

VOL. 3

NO. 32

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, MAY 4, 1981

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1218

DW - 1

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I have a communication here addressed to me from the Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. "The Lieutenant-Governor has asked me to acknowledge your kind letter of April 15th. in which you informed him of the passing of a resolution of appreciation by the House of Assembly. His Honour directs me to tell you that he is grateful for the generous and kind terms in which the members of the House have expressed their feelings. His Honour is most appreciative of the respect and loyalty which has been shown to him by you, Mr. Speaker, and by all the members of the House during the period that he has been the Queen's representative in this Province." And it is signed by Major Donald C. Barter.

I would also like to at this time welcome on behalf of all hon. members the newly elected member for Bellevue district (Mr. Callan), who today -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: - who, of course, takes his seat, for the first time in this General Assembly although he is no stranger to the House. So I welcome the hon. member for Bellevue.

I would also ask hon. members to extend a welcome to a new Page to my right who will be serving this House during the remainder of this session, Miss Elizabeth Hutchings of Grand Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

And finally, while I am on my feet, I would like hon. members to extend a warm welcome to a distinguished visitor in the gallery today, Senator and Mrs. William Petten.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), but in her absence and in the absence of the Premier I will ask the question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). What action is the government taking to avert what now appears to be common knowledge throughout the Province that there will be a strike amongst the teachers of this Province? Can the President of the Council fill us in on what action government is taking to avert that strike?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can give details to the answer I am going to give, but I will just say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) that his question has a certain presumption and supposition to it that, in fact, there is going to be a strike. This government is ready, willing and able at all times to negotiate with the negotiating committee of the Newfoundland Teacher's Association and to negotiate in good faith with them with the aim and the hope of arriving at a reasonable settlement, reasonable for the teachers of this Province, Mr. Speaker, having taken into account the capacity of this Province, in its financial resources, to pay.

MR. L. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if this were the first confrontation with this government and a group of employees it could be understood that the government would sit on their hands and hope for the best, but in view of the same presumption taken last Summer when the fishermen's strike took place, the presumption that nothing would happen, and the presumption that NAPE would be beaten to their knees, and they actually had to go on a hunger strike, what I am asking the President of the Council is does the government have any contingency plan in effect now to take any last minute action to avert a strike?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the matter of education is the responsibility of other concerns but it is also very much the responsibility and concern of the Province. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, in this particular matter, this is a part of the normal collective bargaining process, and the hon. gentleman can make his own inferences as to the way in which the government has operated in the matter of these labour disputes, and I am sure that his own inferences will be as he wishes to infer, but the fact of the matter is the government continues to honour the matter of collective bargaining, of labour negotiation, and is negotiating in good faith, has been negotiating in good faith, will continue to negotiate in good faith, and hopes that this result will be about a solution.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

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

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1219

NM - 2

MR. STIRLING: Do I understand from the President of the Council that there are ongoing negotiations now taking place to avert this strike?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is not the place to get into the area of what is happening, particularly with ongoing negotiations as to the way they are. The fact of the matter is that this matter is within the collective bargaining process at the present time. The government is ready, willing, and able at any time to sit down with any group in this Province for the purpose of discussing their financial needs in relation to the financial capacity of the government to respond to them. And, you know, that is the situation. It is a situation which is well known and I do not propose, I do not think it is in the interest of the present ongoing dispute, neither is it in the interest of the people who will be affected, to get on to the floors of the House of Assembly, the public floors of the House of Assembly, the people's House, and get involved -

AN HON. MEMBER: - a poor face -

MR. MARSHALL: - no, no, it is not a poor face.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: -to get involved, Mr. Speaker, in the matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, to get into the specific details of the collective bargaining process and collective bargaining.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1219

NM - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! A supplementary,  
the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this  
government does not negotiate and they do not wish to discuss  
things in this House, and they do not wish to be asked questions.  
Can the President of the Council give any assurance to the parents  
that there is any kind of a contingency

MR. STIRLING:

plan to deal with the situation of students who may not be given the opportunity to write exams? What will be the situation as far as those children are concerned if the government persists with their pattern of no negotiations, total arrogance, and if we have a strike which will last well into next year, can the President of the Council give any assurance to the parents that any kind of contingency plan is in effect to protect the students?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that question has the hon. gentlemen's own imprimatur on it. He has his own conclusions, that this government will not negotiate with anybody, is not reasonable, etc. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we are in the throes now of a very sensitive collective bargaining process and as far as the direct answer to his question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am not in the process of answering hypothetical questions. That particular question will be addressed at such time as it becomes a reality.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am going to try and get an answer from the President of Treasury Board because the hon. the House Leader seems to think that the procedure with respect to collective bargaining is secretive. So, Mr. Speaker, with that brief but very necessary preamble, I wonder if the President of Treasury Board can indicate to members of this House, and by so doing to the people of this Province, what now is transpiring between the teachers and the Treasury Board? Is there any negotiation? As I understand a strike vote is about to be taken, so the question is have all negotiations now ceased? Are we at the procedure

MR. LUSH: now where the NTA is asking for a strike vote? Is that the procedure we are at now or are there some negotiations going on before that strike vote is taken?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, following the annual meeting of the association last week there were meetings between representatives of the Teachers' Association and the Department of Labour and Manpower and between the officers in the Department of Labour and Manpower and Treasury Board. There was considerable discussion as to the outstanding issues. Now the hon. members understand and of course the association knows that government has accepted the majority conciliation board report which amongst other things recommended a certain salary package. We accepted



DR. COLLINS: that majority report and the association knows we accepted that report. They, themselves, came back with another proposal and we indicated, having looked at the proposal, that was not a proposal that we could accept and we asked them to reconsider the matter, and if they saw fit to reconsider the matter that we would be available to discuss it with them through Labour and Manpower or, if need be, if it seemed appropriate, directly.

At that point in time, the representatives of the association, I understand, decided to consult with the executive committee of the association and, I think, subsequently with the board of the association, and I believe that took place over the weekend. Now, since that time I have not received any further word on what the representatives of the association have decided to do. I have not received any further word whether they intend to request the services of the conciliation facilities within the Department of Labour and Manpower or not. But we have indicated that if they so wish to do, we will be available to carry on meetings and discussions similar to those that took place late last week.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: Although I can appreciate the minister might not want to give the specific details relating to the present problems with respect to the teachers right now, can the minister indicate whether the dispute is a monetary one or whether it is related to other issues?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues but the strong indication we have is that the

DR. COLLINS: monetary one is the primary one, that is the essence of the whole piece, and that if that is settled to mutual satisfaction that the other items very likely would not prevent an agreement.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous inconvenience, for the want of a better word, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, in view of the great anxiety and frustration and the many problems that would be caused by a teacher strike - and one which I am sure that the teachers themselves do not really want to call - but in view of the frustration and anxiety and the problems that this particular strike would cause, has the Treasury Board indicated their willingness to make any moves at all towards the demands of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association -

MR. STIRLING: Towards meeting.

MR. LUSH: -Towards meeting their demands?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of the representatives of the association that Treasury Board would be meeting with them through the Department of Labour and Manpower. If we did not consider the point that a) we have accepted the conciliation board report; b) they did not accept it and they have indicated very distinctively that they did not see their way clear to accepting it in the future, so I think that taking those into consideration I am sure the association understands that government is willing to talk about something different from what the conciliation board report stated.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Agriculture (Mr. Goudie). Would the minister tell us if the government has entered into an agreement or a contract with an individual or a group of individuals now here in this Province to supply agricultural lime or agricultural limestone to the farmers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a decision taken on the supplying of agricultural limestone to be mined in this Province. I am subject to correction on the number of months ago, but it was last year when the agreement was reached.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to give us some details, the name of the individual or the firm that will be supplying the limestone and where the

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1222

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: supply of limestone will be obtained?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Rural,  
Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember the  
name of the company, The principal, the one name that comes  
to mind, is Mr. Wallace Maynard up in the St. Barbe district. I  
cannot remember the exact community. That information I can  
get for him. But that is the firm that was awarded the  
contract which was advertised by tender last year.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Minister of  
Agriculture care to tell the House where Mr. Maynard will  
get his supply of limestone? I think that is very important  
that we find that out.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister for Agriculture.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will get that  
information. I do not know the name of the community off the  
top of my head but it is from that general area up there. I  
will get the information for the hon. gentleman tomorrow if  
that is satisfactory.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Does the hon. gentleman know if  
the limestone will be secured in the Daniel's Harbour area  
where the waste from the mine, the tailings from the mine,  
is being stockpiled? Is that where Mr. Maynard will get  
his limestone?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is in the  
Daniel's Harbour area, yes.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Why do I have to ask so many questions?  
It is like extracting a tooth.

