rubber factories, and the chocolate factories and all the rest of the foolishness that went on, Mr. Chairman, the waste, the bribery, the corruption. Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to get into houses, who built houses. That is only peanuts to what happened, Mr. Chairman, in that infamous administration. Liberals stand up and talk about how proud they should be of that twenty-three years. They should hang their heads in shame over that twenty-three years, Mr. Chairman, hang their heads in shame. Seven hundred million per year on the Upper Churchill thrown down the drain, given to Rene and his boys to do their thing, Mr. Chairman, while we gave it away.

The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) talked about negotiation. There was no negotiations with the teachers in 1970-1971 or for the twenty-three years previous to that. Never was there a set of negotiation that took place. They took what they were offered or else. Out of frustration in this Province, out of straight frustration in this Province the teachers went on strike. They never had the right to negotiate. Mr. Chairman, we are proud of our record of giving these people the right to negotiate, the right to collective bargaining. And sometimes it does not all work. And the employees at the Trades College got every possible opportunity to negotiate in that collective agreement. They were given every possible opportunity. They were given - where was I at three or four o'clock in the morning when hon. members were in bed, when the hon. member for Labrador, who never visits his district, who has not seen it since he got in but once, Mr. Chairman, a disgrace as a member, Mr. Chairman, got the nerve to sit in the backbenches. Get up on your feet and speak like a man. Get up on your feet if you have to say something, instead of shooting off in the background and saying nothing.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

Yes, he had the same rights as everybody else to negotiate.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Exactly the same rights. Not like the teachers, the teachers coming in begging and squirming, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible). It is a shame, definitely a shame.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to restrain himself.

MR. DINN:

They had the right to negotiate as every citizen of Canada, every citizen of this Province should have the right. And the hon. member for Torngat Mountains, who should be spending a little more time on issues centered around Labrador, spends his time sitting in the back seats and genuflecting to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who is a disgrace, a book written about him, about how he operated when he was in Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, I will take no back seat to anybody over there, nobody over there, not one person. The track record; They have a track record, they had a track record when they were in, Mr. Chairman, an infamous administration, a track record and the hon. member for LaPoile, and those who were involved, should hang their heads in shame, not get up and boast about it, Mr. Chairman.

Outward, inward migration, people during that administration were leaving here at the rate of 8,000 per year. It peaked out at 8,600 per year, net outward migration of this Province. Right now it is down to about

MR. DINN: 1,200 and it will go lower. As the years go on it will go lower, until we reach a point in time when Newfoundlanders who went to the mainland will come back here in droves, Mr. Chairman, when they see what sort of a government we have down here now, an honest, open administration. They have not seen the likes, Mr. Chairman -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - have not seen the likes in all their lives. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) who went down to City Hall when he was Deputy Mayor and cried when he lost a contract, has the nerve to jump into the debate.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): A point of order?

MR. DINN: The hon. member is now going to make a -

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order?

MR. STIRLING: On a point of order.

MR. DINN: - point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DINN: You cannot take it, you never could take it.

MR. STIRLING: I do not know what it is that the minister is getting at, but he is certainly having no other purpose but to impute motives of some type and I call upon him to withdraw it, Mr. Chairman. It is categorically not the truth.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order, it is a difference of opinion between -

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. STIRLING: No difference of opinion.

MR. DINN: Yes, it is a difference of opinion between hon. members. If the hon. member does not want to admit it, that is fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): To the point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Chairman, outward-inward migration - I was just getting to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) because he does not like the facts, you see. The hon. leader does not like the facts. A net outward migration during those infamous years of 8,600, now it is 1,200 approximately, Mr. Chairman, and going down every year.

MR. HISCOCK: So is the population going down.

MR. DINN: The population is not going down. The hon. member is having another figment of his imagination, the hon. little crackie in the back benches over there chirping, breaking the rules of the House. If the hon. member has something to say, he can stand up after I am finished and say it. But in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member to sit in his place and listen in silence, Mr. Chairman, observe the rules of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, let us talk about employment because I like to bring this out. You know, hon. members do not like it but I always like to do it, you know. Mr. Chairman, I should not, no, I should not - I mean, one would consider that I might be rubbing it in now. I mean, people might get the idea that I am starting to rub it in now, but the fact of the matter is that 1979 over 1978, 10,030 jobs. Now that is more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Hon. members do not like it. Hon. members do not like that and not a good statistic, Mr. Chairman. The same the following year and this year to this point in time, 9,600 on a month to month basis over last year.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Chairman, the little crackie in the back seat on the opposite side is breaking the rules of the House and he is not allowed to break the rules of the House. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not like these statistics and he talks about more fish. Well, Mr. Chairman,

MR. DINN:

if we waited, if we listened to what the hon. Romeo LeBlanc is doing for us, he is going to give away 11,000 metric tons - 11,000 metric tons he gave to the Nova Scotians. He gave 17,000 metric tons of squid. And, as I understand it, and it has not been confirmed yet, but 45,000 metric tons to the Russians. Now, Mr. Chairman, where are we going? I mean, what are these people trying to do for us?