MR. MORGAN: He is giving it to you in baby talk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: First of all I have to ask the hon. gentleman questions, then he does not remember, he has amnesia. Then when I asked him if it was in Daniel's Harbour, he says yes; all of a sudden he knows. Well would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the agricultural limestone is being taken from the waste, the tailings in Daniel's Harbour, if it has been tested to see if it is suitable to be used by the farmers as agricultural lime?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the material in question was

MR. GOUDIE: tested and has been found, at least to date, to be quite suitable for farming.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman tell the House if this waste material that is being removed from the ore at Daniel's Harbour, the tailings, contains cadmium? And if so, is that not dangerous to people's health? And if it does contain cadmium, would the hon. gentleman undertake to find out if any of it has already been used? Because once it goes on the ground that is the end of it, the ground is ruined forever. Would the hon. gentleman check that out, because that is very important? I am told that this cadmium is dangerous to people's health because of the chemicals it contains. Would the hon. gentleman, if he cannot give us the answer now, undertake to get the answer at the earliest possible moment for this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that limestone does contain cadmium. As I indicated in a previous answer, the limestone had been tested and had been found, certainly up until this point in time, to be quite safe for use. But just to ensure that there are all necessary safety measures being carried out, I will double check it again. But to this point in time the information I have from the staff in the department is that the cadmium content of that particular limestone is not at a high enough level to be of danger to anyone.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary on that. Is it not true that the officials in the field, fourteen field officials, have recommended that the department turn this down and that basically this cadmium is of a very high rate and if it gets into the soil at the rate that it is, the farmers are very concerned and will have to give up using that land indefinitely and that it is one of the major health concerns, or potential health hazards to this Province since any other hazard has come - it is one of the major health potentials, put it this way, of the future, if something is not done immediately.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of fourteen members of my staff, I think the hon. member is suggested, who have recommended that this not be used. I had a representation from another person who placed a bid on that particular tender last year who suggested that he felt the cadmium content in the limestone was too high. Well, I emphasize again it was one of the other bidders. I had my staff check out the cadmium content of that particular limestone in question and they have informed me. And I read memos on it from the staff as early as this morning indicating that the cadmium content of that particular limestone is not a health hazard at this point in time. But I will double check it.

MR. NEARY: A further supplementary, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House how this came about, this using the waste material down in Daniel's Harbour that apparently contains chemicals that are dangerous to people's health?

MR. NEARY:

If it is put in the ground it is there for a long time and that ground will have to remain unused for a long time to come, probably forever. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how it came about? Was there a proposal from Mr. Maynard to the Government? If the government called tenders, were the tenders designed in such a way that you could only use the waste material at Daniel's Harbour? Was the tender designed in such a way to favour Mr. Maynard? Why not the limestone in Port au Port?

MR. TULK:

A good question.



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, of course, the tenders were not designed so that one particular person in this Province could take advantage of that particular tender process. Of course not. There were public tenders. I do not remember the number of people or firms who tendered on that particular project. As I said it dates back, almost a year now, when this thing first came into place.

I would have to check to find out how many tenders were involved because as I indicated one other person, one other firm which had tendered on that particular process of quarrying limestone in the Province brought to my attention before the House recessed for Easter that he felt the cadmium content of that particular limestone was too high. I will emphasize again that that was one of the other people who bid on this particular contract. The decision was made by government to use not just the limestone or the tailings, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) suggested, from Daniel's Harbour but to find a source a limestone within the Province. Because traditionally in the agricultural industry all limestone had been imported into this Province from some other part of the country. We wanted to find a local source of limestone and to set up an industry in this Province, as small as it might be, to cater to the agricultural industry and that is why the tenders were put out in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1224

DW - 2

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

MR. J. HODDER: I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) yields.

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems every time we turn over a rock Mr. Maynard crawls out from under it. Would the hon. gentleman undertake to table all the correspondence, tenders, the whole -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. D. HANCOCK: What are you spokesman over there today or what?

MR. S. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) cannot even do his own job without trying to come to the rescue of the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) who is in a bit of trouble at the moment over this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to table all the correspondence in connection with this matter -

MR. HANCOCK: And the contracts.

MR. S. NEARY: -and the contracts that the government, that his department has with Mr. Maynard? Because I am told, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Maynard, whether or not he gets the supply of limestone in this Province or not, if he brings it in he still gets his percentage for bringing it in to the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: That comes in anyway.

MR. S. NEARY: And it comes in anyway. It does not make any difference who brings it in, Mr. Maynard gets his 10 per cent. It does not make any difference if the Minister of Fisheries brings it in, Mr. Maynard still gets his 10 per cent.

MR. S. NEARY: I would like to see that contract tabled. Would the hon. gentleman undertake to table every detail in connection with this contract and with this supply of agricultural limestone for the farmers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel as if I am in any particular trouble at the moment, contrary to what the hon. member has suggested. And I would also suggest that the tendering process was followed the same as any other government tender is followed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: At least we got a tendering process.

MR. NEARY: Look at the Public Works scandal.

MR. GOUDIE: - and that the firm in question owned by Mr. Maynard

MR. GOUDIE: was awarded the contract in the usual manner. There is no difficulty that I am aware of, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: We will get all the facts.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand I heard the minister say a few minutes ago that they had looked for suitable limestone around the Province for agricultural purposes, and in light of the fact that the Port au Port limestone block is the largest block of limestone on the Eastern Seaboard of Canada, and also in light of the fact that -

AN HON. MEMBER: And North America.

MR. HODDER: And North America, the hon. member is correct. And also in light of the fact that during the days of the Labrador Linerboard mill that limestone was being quarried there in Port au Port, has the minister given any consideration to the use of agricultural limestone from the Port au Port group for use in agricultural purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, when this tender was awarded there was no specific region identified in the tender call where the agricultural limestone had to come from. The tender was awarded on the normal basis, as far as I am aware, unless there is something that I am not aware of -

MR. NEARY: Well, there is something (inaudible),

MR. GOUDIE: - and the tender was awarded to Mr. Maynard or to his firm. He identified in his tender that this is where he was going to get his source of limestone and the tender was awarded on that basis. There was no particular region of the Province identified as being the source of agricultural limestone in the Province.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1225

NM - 2

MR. HODDER:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

for Port au Port.

A supplementary, the hon. member

MR. HODDER:

I just want to ask one short question to the minister. If indeed the limestone in Daniel's Harbour is not adequate because of impurities for the use for agriculture in the Province, would the minister look at the Port au Port area, which as I said before, is the largest and most pure group.

MR. FLIGHT:

Too lazy.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great deal of concern expressed about the cadmium content and I assume that is the basis on which hon. members are objecting to this whole process that we have gone through. If the cadmium content is at a dangerous level then of course we will go looking for agricultural limestone in another source.

MR. NEARY:

How do you get out of the contract?

MR. GOUDIE:

And Port au Port would be as likely an area as anywhere else.

However, as I have said in earlier questioning, the staff of my department, the people who are specialists in this particular field, have indicated to me that there is no danger from the cadmium content in this limestone, but I will, Mr. Speaker, review the situation again to reassure not only myself but all hon. members and the public of the Province that indeed this limestone contains cadmium at an acceptable level.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1225

NM - 3

MR. HISCOCK:

The minister says that his officials are saying that the rate of cadmium in it is quite acceptable and that there is nothing to be concerned about. Is it not true that the officials of his department had a meeting and the field

MR. HISCOCK: staff were brought in and only for an hour were given the three reports, and all three reports were written from a very biased point of view reinforcing Daniel's Harbour tailings of the mines and that they only had an hour to read the reports which were written from a biased point of view and then after they had to give their comments on those reports and within a week tenders were called? And in his department now it is one of the major concerns of agriculture because of the impact it will have upon the Newfoundland grown. If it is going to be a health hazard then the land - we have so very little land, but if it is going to be contaminated then our Newfoundland grown products and our programme that the department has built up over the years are down the drain. Is that true?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the hon. member is suggesting over there. I know nothing about an hour-long meeting in which a biased report was read. By whom?

MR. HISCOCK: Well, find out.

MR. GOUDIE: I have no idea who the hon. member is talking about.

MR. HISCOCK: Find out.

MR. GOUDIE: If he has some allegations to make, I would suggest that he come out with them, Mr. Speaker, so that this scare tactic process that he is going through right now is not used to scare the general public of this Province. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, the staff have assured me up until I left a week ago that the cadmium content of this limestone is acceptable. I will review it again and if it is not then something will be done about it,

MR. GOUDIE: but at this point in time, I am satisfied that the cadmium content is not high or dangerous to the farming industry or to the general public of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this was indeed a rush job and my hon. colleague is correct that the field staff were called in, given these reports, sent home, and within a week tenders were called. It was a rush job. And the reports they read were merely a sales pitch for the tailings in Daniel's Harbour by Mr. Maynard, and the staff are very concerned about it. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I would not have raised the matter, because the hon. gentleman may be surprised where the information came from.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member has a supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman to tell the House what is the term of the contract? Is it a year, two years, three years, five years? What is the term of the contract? Would the hon. gentleman tell us how he could manage to get out of the contract in the event that the cadmium content of the tailings in Daniel's Harbour is too high to be used as agricultural limestone in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, all I am suggesting is that if the cadmium content of this agricultural limestone under question today is proven to be unsafe, if the cadmium content is there at too high a level, then, obviously, the only thing to do is to get out of the contract or to correct



MR. GOUDIE: the process in some way or other. But at this point in time there is no fear, based on the information that I have, that the cadmium content is too high. Obviously, if it is not too high, if it is safe to be used, then there is no reason to get out of the contract that I am aware of.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the university was invited to research this waste material at Daniel's Harbour? The hon. gentleman did not answer my question on the term of the contract. And if the government did buy their way out of the contract, which would be a pretty expensive undertaking, would not

MR. NEARY: Mr. Maynard still get his ten per cent? If the agricultural lime has to be brought into Newfoundland, it does not make any difference who brings it in, under the contract will Mr. Maynard still get his pound of flesh from the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice. I do not really know if the university was invited to -

MR. NEARY: You will table everything?

MR. GOUDIE: I will get whatever information I can, Mr. Speaker, and as soon as it is available, yes, make it available to hon. members of the House.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: It seems an obvious question, Mr. Speaker. The minister has indicated that a contract has been let to a company of which Mr. Maynard is the owner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister tell us whether or not his department has attempted to determine the level of cadmium before they went into a long-term contract or any contract? That would seem to me to be the obvious thing to do. Did his department determine or attempt to determine whether or not the cadmium level is too high before the contract was signed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the cadmium content of that particular limestone that is under question

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1227

AH-2

MR. GOUDIE: today had been looked at before any tenders were placed and it has been analyzed several times since that. As I have indicated, I cannot give the hon. House all of that information in chronological order today but I will get the information and provide it to the hon. House as soon as the information is available.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I have the honour to present today the report of the Legislature's standing committee on Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 31st of March, 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Justice I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills; a bill, "An Act To Provide Certain Rights For Blind Persons," and a bill, "An Act To Amend The Landlord and Tenant (Residential Tenancies) Act, 1973".

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 1. The Budget debate.  
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1227

AH-3

MR. ROBERTS:  
be back in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to

MR. HANCOCK:

You are driving them out already, 'Ed'.

MR. ROBERTS:

I should hope so. I would like to

drive them all the way out, Mr. Speaker, either through -

MR. HANCOCK:

They are doing that themselves.

MR. ROBERTS:

- an election or out of office,

any lawful way to achieve either. It is a pleasure, as I was saying before my friend from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) erupted himself back there, to say a few words about the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

Now here we go again, Mr. Speaker.

I can, as I have demonstrated over the years, I can really shout as loudly as anybody in the House, including the gentleman

MR. ROBERTS: from Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) and the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey). I would not attempt to surpass the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) but I might be able to come fairly close to him in volume if not in intellect, but I do not want to have to engage in a shouting match -

MR. HANCOCK: You are really showing him up.

MR. ROBERTS: - and so I would ask my hon. friends carrying on the little caucus there if they could either do it more quietly or if they could move outside the House. I have no desire to engage in a shouting match; I do not think it helps the House, I do not think it helps the -

AN HON. MEMBER: They can all leave.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I just as soon the gentleman for Bonavista South left, unless he wants to say something witty which I realize is probably beyond his abilities, but short of that perhaps he could just be quite or at least behave himself if he cannot be quite.

Now what I began to say before the hubbub across the House was that there are a number of ways we can regard this Budget Speech which the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) delivered himself of back in the halcyon days three weeks ago before the House rose so those who wanted to go South could go South. It could be regarded as a financial statement, which it is. The Budget, and particularly the appendices attached to it, the various documents and the Budget, you know, has grown, the physical documentation has grown like topsy and I am not so sure if we are any further ahead. The minister, when he came to talk of waste and extravagance and prudent housekeeping, might begin by reducing the volume of physical material that is made available for the budget. But in any event, be that as it may, the budget is a financial statement. It is more or less a report to the shareholders in this Province and

MR. ROBERTS:                   there are a number of comments I want to make about that aspect of it. It is also an economic forecast. The minister in his speech made some forecasts about our economy this year and of course the documentation that was tabled equally makes some detailed forecasts about our economy. It also talks about the estimates for the coming year, and the estimates themselves are tabled with the budget so we get some idea what the government propose to spend. It talks about the tax changes, and I will have something to say about the tax changes, the increases, because that is all tax changes ever mean in the hands of this government. But most importantly of all, Mr. Speaker, the budget is a economic and a social road map, it is the document that more than any other shows what this government consider to be their priorities and how they propose to go about trying to achieving them.

                                  And that is really what I want to talk about in the primary sense. It is very easy for me to stand here and it might be good sport for a few minutes to flay the government's financial policy, if in fact they have one. You know, you can talk about the economic concerns of either the government of this Province or of the people of this Province, and sometimes those concerns are the same and sometimes they are divergent. You know, if you list them down anybody would say they are five separate types of concerns of the economy, or that are economic in scope: taxes, cost of living, hydro rates, which, of course, are part of the cost of living and also are a tax by another name, the unemployment or the lack of employment and, of course, the lack of services. Those are surely, Mr. Speaker, the five significant economic concerns of the people of this Province, these are the economic issues as opposed to constitutional or political or personal or whatever concerns we may have.

MR. ROBERTS: The budget, it is fair to say, has absolutely nothing to offer of any help on any of those five separate issues. On taxes, the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) only proposal is to drive them higher still. He has done that. He has maintained his record and maintained that of his administration and of its predecessor and as Kipling said, 'The colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under the skin,' then the Minister of Finance is certainly a sister under the skin with such notable benefactors of the public as Mr. John Crosbie, one of the truly great finance ministers of this Province; he took away the mothers' allowance—that was his big achievement. The Minister of Finance has maintained the impeccable and unblemished record of the

MR. ROBERTS:

Tory Government in this Province; they have yet to bring in a Budget that has not increased taxes. There has not been one of the ten or eleven they have brought in that has not increased taxes. They have never lowered a tax with the exception of the fuel oil tax and the s.s.a. on children's clothing. The s.s.a. on children's clothing represented a net gain for the government because, of course, with one hand, the Tories gave an exemption for children's clothing and on the other hand they took away the mother's allowance, and the net result was that the mothers of the Province had less money to spend on their children than they had under the previous Liberal policy.