Another thing that the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) stated today, which is not true, it is simply not true, was the fact that when fish and chips got in in Ottawa, they cut out the job creation programme, Not true! Complete fallacy, complete falsehood, not allowed to say it in the House if it is not true, but the hon. member persists, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is, that when the hon. Ron Atkey was Minister of Employment and Immigration, he went to all the Ministers of Manpower and Industrial Relations, Manpower and Labour in Canada. He met with all of them and he said, 'Look, we got to change this porkbarrelling system - this porkbarrelling system, we are not getting our dollars worth. What we want you to do is get your resource people together and we will create jobs in the resource areas, the same amount of dollars, or escalated a bit for the cost of living or what have you, but the same amount of dollars, we will put them into resource areas so that we can use, utilize the facilities after the job is complete'.

So we did it here in Newfoundland, We had our six or seven resource ministers here in Newfoundland and we put the proposal together - just to explain for the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) - we put a complete proposal together and we prioritized it, and we sent them into Ottawa. There were something like \$36 million or \$40 million worth of good resource-



MR. DINN: based job opportunities and a complete programme in place.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we sent it through to the hon. Ron Atkey who was completely delighted, he was completely delighted. The Leader of the Opposition now has to leave, He got his few little licks in today and he got soundly put down. But, Mr. Chairman, we put our proposal in and Mr. Atkey thought it was an excellent proposal, something like \$36 million worth of good projects, sound resource-based projects. And then, all of a sudden, we had a bit of an election, So immediately upon the appointment of the hon. Lloyd Axworthy, I contacted him - it can be tabled or hon. members can come to my office to see what was done, what the proposal was all about, I got in touch with the hon. Lloyd Axworthy the new minister, and he said, not in

MR. DINN: so many words, but he said, 'We are going back to the old system, porkbarrelling. We will give it to a little group here and a little group there, depending on what the member wants. We do not want to do it your way, even though we know it is a good way,' he said.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the minister went - you know, when you see a minister you are willing normally to start out and say, 'Look, let us give him a chance; let us give him an opportunity to prove himself.' Well, he proved himself. Back to the old porkbarrelling, that is what happened, Mr. Chairman.

That is about all I have to say and I will wait for hon. members to add their few remarks and then possibly jump into the debate again.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Obviously members filibustering on the other side of the House. They are not prepared to give us our right to criticize this bill and the other matters that are coming before this House, but I tell you, Mr. Chairman, the irony of it all is this, that it seems in this session of the House a pattern has developed. And let me tell the hon. the Premier what the pattern is. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to making a feeble attempt at defending this administration and defending ten years of Toryism in this Province -

MR. HISCOCK: They cannot do it.

MR. NEARY: - who is it that does it? Who are the chief spokesmen for the government on that side of the House? Well, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is one of the chief spokesmen who gets up and speaks on every item that is raised in this House. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) gets into the fray and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. NEARY: These are the -

MR. WARREN: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

MR. NEARY: No, not Stephenville.

Mr. Chairman, these are the three spokesmen for the government during this session of the House. Three more crude members you could not find if you went out and scraped this Province from one end to the other. You could not find three more weaklings. You could not find three members who are more ignorant of the facts - and I am talking about the political facts. You could not find three more whose vocabularies are so low than these three hon. gentlemen. So therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to waste any time commenting on anything they said. What they said was so low and rotten and lacking in common sense and logic, that was so crude, Mr. Chairman, that it is not worthy of comment by me. So I will just go on. If the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) wishes to participate in the debate to defend the administration or the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), who is not in his seat, then I might be tempted -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I take exception to the statements and want to correct the hon. member when he is saying that the things I have said in the House in debate the last few days in particular were - I think the term was 'crude'