Cost of living - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon? The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) wants to say something and I will listen. Would he say it, please?

MR. HODDER: The member for Stephenville.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I am sorry.

MR. STAGG: The cost of living (inaudible) industrial development.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I shall talk in due course about Tory industrial development and the shining gems which are represented by those projects which the gentleman from Stephenville endorses including the Lower Churchill, the Upper Churchill, the giveaway of the Linerboard mill, the gems in the crown, the general story of unblemished success which has been the Tory record.

But I was talking about cost of living and, of course, the Minister of Finance in his budget has done nothing to help with the cost of living except to



MR. ROBERTS: introduce regressive taxes.

We are now even given the pleasure of paying a percentage of what goes to the Government of Alberta. The other provinces, as they get their increased, take as the oil companies make their increased profits, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, thanks to the minister's beneficence are now given an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way; they now get to pay 22 per cent of whatever the grossly bloated, over-inflated price of oil is. And, of course, now we know why this government wants to raise the price of oil and gasoline to world levels. They want to profit from the unfairly bloated costs, the grossly inflated costs. I am just thankful we have men like Allan MacEachen and Pierre Trudeau in Ottawa, because they are holding down the price. It is high enough, heaven knows, but it has not gone to world levels and it will be a long time before it ever gets there if they have their way. It would go tomorrow if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had his way.

Hydro rates - well, we have seen the government's answer on hydro rates. It came a few days after the budget when the President, I believe the gentleman is, Mr. Victor Young of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro announced that they would be going for another increase, which of course will immediately be passed through to the customers.

Unemployment - there is nothing in the budget that in any way touches the unemployment problem in any beneficial way. There is not a measure, not a suggestion, not a hope of anything to alleviate the unemployment. There is a little boasting, but I will take that apart using the minister's own documentation to reveal that for the false and meretricious claim that in fact it is.

MR. ROBERTS: And finally, the lack of services - of course, here the budget at least finally speaks with some truth and some veracity because it reveals something which the government can no longer hide, that this government are unable as well as unwilling to provide the people of this Province with the services which they need and the services which they deserve.

I do not want to stand here for a couple of hours and simply slay the budget and slay the minister. That would be poor sport and the minister is just not up to that. I do not see any point in it. I do not have any sadistic tendencies. I do not enjoy desporting with the minister - he comes ill-equipped to that kind of game - other than simply noting that the budget really does not address any of the economic issues, and in that it simply reflects the policy of this administration, a group of men and women who really have no idea how to cope with the problems of this Province, and, furthermore, I think it is fair to say on the evidence we have, are not even aware of the problems of this Province. How they, for example, could bring in a budget which has reference to the fishery without dealing with the major problems that confront the fishing sector of our economy, that escapes me. I know it escapes the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), but I can understand that. What I cannot understand is how it escapes the entire administration. They acknowledge the primary role which the fisheries play and then they avoid or evade all mention of any of the problems and some of the possible and likely solutions.

Now, my colleagues

MR. ROBERTS: will be talking about aspects of the budget. I gather that we are going to be allowed to talk about the budget one day a week, is it? The government's plan is that they are going to -

MR. HODDER: It starts this week.

MR. ROBERTS: It is going to be like Neapolitan ice cream now, it comes in different colours and different slices; and we are going to be allowed to talk about the budget one day a week, two days this week and one day a week thereafter, and then we are going to talk about something else on Tuesday and on Wednesday private members are going to be allowed to talk, and on Thursday we are going to hear about something else and on Friday something else, it is just a smorgasbord, and a very unfavourable smorgasbord. The government are that disorganized they cannot even keep their own act in order.

But as we are allowed to talk about the budget from time to time, my colleagues will deal with some of these aspects, The infamous 22 per cent tax -

MR. STAGG: Ho, ho, ho!

MR. ROBERTS: Now it may not affect the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

MR. STAGG: Talk to your buddy, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) and his taxes.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly speak about the Minister of National Revenue a man who is not only a friend of mine, I am proud to say, but is a gentleman of humanity, irrudition, and compassion, all of which are factors completely unknown to the gentleman from Stephenville or the government which he endorses so wholeheartedly. He may object to paying his taxes.

MR. ROBERTS: I have found no fisherman who objected to paying his taxes. I know a great number who object to the way in which they are -

MR. STAGG: Visit your district.

MR. ROBERTS: I visit my district, Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), but not to practice law. He visits his, but only, I would venture, to practice law. I do my law here in St. John's. He does his out in Stephenville, which is his home, I guess, or if it is not his home at least it is now where he now resides. I think he is a native of some other community.

But the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) is doing his duty according to the law, doing it with humanity, responsively, and responsibly, equitably. And I am sure that no fisherman or no other taxpayer will be treated unfairly and I say that some three or four days after I had to write a cheque for the modest amount which the Government of Canada exacted from me.

MR. STAGG: Talk about the Liberal gasoline tax.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I will talk, Mr. Speaker, gladly about the Liberal gasoline tax -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - far less than any other Tory gasoline tax, and now I will also talk about the Tory tax in this Province which, of course, is now a percentage. These fellows now have a vested interested in driving the price up. Twenty-two per cent or what everybody else gets this crowd gets. There is just no mercy.

I was reading the other night a biography of Peter the Great, not Brian the Great.

MR. ROBERTS: There has been no biography written about Brian the Great. And there will certainly be none written about Frederick the Great in this House, but about Peter the Great, that giant in Russian history, and it was telling of what he did to some of his subjects fire knout- or is it k-nout- was his treatment, and this is exactly what this government are doing now, fire and the knout in the form of a 22 per cent tax. Lashing it to the people, 22 per cent of the cost of gasoline.

MR. HISCOCK: Indexing.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is indexing, I say to my friend for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). It is indexing with a vengeance. It is regressive tax upon regressive tax. And I do not know where the mandarins in the Finance Department came up with this, but the minister I am sure welcomed it just as Peter the Great welcomed the spectacle of a couple of thousand people being tortured with fire and the knout - or is it k-nout I do not k-now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now if my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would restraint his natural impatience. I know that he is impatient. He has much to be impatient about. He is warming the backbenches, Sir; if he were a chicken hatching eggs he would have flocks of them by now, he has been warming the backbenches that long. But let him control his impatience. Let him hope to rise on his merits. Let him not admit that he knows that he cannot rise on his merits. Instead of sitting on his merits, let him hope to rise on them.

MR. STAGG: The roast -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the roast was great. We had great fun at the roast for Bill Doody on Friday night. Your Honour has no recollections of it.

MR. STAGG: The same old stories.

The same old insults.

MR. ROBERTS: The same old insults. He should have heard his former Premier, Mr. Moores, who was as funny as he always is. Some of them were marvelous. I will not say what was told about the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) because nothing was said about the gentleman for Stephenville. He was so utterly insignificant that even in that crowd of staunch supporters of Bill Doody, some of whom are Tories and some of whom may or may not be, but they were all supporters of Mr. Doody and friends of his, Senator Doody, now gone to his eternal reward, the afterlife,

MR. ROBERTS: as he was the first to acknowledge in his very gracious remarks at the end. But I say to my friend from Stephenville, there was no mention made of him at all. And I realize that hurts him.

MR. STAGG: An oversight.