MR. MORGAN:

and very low. Well, the hon. gentleman if he is referring to 250 fishermen in his riding who are presently unable to get assistance for being refused the right to fish- that is one very important problem I discussed in debate- it is a problem that I think is very, very far from being low, very far from being crude. It is a problem that affects his own constituents. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, these kinds of remarks, he should think carefully before he says them in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): To the point of order, there is no point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is a typical example. I am sure that the hon. the Premier - Mr. Chairman, you should sit on this side of the House and look at the expression on the Premier's face, look at the expression on the President of the Council's (Mr. Marshall) face. You should come over here on this side of the House and take a picture of the expression, the look of pity, the look of anger, the look of frustration, the look of pity and the strain on the faces of the Premier and the President of the Council as these three hon. gentlemen I just named stand in their places in this House to try to defend the Tory Administration. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, it is so obvious that the Premier has absolutely no control at all over the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). And the hon. Premier should have the courage now to stand up and tell the House that these three gentlemen are either speaking for the administration or they are not speaking for the administration. And if they are speaking for the administration, then the only thing that I can say to the Premier is if that

MR. NEARY: is the best he can put up, if that is the best that he can show the people of this Province, then I would say God help Newfoundland and Labrador. I say, God guard thee Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman.

And you know, Mr. Chairman, this propaganda that they have pumped out in previous sessions of the House, chat 'oh, the House would be closed only for Neary; well, it is not going to work this time. Because, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a statement over right my colleagues, over right all of my colleagues I am going to make this statement, that the Liberal caucus, the Opposition, every single member to a man, Mr. Chairman, we were never as united

MR. S. NEARY: in anything in our lives as we are in seeing that every single piece of legislation before this House, currently on the Order Paper will be thoroughly debated before the House closes. Every member, and most of them are sitting in their places now, every member, Mr. Chairman. And every member will participate in—maybe not this debate but in other debates in this House, as we get down through the Order Paper. Mr. Chairman, I would not recognize the hon. gentleman if he was the only one in the House. There are three hon. gentlemen - I will just single them out over there - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) who are the chief spokesmen for the government. They are the chief spokesmen on everything in this House. And what an embarrassment. As I said, you should see the look of pity and strain and confusion and frustration on the faces of the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), and on the Premier of the Province (Mr. Peckford), and on the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) when they stand to speak, unauthorized. They are obviously out of control. The Premier has no control over these three members and I would not be a bit surprised but pretty soon he will be standing in this House and disassociating himself with some of the remarks that have been made by these hon. gentlemen in recent days. It is crude and low and should not be repeated and should not be answered by anybody on this side. The record speaks for itself. But, Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, every member to a man on this side of the House is prepared to see that things are debated thoroughly in this House, that nothing will be rushed through at last minute. They are all sitting here completely content and happy, maybe they would prefer to be outside on such a fine day, but,

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is no way that anybody on that side of the House or anybody up in the press gallery, will be able to say, 'Oh, Neary is hanging her down and everybody is teed-off', because that is not the case. And my hon. colleagues can confirm that. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with the Liberal administration and I forgot to mention the fact - as a matter of fact the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) reminded me - that the period I was talking about, from 1855 up to 1981, there were twenty-two premiers during that period of time, twenty-two premiers, and one out of the twenty-two-

AN HON. MEMBER: Bill Patterson (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Smallwood and the Liberal administration, one out of twenty-two, did more than the other twenty put together, and I am including the present Premier (Mr. Peckford) in that, by the way, did more. One man and one administration did more than the other twenty-one put together. And now, Mr. Chairman, as I cannot help but repeating, is that not something, is that not a record to be proud of? But the thing that bothers me about it, Mr. Chairman, is this, and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock)

MR. NEARY:

made reference to it, that in the last ten years in this Province, in the last ten years of Toryism, we have had a barrage of propaganda going out across this Province the likes of which you have never seen before in Newfoundland's history. And the Liberals, the Liberals have sat back to large measure and then taken it, they have allowed things to be said and things to be done, they have allowed statements to be made that are untrue, unfounded, that are fiction. They have used a Hitler-type propaganda, they have used the big lie, the big lie in this Province to try to cover up for their inaction.

MR. MORGAN: There is nobody listening to you up in the press.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference - it does not make any difference if anybody is listening in the press, but I am sure they are -

MR. MORGAN: No (inaudible) copy (inaudible).

It is not worth the paper it is written on.