MR. ROBERTS: I would say to him, Sir, it was no oversight. It is impossible to overlook the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg); He is like a large pat, a cow pat, in the middle of the path; one overlooks it at one's peril. Now I have unlimited time, my voice is obviously in fine shape, and if the hon. gentleman from Stephenville wants to continue this game of wits, as best he can in his own humble way, I shall try to respond as best I can in my own humble way, but I am not so sure it is getting a great deal on with the Budget Speech. But I would say to him that we did not miss him on Friday night. It was entirely a pleasant evening. And there was no thought at all given to him. We did give some thought to the Minister of - what is he? Labour, is it?

MR. NEARY: Manpower.

MR. ROBERTS: Manpower, person power, that petulent pooh-pah the gentleman from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn), and he was not there.

AN HON MEMBER: Oh?

MR. ROBERTS: He was supposed to sit next to me and I was wondering whether perhaps I had offended him because he is a man who stands upon his dignity.

MR. HANCOCK: On a hunger strike.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not know why he was not there but I must say it got a great laugh from this great Tory crowd when I said that he was not there and I understood he was on a hunger strike. And that crowd of supporters of the Tory Party certainly agreed whole-heartedly with poking fun at the Minister of Manpower, but nobody paid any attention at all to the gentleman from Stephenville.

MR. NEARY: What were you doing at a Tory fund raising function?

MR. ROBERTS: I was there, I say to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to make it a success. And it was a success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: We had the former -

MR. NEARY: Was it \$150 a plate?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was not \$150 a plate, Sir. That is tomorrow night. But all the tickets for tomorrow night are sold. They are sold and most are even paid for.

MR. NEARY: Every aristocrat and every -

MR. ROBERTS: Every aristocrat will be there and some who want to be aristocrats, and some who have been aristocrats, citizens all anxious to hear what the Prime Minister of the country is going to say.

MR. STAGG: They are going to be there to be (inaudible) upon.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear. The gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) erupted again. What upon?

MR. STAGG: All the aristocrats are going to be (inaudible) upon.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Stephenville often mystifies me, but this time he has mystified everybody else in the House as well, a very mystifying gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where was I before this? I have been in the House two or three years, I should not allow myself to be led astray by the likes of the gentleman from Stephenville, should I?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: I should save my ammunition for worthier targets like the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Now there is somebody worthy of my metal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. ROBERTS: There is a man, Sir, that any half-wit would be proud to do battle and destroy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway, it is only my friend from Exploits, who has succeeded, my former - well still very much my friend, the former member for Twillingate, Mr. Gillett, who had a unique characteristic, my friend from LaPoile will remember the -

MR. NEARY: Mostly we used to wonder whose side he was on.

MR. ROBERTS: - the most unique characteristic. My friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), who is faithful in his attendance on the House, and even appears to be listening most of the time. I commend him and credit him.

Now, Sir, there are some good things in the budget. Let me get this out of the way very quickly. It will not take me long to say what they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Certain things.

MR. ROBERTS: They are all listed in the highlights. Some of the highlights are pretty dim. You know, if this was the best the government can do well that in itself tells a tale. But we certainly welcome the good things that are there. I think, for example, the new school for the deaf, something which is very much needed and we on this side are the very first to welcome the government's decision to go ahead with this long deferred project. It is too bad they could not also go ahead, say, with the residence over at the College of Trades and Technology that they promised seven or eight years ago. But that is another story, is it not?

I think it is a good thing that they are going to build another Confederation Building here in St. John's, and they put \$1 million aside. There is no doubt -

MR. CARTER: Your hero made a mess of it.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has given forth with an explanation. It did not make any sense. Maybe he could try again.

MR. CARTER:

The hon. gentleman's hero,  
the former, former Premier certainly made a mess of this.

MR. ROBERTS:

I have many, many heroes and I  
have a very great admiration for Mr. Smallwood. I certainly do  
not agree with everything he did. He does not agree with every-  
thing I do either. But a mess of this Confederation Building?  
Well, it is funny; if Mr. Smallwood made a mess of Confederation  
Building how come the Tories are emulating him some twenty-two  
or twenty-three years later? This building in fact is all but  
paid for now. It is now ours, free. All we have to do is heat  
it and light it and insure it. The twenty-five year leasebacks-  
are they called? -they are about over and done with now on this  
building. You would have to look at the foundation stone

MR. ROBERTS:                   laid, by that great  
Canadian, Mr. St. Laurent, down by the front entrance.  
I believe it was 1959, was it?

AN HON. MEMBER:               Somewhere around there.

MR. ROBERTS:               1959 - 1960. Well, you  
know, we only have two or three years left now and our mortgaged  
home, as Mr. James Greene used to call it, will be paid  
for. Knowing this government they will probably  
mortgage it again. But it is a good idea, I say to the  
Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), to try to cut out the  
rentals. The rentals are getting very expensive. There  
are a lot of buildings, a lot of space around St. John's  
that is being rented by the government. And assuming it  
makes sense economically to rent - I am sorry, to take  
the rents and to put them into the construction of a  
building and pay ourselves, pay rent to ourselves in  
effect, then I would be all for it.

I assume the minister has  
a study. I would be very interested to have it tabled  
in due course. I think that is something that the House  
should see, but that is a policy that we are quite  
prepared to endorse. After all, it is only a Liberal  
Government policy that has once again been endorsed by  
the Tory Party.

And some other good things  
too: The 10 per cent rise for the social assistance  
people is welcome; the foster homes rates being increased  
by 15 per cent is welcome. These are all commendable,  
Mr. Speaker, and we are not so small, nor are we so biased that  
we would not welcome these. They are not enough, but they  
are better than nothing. The people on social assistance  
will now only be one or two percentage points behind. They  
are falling behind. The least fortunate group in all  
society, the people who were forced to look to the government  
for their daily bread, are falling behind. And this

MR. ROBERTS: government have given then 10 per cent, the cost of living was 12 per cent or 12.5 per cent last year, these people are falling further and further behind and they have got little to give.

But, Mr. Speaker, for what it is worth, we welcome it. There is an old saying that half a loaf is better than none. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has now changed that to say a tenth of a loaf is better than none.

There is a great deal more that could be said about the highlights, but in deference to common decency I will not say it. Because, of course, I have picked on just about every beneficial and every useful thing that this government have announced in the budget. I do not think there ever has been one as barren. I do not ever think there has been one as bare. But my concern is not specifically with the document itself. A number of my colleagues are going to speak and they will help to take it to pieces. We will be moving a motion of non-confidence. I probably will not, it may be one of my colleagues who follows me. But there will be a motion of non-confidence. I believe we are allowed one amendment to it as well. I think we are allowed an amendment and a subamendment. So there will be a motion of non-confidence. And we will hear a great deal of talk about the budget document itself and what little it says about what is going on.

But I want to talk about a different aspect; I want to talk about the budget, by which I mean the speech, the thirty-one pages of painful prose that the Minister of Finance delivered himself of here in the House on whatever happy day it was the budget came down, two or three weeks ago.

I am concerned with the way in which this government are running this Province, or are attempting to run this Province.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, My friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says the government are. That is the correct use of the term, the government are.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The government are a plural group, they are a collective noun. When I talk of the government as being - how many of them are there, seventeen or eighteen men and two women? I do not know how many there are, however many there are. I am concerned about the way the government are running this Province, or attempting to run it. And the budget is a very key document when we come to look at the way in which this government are handling the affairs of the government of this Province and the people that that government serves.

The budget, much more so than the Throne Speech, which was a vacuous document to mark and surpass all vacuous documents, the budget and the supporting material and the contextual material

MR. E. ROBERTS: viewed in that context tell us a very great deal about the administration's thinking and about the strategy that they have adopted or fallen into—and I am not sure which; I am not sure they know what they are doing so maybe they have fallen into it. Whether they have fallen into it or not or whether they have come to it by design is really irrelevant. What concerns me is the state of affairs it is and what we can do about it.

In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the Budget Speech that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought in here is a sad document. And I can find more pejorative words. I know a fair number of them. I have used some and I have had some used on me over the years. But I turned it over, I was not South unlike many members on both sides, so I had a chance to sit here and enjoy the St. John's weather, lovely weather. Jim McGrath has been out praying for fog. You would think a fellow who is trying to serve the people of St. John's would try to do something good for us would you not? - instead of praying for fog, but then again there are those who say that some live in a fog.

But the word I would find to describe the minister's Budget is it is a sad document. It is the produce of a political mentality that is empty and sterile and it is capable only of confrontation and unreasoning and never ending stubbornness. It is not a document of a group of men and women who adhere to a policy, a planned policy or to a reasoned principle. It is the document, the thoughts, the considered thoughts of a group of men and women who really are at the end of their tether. They do not know how to handle the problems that are facing them. And so all they are doing now is

MR. E. ROBERTS: reiterating stubbornly, as would a little child, the very few half-baked thoughts that they call their strategy.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has been in office for two years. We are nearer to the next election than we are to the last. More than one half of this administration's term has gone. We are on the downhill slope, and a slippery slope it is. You know, I do not know when the next election is going to come; I doubt if anybody knows, including the Premier. The Premier may well have - first of all, of course, it is entirely within his prerogative to decide when the election is to come. He has that right under our constitution, an untrammelled, an unbridled right to decide when the next general election will come. It must come by June of 1984, the five year period set down in our House of Assembly Act. But subject to that the Premier can decide. I doubt if he has made any decision and, of course, knowing the Premier he is as unpredictable -

MR. G. WARREN: As the fog.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, no, Fog, I say to my friend for Torngat Mountains, is predictable. You can predict if the fog is not in, it is coming in. You cannot predict that with the Premier. I would not venture any predictions with the Premier. I think he is quite irrational at times, quite rash, quite capable of making decisions of moment without having thought them through. So I am not going to predict when he will call a general election. But it has be within the next two or three years and the odds are it will come within the next year and a half. So within a year and a half the people of this Province will have a chance to judge. That really is the only good news I can find in this government's performance over the last couple of years.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1233

DW - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS: They have been in office for two years now. It is time to take stock, to ask what they have accomplished and to ask where they are leading us. Their policy, the only policy of the Peckford administration, has been one of confrontation; constant, continuous, never-ending confrontation. They have never learned the value, never learned the supreme worth of those words that the prophet Isaiah used, 'Come, let us reason together'. If ever there was a group of men who knew not how to reason but knew only how to confront. Take for example this astonishing situation we have with these men and women who have been on strike at the College of Trades and at the WCB, the Worker's Compensation Board. They have been out now for seven months - is it? - at the Trades School and five at the -

MR. G. WARREN: Four.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Four, I thank my friend for Torn-gat Mountains (Mr. Warren), at the WCB. It has cost



MR. ROBERTS:

the government untold thousands of dollars to keep those institutions going. And we have not yet had that figure, but when it comes out what the government have paid for scab labour- and that is the only word to describe it. People have a lawful to cross picket lines but people who cross picket lines are scabs - and a government that says as this crowd do that they endorse the principles of collective bargaining and then encourages scab labour, and I hear pays them outrageous rates - I do not know what is being paid them because the government, the great, open Peckford administration have not told us. But we will find out. If the government do not tell us the Auditor General will or the Public Accounts Committee will or one of those mysterious brown envelopes will arrive with the administration in it. And of course the administration now have lost the confidence of their public servants so the results is it is as leaky as a sieve. How else do we find out things like who pays for certain trucking or does not pay? How else do we find out about the Agricultural Department cadmium? Obviously the brown envelopes. And in the age of the Xerox machine long may it last. And so, Mr. Speaker, we have got a government of confrontation and these workers go on strike. They are offered eight per cent. Now you can dress it up anyway you want, but a cow that has calves in a china shop still has calves and not soup plates, and eight per cent is still eight per cent no matter how often the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) or anybody else says differently. So these people are forced out on strike. They are out for seven or eight months through the teeth of the Winter and by God they stick to it. I do not always agree with everything that the labour movement does, and I do not always agree with what any individual union does, but you can only admire those men and those women,

MR. ROBERTS: They stuck to it, they stuck to the picket lines and I think I am fair in saying it was as peaceful a strike as we have ever seen in this Province. You have to admire them. They could not get their voice heard by the government, ministers refused to meet them, members refused to present petitions to the House but these men and women stuck to it. Finally they are driven to engage in a hunger strike. Now I do not have much sympathy for hunger strikes. The kind of tragedy we are seeing now in - what is the name of that prison? - the Maze in Northern Ireland near Belfast where that man Sands is starving himself to death, I do not see any justification for that whether he is right in his cause or wrong in his cause, you know, there can be no law of God or man that justifies that. But these people on the negotiating team here have a hunger strike and they sit in and I guess it is fair to call it a publicity stunt. The Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the petulent pooh-bah, as I called him, a man who is so conscious of his dignity that he does not do his job, calls it blackmail. That is his reaction. I think he also called it a Newfie joke. You know, that shows the compassion and the feeling and the concern. This is the man - bad enough if he was the negotiator to feel that, but even the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) did not get that bad, This is the man, the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), who is the conciliator, whose job it is by law, as he kept reminding us. Oh, and if ever there was a man, Sir, who stood on his prerogatives, stood on his privileges, it is the member from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). He is just about the most self-important man we have ever seen in this Province, just about the most self-important man we have ever seen. He is mightily impressed with the

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1234

AH-3

MR. ROBERTS:

minister. As was once said of a man who was a minister many years ago, "When he comes into the House all he needs is his false teeth being borne in front of him on a velvet pillow like some mid-African potentate." The petulent pooh-pah calls it blackmail. So these men and women, finally,

MR. ROBERTS:

after they had made their point in seven or eight days of subsisting on fruit juices and Coke and coffee, whatever it was they were taking, these people come back off their strike, negotiations come back, and I understand a settlement has been achieved. I do not know if the vote has been completed yet, I would not want to predict what will happen, I hope it will be ratified and I hope the strike will be settled.

I do not know - has it been announced what was in this package?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Have any of my colleagues heard whether it has been announced what was in the NAPE package? I mean, I know what is in it.

MR. STIRLING: It is not going to be announced.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not going to be announced. Well, it will become public in due course. And I will say without any hesitation that the NAPE people have got a better deal than they had before they were forced by this government into a seven month strike and before they were forced into this hunger strike business, before they were forced into the position where I am told on the national television the Minister of Manpower's (Mr. Dinn's) uncle saw fit to take an almighty swipe at the Tory Party and the Premier leading the Tory Government. And it just proves that the hon. member's uncle is a man of principle and commitment.

So that is typical, is it not?

A confrontation. We had a seven month strike that has cost the government thousands of dollars. Does the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) want to hazard a guess how much we have paid out in overtime and extra charges at either the Trades College or the W.C.B. owed? The W.C.B., they will say, 'It is not our money.' No, it comes out of the backs of the

MR. ROBERTS: employers of this Province,  
But it has to come out of somebody's pocket.

All of that, Sir, when all is  
said and done, when the truth comes out that these strikes  
which this government's stubbornness has forced us into,  
not only cost the human suffering and the hardship of seven  
months on a picket line -

MR. STAGG: Who gave them collective bargaining?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry? Who gave them collective  
bargaining? I know who gave them collective bargaining, this  
House did, But now all I want to know is who is going to  
bargain collectively? And I say to my friend from Stephenville  
(Mr. Stagg) this government does not. This government mouths  
platitudes but do not honour principles.

MR. HISCOCK: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Who was the government, I say to  
my friend from Stephenville, who forced men and women on a  
hunger strike? The Tories.

MR. FLIGHT: Because they refused to bargain.