MR. NEARY: Ah, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman did not read the front page of The Telegram on Saturday, The Weekend Edition of The Telegram -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, so - but what has happened, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) more coverage (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. TULK: He is desperate over there!

Boy, he is desperate!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Premier would ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to restrain himself. He obviously has no control over him. There are three people that he has no control over. They get up and they cause him



MR. NEARY: all kinds of embarrassment. Sometimes I pity the poor old Premier for having to sit there with three members over whom he has no control whatsoever, And when the fishermen in Bonavista -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are getting close 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: When the fishermen and the plant workers finish up in the Fall, and they get back at the hon. gentleman, they will take care of him, Mr. Chairman. There may be a lull in the controversy in Bonavista at the moment, but it will flare up again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, this propaganda that has gone out in ten years has perpetuated the Hitler tactic, the big lie. And what is the big lie, Mr. Chairman? The big lie is condemn Smallwood, down him, condemn the Liberal era. But you notice this afternoon, when three members stood in their places in this House after all I said, I challenged the government's spokesman to get up and tell us about their record of Toryism in this Province for ten years, not one of them, Mr. Chairman, not one of them dealt with their own record for the last ten years, especially the last two. Not one member, not one of the three, not one of the government's spokesman, not one of them could tell us about their own record which is, as everybody knows, non-existent.

And while I am at it, this popped in my mind, I have to say this about the condemnation by the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), whom I presume was speaking for the government, after all he is a backbencher who supports the government -

MR. MORGAN: Are you speaking for the Opposition?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am speaking right now for the

MR. NEARY:

Opposition. Mr. Chairman, when I want to express a personal opinion, I will say it is a personal opinion which I have a right to do as a backbencher. A minister cannot do that. You cannot wear two hats. You cannot express a personal view - put on one hat, express a personal view, and then put on another hat and be a minister. You cannot do it.

MR. TULK: He does it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) does it.

But the other day, when the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was speaking for the government, he said that Mr. Smallwood had built his house - just to show you how the big lie is used, how the Hitler tactic is used. He said that Mr. Smallwood built his house on several hundred acres of good agricultural land. Now, that is what the hon. gentleman said, and he is over there now and he is nodding 'yes' he did say it. Well, I did not have my wits about me at the time to check the deed, but I checked it after.

MR. MORGAN: Over 100 acres of Crown land (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me correct that statement merely for the sake of setting the public record straight. That house, Mr. Chairman, is built on ten acres of non-agricultural land. Mr. Chairman, how long more is this Hitler tactic, is this big lie technique going to work? How long more will it work? Or is my hon. colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) correct when he says that the people of this Province are beginning to see through the big lie? Are they beginning to see through it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, you have to take this into account. My hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) must take this fact into account, that ten years ago, when the Tories took over in this Province on January 18, 1972, there are a large number of voters who at that time were ten years of age. As a matter of fact, at the moment I would think that the number of voters in this Province who were not born at the time of Confederation total now about 60 per cent of the electorate. And some of that 60 per cent were only ten years old when the Tories took over. So for ten years, Mr. Chairman, for the last ten years, they have been listening to the propaganda of the big lie, the Hitler tactic, the Nazi tactic that Mr. Smallwood was this, the Liberal administration was that, they were corrupt, he was crooked, and he bankrupted the Province and he was this, that and the other thing. And from now on, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: as long as I have my health and strength, the big lie will be exploded because there is not an ounce of truth in any of these statements. Now, as I said earlier today, the Liberals were not angels, the Liberals were human. Mr. Smallwood was human and we made mistakes - everybody makes mistakes - but at least he was doing things whereby he could make mistakes, but this administration, and the ten years of Toryism, have done nothing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that brings me to another point that I want to make and I doubt if I am going to be able to say everything that I want to say today, but I hope I can deal with this one item before six o'clock and that has to do with the power corridor across Quebec. Now, Mr. Chairman - and I do not blame the Tories for doing this, I do not blame the Tories for trying to get credit for that action that was taken by the Federal Liberal Government. I do not blame the Tories for trying to claim it as some kind of a victory, but I do blame the Opposition if that is allowed to stay on the record and not be exploded -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - some kind of a victory that this administration are trying to claim for something that Mr. Trudeau is going to do about the power corridor through the Province of Quebec. Let me first of all, Mr. Chairman, point out that at the last Premiers' Conference, the hon. Premier was there - he is in his seat now and I am glad when I make this statement - the hon. gentleman put some hard questions to the Prime Minister of Canada back a year or so, over a year ago, about the rights of Newfoundland to transmit power across the Province of Quebec. And what did the Prime

MR. NEARY: Minister say? What was the Prime Minister's answer to the hon. the Premier of this Province? He told the hon. gentleman over a year ago, almost a year and a half ago, that constitutionally Newfoundland and every other province had the right to transport goods and services across provincial boundaries. That is what the Prime Minister of this country told the Premier of this Province almost a year and a half ago. In a letter to the Premier of this Province on October the 20th., 1980, Mr. Trudeau again repeated what he had said at the Prime Ministers' Conference. He said, "My dear Premier: This is in response to your letter of September the 24th., 1980, in which you reiterated your concerns about the Federal Government's willingness to use its constitutional authority to ensure the passage of Newfoundland

MR. NEARY:

electrical energy through Quebec. In my letter of July 29, 1980 to you, I indicated that the federal government stood ready to act if it could be clearly demonstrated that the exportation of electricity from Newfoundland was, in fact, being prevented by Quebec. This, as you will recall, was also the essence of my comments to you when we discussed the matter at the recent Conference of First Ministers on the constitution", confirming what I just said a few minutes ago.

"I was very interested to learn the the Power Authority of the State of New York has indicated its willingness to purchase surplus power from your Province if price and certain other requirements can be met. Although there are, I understand, many factors over and above the question of transmission through Quebec to resolve before formal contracts can be signed, this is an encouraging development.

"As I am sure you appreciate, your request for federal government action to ensure transmission through Quebec raises many complex issues. Federal officials are giving priority to examining these issues and it is clear that to expedite this work, discussion between our officials will be required at an early date. To this end", the Prime Minister said, "officials of the Federal Government Relations Office will be getting in touch soon with their Newfoundland counterparts to discuss arrangements for such a meeting. Your Truly, Pierre Elliot Trudeau"

So we had the question at the Prime Ministers' Conference answered by the Prime Minister of Canada who said, "Yes, we will stick by Newfoundland. We think you have a constitutional right to transport power", confirmed in a letter on October 20th. But, Mr. Chairman, before that, on January 20, 1980, Mr. James McGrath,

MR. NEARY: M.P. had asked the Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, a number of questions. And I have the Hansard here to prove it. The House of Commons Debates, June 20, 1980. The question is on energy. And in reply to questions asked by Mr. McGrath the Prime Minister again confirmed, for the third time, confirmed that as far as his government was concerned, the Liberal Government in Ottawa, Newfoundland had the constitutional right to transport electrical energy across any province.

MR. TULK: And did it again four weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. TULK: And did it again four weeks ago.

MR. NEARY: And did it again four weeks ago.

Four times the Prime Minister categorically made that statement. And now, somehow or other, the government here are trying to claim it as some kind of a victory. How many times, Mr. Chairman, does the Liberal Prime Minister of this country have to say, 'Yes, you have the constitutional right, Bring us the contract. If Quebec is being unreasonable with you bring the contract and we will deal with it'? Four times the Prime Minister said it.

MR. NEARY: Not once, not twice, not three times, four times. Put it in writing, told the Premier at the First Ministers' Conference. And now they are over there trying to claim it as some kind of a victory. Well, Mr. Chairman, if they get their jollies out of that, if that makes them feel happy, well, I would say, okay, congratulations! I do not know what for, but congratulations! You think you have some kind of a victory, good for you. But the Prime Minister has been saying this all along. The only thing is your heads have been in the sand and you have been wasting time. When you should have been getting on with the job you were playing politics. I am sure that is what the Prime Minister of this country must be thinking. But now, Mr. Chairman, they are now having that matter put aside for the time being.

I hope that this administration will not take the good will and an indication of the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada that they are going to strengthen this right - not only are they going to put it into the constitution but they are going to strengthen it by a special act of Parliament. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this government will not interpret that as meaning that there should be no negotiations with the Province of Quebec. But I am afraid, and I have to issue a warning, I am afraid that is what is going to happen, that they want to continue and they want to perpetuate the war with Quebec because they can get good political Brownie points by doing it. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the attack on Rene Levesque and Quebec will continue.