MR. ROBERTS: Refused to bargain. They made an  
offer of 8 per cent at the start and they stood by that until  
finally, after a seven month strike, hundreds of hours of  
hardship on the picket lines and people doing without jobs,  
thousands upon thousands of dollars spent in overtime to  
scab labour -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) collective.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we gave  
collective bargaining to fishermen, the Liberals did, and  
not only that, they honoured it. But as for the Tories,  
just like the gentleman from Stephenville, they mouth platitudes  
but do not honour principles. And anybody who talks about  
collective bargaining and the Tory Party is going to have to  
try to square that with what this government have done.

MR. ROBERTS: The teachers are out saying they, the government, have bargained in bad faith, and so they have. NAPE were saying they are bargaining in bad faith, the nurses are saying they are bargaining in bad faith. You know, their troubles are far from over, I am afraid, on labour relations. But we are talking about a confrontation policy. We are talking about the results of it. And the labour strike, the strike by these men and women at the College and at the W.C.B. is a glaring and a graphic example of what is wrong with the Tories, what is wrong with their policy, what is wrong with the way they are trying to run this Province. They do not know how to govern, they do not know how to negotiate, they do not know how to conciliate, they do not know how to lead. All they know how to do is to confront - stubborn little children. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) epitomizes that and this budget epitomizes it in words just as the administration of which he is such a proud part epitomizes in actions, the administration which the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) supports so unblindly and so unthinkingly.

MR. STAGG: Blindly?

MR. ROBERTS: Blindly, I am sorry, and unthinkingly.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Where there is no vision the people perish, I say to my friend from Stephenville, and he should know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government will doubtless tell us they stand on principle. They fight for Newfoundland and Labrador. And I can hear it now. We will get a parade of them standing up trying to curry favour, trying to heave it out as best they can.

May 4, 1981

Tape 1235

EC - 4

MR. ROBERTS:

Let us look at the results of their fighting policy. They are fighting with the teachers, they are fighting with the public service, they are fighting with the nurses, they are fighting with the hospital workers, they are fighting with the fish companies, they are fighting with the Fishermen's Union, they are fighting with other provinces and, of course, they are fighting with Ottawa. Is there anybody in this Province, anybody in this country, that the Tory Government are not fighting with? Who have they conciliated? Who are they not fighting with? Who, anywhere in this country?

MR. WARREN: Premier Lougheed.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Lougheed, the Premier of Alberta, my friend from Torngat nominates Mr. Lougheed. Of course they are not fighting Mr. Lougheed, they are borrowing money from him and they are saying, 'Raise the price of oil to help Alberta,' Now, God bless Alberta. Boy, I would like to be the provincial treasurer in Alberta and so would the gentleman from St. John's South, the present Finance Minister (Dr. Collins). Let us see now, they have no sales tax in Alberta, we pay 11 per cent. They have no gasoline tax and we pay 22 per cent. That is what? - seven or eight cents a litre now, is it? Their provincial income tax is one half, it is twenty three as opposed to fifty-eight, less than a half of ours. Now there budget, they have a problem; they have no municipal debts. Before the election a year or so ago Mr. Lougheed gave out a couple of billion dollars that wiped out the municipal debts so their municipal taxes are low. And they do have a budgetary problem, they have this fund called the Heritage Fund, it has \$6 or \$7 billions in it, it is going up hundreds of millions a month and they do not know how to spend it. Now they lend us a little, and bless them. But what else has Alberta done? And this crowd across the House, Mr. Speaker, want to see - now I have nothing against Alberta, nothing against British Columbia, nothing against anywhere, but I would like to see a government here that is concerned with this Province.

MR. STAGG: You have friends in Alberta?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I have friends in Alberta, which is more than I could say for my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). And I have friends in British Columbia and Saskatchewan and Ontario and Manitoba and New Brunswick and Quebec and Nova Scotia and the two territories, which



MR. ROBERTS: is more than I can say for my friend from Stephenville. I even have friends in Stephenville, which is more than I can say for my friend from Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the government are fighting with everybody.

MR. HANCOCK: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) finally woke up. He will not go to a meeting with provincial ministers, he cannot handle them.

MR. ROBERTS: The confrontation policy, you know, we are rowing with everybody. We have had two years of the Peckford administration's leadership and what we have -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) and still be leader.

MR. ROBERTS: I would rather be where I am the way I got here than where the hon. gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is the way he got where he is, any-time. I would rather be where I am than where he is. On the other hand, he has got the advantage, he can get to look at me while in turn I have to look at him, so he is ahead on that score.

Let us look briefly at some of the results of this confrontation policy. Let us look first of all at the labour scene because that is, I am sure , causing the minister concern; it ought to. The teachers about to strike. We hope they will not, maybe they will not, but they are, I understand, conducting a strike vote this week.

MR. LUSH: Wednesday.

MR. ROBERTS: Wednesday. I understand their executive are recommending that they vote in favour of a strike and they have, the executive, I believe, or the President has said publicly that the government have been bargaining in bad faith. So much for the Tory commitment to collective bargaining. They mouth the principle, mouth it as a platitude, but do not honour it in reality. The government have offered them 9 per cent; now we all know

MR. ROBERTS: the government will offer more. The teachers in this Province, Mr. Speaker, when they settle their agreement-and they will settle it sooner or later - will get more than 9 per cent from this government. So why are we being forced, why are the people of this Province going to be forced to undergo even the threat of a strike? We may be forced to live through the reality of a strike, but this government's stubborn, unyielding, unthinking, unreasoning, arrogant, uncaring -

AN HON. MEMBER: Vicious.

MR. ROBERTS: - no they are not vicious; they do not have the guts to be vicious.

MR. STAGG: Fearless.

MR. ROBERTS: No, they are not fearless, they fear-some.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And most of us are fearful when we see what this government is doing but they are not fearless, no. They are not fearless, far from it. Reckless, feckless, but not fearless.

I do not pretend to know the merits of the teachers' negotiations, I do not pretend to know whether the teachers should get 9 per cent or 10 per cent or 11 per cent or 12 per cent or 15 per cent. I have not the least idea. I do know that the process by which the government have been negotiating is flawed. I do know that the teachers have said the government is acting in bad faith, I do know the Premier was afraid to face the teachers in Gander, afraid. Imagine a Premier as fearless as our Premier allegedly is, afraid to go to Gander to speak to a group of teachers at the NTA Convention.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Education went and bombed out.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) showed up and even the CBC said it was lukewarm applause.

AN HON. MEMBER: She will not even come back to the House.

MR. ROBERTS: She has not been back in the House since, one of my colleagues reminds me.

MR. STAGG: Neither has anyone else.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of us are here now. I think the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is here although there is some argument against that.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine! I do not see the minister. If the minister is in the Province and not in the House, then she is in breach of the rules of the House, is she not?

Now, let us talk -- that is about the teachers. You know, they will get more than 9 per cent. We all know that, just as we all knew the workers at the CTT and the WCB would get more than 9 per cent, and yet the government, led by the petulant pooh-bah from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) insisted upon making those men and women go through a seven month strike.

MR. STAGG: Unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not unparliamentary.

MR. STAGG: It is unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: What I am thinking is unparliamentary because I am thinking about the man from Stephenville. What I am saying is not, because I am talking about the gentleman from Pleasantville. And to call a man a petulant pooh-bah is not unparliamentary. It is unpleasant, but it is true and accurate. In his conduct of his office he has shown himself to be the petulant pooh-bah, a miniscule Mikado.

MR. ROBERTS: Now let us talk about the public service: The police force in St. John's - in turmoil. In turmoil! We have talked about the strikes. What about the rest of the people paid out of the public chest - the nurses, the hospital workers, the x-ray workers?

MR. HANCOCK: It is going to be a lot more serious, I will tell you, than it is right now.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. I say to my friend from St. Mary's - the Capes (Mr. Hancock), that he is right on. The real labour negotiations are ahead of this government yet.

MR. HANCOCK: A lot more serious than the teachers.

MR. ROBERTS: The hospital workers, the CUPE and NAPE locals in the hospitals, the nurses, the x-ray and laboratory technologists, they are all looking for considerably more than the government is prepared to offer and the government will not even talk to them.