The Parliament of Canada, when they passed this piece of legislation, the Parliament of Canada, when they spell it out in law, that every province has the constitutional right not only for people to move freely back and forth across Canada but for goods and services to move, I am sure when they pass that act



MR. NEARY: in the Parliament of this country that they do not mean that the provinces, the provincial governments then can go in, march into another province, march into their sister province and take over. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the spirit of the law, that they would hope, as a matter of fact they would possibly demand, that negotiations take place. And what I am afraid of, some of the remarks I have heard from this administration, from spokesmen in this administration, is that it would appear to me that they are taking this law, that they are taking this piece of legislation and they are saying, 'That is it. That is the law, Mr. Levesque and people of Quebec. No negotiations. We do not have to deal with you. We do not have to talk to you because we have got this piece of legislation.' Well, Mr. Chairman, if they do that they will be making a grave mistake indeed. Because even with that legislation,

MR. NEARY: there will have to be negotiations with the Province of Quebec. Otherwise, it will never work, Mr. Chairman, it will not work. It will not work for Newfoundland no more than if the situation was reversed and Quebec wanted to run a transmission line through Newfoundland and we did not want it and the Government of Canada tried to force it on us, force a transmission line on us. What would happen, Mr. Chairman? What does Your Honour think would happen? I know Your Honour cannot answer me, but I think it is obvious to every member of the House what would happen, I do not have to spell it out. In order to make that legislation work there has to be a spirit of co-operation and good will. And if that is not there, then it will not work law or no law. The people of Quebec would take the law into their own hands, just the same as the people of Newfoundland would take the law in their own hands if the shoe was on the other foot. So I hope these inflammatory, illogical statements made by spokesmen for the administration will cease because, Mr. Chairman, if they do not we are doomed.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Sure, yes, sure, you will get a bit of mileage out of attacking Quebec, attacking the Province of Quebec, attacking Mr. Levesque. Of course, you will get a little political mileage, and in the short-term you may gloat about it, but, Mr. Chairman, in the long haul, over the long period, it will do Newfoundland no good. We will still have the world's largest electrical potential that is left; we will still have the water flowing out into the Gulf of St. Lawrence and no development. And, so, I issue that warning to the administration, do not think because of an act, a little piece of legislation being passed in the Parliament of Canada, being introduced and probably passed this Fall, that this is the end all or be all of this problem with Quebec because it is not, it cannot be and

MR. NEARY: can never be that easy. There have to be negotiations; there has to be co-operation and there has to be good will. You just cannot walk in, and I do not care what government it is, you just cannot walk into a province and clobber them over the head and expect your transmission line - people looking at it day in and day out - transmitting energy from, say, Newfoundland to New York with Quebeccers looking at it day in and day out and saying, 'We do not want that there, it should not be there, we do not want it there. It has to be removed.' Why, Mr. Chairman, the situation in Northern Ireland would make it look like a Sunday school picnic.

MR. NEARY:

We all remember what happened to all the monuments in the Southern part of Ireland. I was there once, shortly before they blew down Nelson's Column in Dublin. And so, Mr. Chairman, need I say more? If the good will is not there, if the spirit of co-operation is not there - does anyone in this House, is anyone silly enough to think that if there are no negotiations, that if you tell Quebec I have the law here, I have got the legislation you can go jump in the lake, or jump in the Smallwood reservoir, is anyone in this House silly enough to think that it is going to work? Now, Mr. Chairman, that is one point I wanted to make and I have two other points before we finish this bill that I want to make, I hope I will get an opportunity. Well, maybe I can move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again because it is getting near six o'clock, Mr. Chairman. Intervene. You intervene.

MR. MARSHALL: No, his time is up, Mr. Chairman, he can sit down.

MR. NEARY: Well, if my time is up maybe one of my colleagues will intervene so I can carry on and make my other couple of points I wanted to make. Go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Shall the resolution carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is just an example of what we get. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not delaying the House, Mr. Chairman, but we know there is a little block and that little block have informed the Leader of the Opposition that they are going to go their own way, and we have seen the example of it.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress.

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

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

MR. STIRLING: I do not know what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is hoping to achieve, Mr. Chairman, but when he talks about a little group on this side doing this, that or the other thing, he knows that he is not in order. This caucus meets and we follow the decisions made by caucus, unlike the other side where they cannot even control the ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Where the ministers get up and take part in this debate when they are trying to get through a tax bill. Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council, if he is looking for the co-operation of this side, has to start treating this side with the respect that we give them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order. There is no point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity to clarify remarks attributed to him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good will.

MR. THOMS: Well said. Well said.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Humber West.

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

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

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

June 30, 1981

Tape 2913

PK - 3

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

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