MR. HANCOCK: They sent St. Clare's a letter this week saying that their budget is cut by 40 per cent. I have not seen it, but I have been told about it.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from St. Mary's - The Capes says that St. Clare's has been told their budget has been cut 40 per cent.

MR. HANCOCK: Not 10 per cent, 40 per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not know it was that deep but I knew that every hospital in the Province was going to have to cut back services, and the government have not the courage to admit it.

MR. HANCOCK: 40 per cent (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: It is going to mean staff layoffs, closures of beds. The hospitals - I do not know, but I would like to see the letter to St. Clare's - are being told to cut back.

MR. HANCOCK: 40 per cent (inaudible)

I was told by a nurse who saw the letter.

MR. ROBERTS: The university has been told to cut back, the President has spoken out.

MR. HANCOCK: You cannot cut back on health services, no forty per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot cut back on health services, you are right, but this government are going to. But the government have seen nothing yet. We are in for a long, hot Summer, when we come to talk about labour negotiations. And what affects me particularly, is that the government are poisoning the well before they even go to it. We are heading into these negotiations with the labour movement poisoned against this government, poisoned because of this government's actions, poisoned because of the minister's refusal to bargain responsibly and responsively. You know, you do not have to be a specialist in labour relations matters. I, for one, am not. But you do not have to be a specialist to know that this government does not bargain in good faith. They make their opening offer and that is it; intransigent, stubborn. And we saw seven months of a strike. And they got the - I do not know what the NAPE workers will get, but I will say they have got more now than before they went on strike, and I will say they got it because they went on a hunger strike, and I will say they got it because they stood on those picket lines for seven months and because the people of this Province stood by them. I had people in my district who are living on social services - social whatever it is called, the pensions from - the old welfare money - say to me that they can give us 10 per cent, how come they can only give those strikers 8 per cent? Because the strikers, many of them, are earning less than people are getting on welfare. You cannot argue with that, you cannot counter that, because that is true. And this is the atmosphere that our

MR. ROBERTS: our administration's confrontation process has brought us to. They do not know how to run the country.

MR. HANCOCK: The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) says other groups have accepted 8 per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. HANCOCK: What was their wage scale?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Minister of Finance is a man who says many things, and he says what he believes. If only he understood what he said we would all be further ahead.

Now, the government say they have no money. That is the reason they put forward,

MR. ROBERTS: but, you know, they have not convinced a soul of that. This government have made no effort to show the people of this Province that they are trimming the garment. We still see the growth in the Public Service. We still see new jobs being created. We still see the bloated bureaucracy. We still see ministers - you know something as small, as significant, as symbolic as ministers travelling first class. You know, we still see that. We still see the Premier -

MR. MORGAN: - travelling first class.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. Minister of Fisheries -

MR. NEARY: There is nobody over there -

MR. ROBERTS: - the hon. Minister of Fisheries is not first class, I agree with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But there are ministers who travel first class.

MR. TULK: What about Toronto and Ottawa?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, we also have something again as small but as symbolic as the only Province in Canada that provides the Premier with an official residence at our cost.

MR. FLIGHT: A security guard.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not very expensive. It is only a couple of a hundred thousand dollars a year maybe, when you add in the maids, the security guards, the heat, the light -

MR. HANCOCK: When you take in the renovations I am sure it comes to a lot -

MR. ROBERTS: - and all that, and I do not begrudge the Premier a place to live.

MR. TULK: Spent 120 grand on it last year.

MR. ROBERTS: But I will say no other Province in Canada, no other Province in Canada - I am sorry -

MR. MORGAN: It might be the hon. gentleman's home one day, who knows?

MR. ROBERTS: It might be my home, but I will tell you this, it will never be paid for by the Province if it is my home. And I would hope that any Liberal Premier and the next Liberal Premier and all who will follow after him will turn that place into anything except a home for the Premier. Make it a home for homeless girls, make it a residence or a group home for children, make it a tourist home. I do not care what you do with it.

MR. HANCOCK: You would not get (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: But there is no other Premier in Canada, you know, no other Premier in Canada for whom -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - his province provides accommodation.

MR. NEARY: It goes with his ego.

MR. TULK: Emperor.

MR. ROBERTS: Pay expenses when a man travels, of course, pay entertainment of course. I mean that is all-

MR. TULK: Empire Brian.

MR. ROBERTS: -legitimate. The Prime Minister of Canada is provided with a residence, the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa is provided with a residence, but there is no other politician in Canada at any level provided with a residence out of public funds.

AN HON. MEMBER: It goes with his ego.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, I know it is not very much money. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, what does it cost a year, a couple of hundred thousand to run Mount Scio house? That is the most. I mean there are five security guards, a maid, a housekeeper, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did he answer you?

MR. ROBERTS: No he does not answer, he is not allowed to.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not allowed to.



MR. ROBERTS: - a maid, a housekeeper, a couple of gardeners, the like, it might be a couple of hundred thousand a year, I do not know. It is not in itself going to solve the financial problems of this Province, but I do say to the minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) years.

MR. ROBERTS: - that it is awfully hard to try to make men and women who get take home pay of \$145 and \$150 a week believe that they are being treated justly in that kind of atmosphere.

MR. HANCOCK: Fill up some of the potholes.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, we are heading into these labour negotiations now with a poisoned atmosphere, and the minister and his colleague have done it. I do not think they know what they are doing, but I am afraid we are all going to have to pay the price.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: You know we are going to get - the teachers are going to get more than 9 per cent. There is no question about that. There is no question at all they will get more than that. The nurses -

AN HON. MEMBER: How long (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and what turmoil and what price do we all pay? I marked down some words to describe the government, you know, inflexible, arrogant, uncaring, unreasonable, and those are polite words. The budget, you know, reflects that, the budget reflects that all the way through. It offers us no leadership.

AN HON. MEMBER: Callous.

MR. ROBERTS: It has got no strategy, no way out.

All it does is the same old pie in the sky we have been hearing

MR. ROBERTS: now for years. What is that old hymn, There Will Be Pie In The Sky By And By? It was an IWW hymn, remember? IWW song, There Will Be Pie In The Sky By And By.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the church (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: And that is the Tory slogan.

No present reality, just down the road. We have been hearing that now for years. We heard that ten years ago did we not, in that infamous March 1 Throne Speech? And they have one other answer, Mr. Speaker, they blame it all on Ottawa, fed bashing. That is the two points of the Tory strategy, pie in the sky and fed bashing. And the budget, the speech of the Finance Minister epitomizes it, summarizes it and exposes it.

MR. TULK: Brian's Fancy.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, fed bashing is an old and an honoured sport in Canada. All sorts of politicians have bashed the feds over the years, sometimes it works and sometimes it does not. Maybe you can even win an election on it once in a while. I do not know. But I say to this government that their policy of bashing the feds, and after all that is their policy-

MR. E. ROBERTS: when you strip away the words and the rhetoric and you look at the flesh and the bones, that is the policy, bash the feds! I could find a dozen references in the minister's speech, I could find a dozen more in the Throne Speech. it is all Ottawa's fault. There is fog, the weather is federal! It is bad enough 'McGrath' prays for fog, may he be forgiven, the Prime Minister will get here anyway. But if there is fog it is the Prime Minister's fault, if there is not enough fish it is Ottawa's fault, if there is too much fish that is Ottawa's fault too. If we have the budworm that is Ottawa's fault, if we do not have the budworm well, Ottawa is keeping it away from us. Everything is Ottawa's fault! No roads because it is Ottawa's fault, too many roads in some areas, that is Ottawa's fault too.

It is a feeble excuse for a policy, a refuge for men and women who cannot cope. They are not able to think through the policy, they are not able to think through their problems, they are not able to find rational and coherent and effective answers.

MR. F. STAGG: Devastating.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, it is devastating. The truth shall make ye free the Bible says. And even my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will be made free with the truth. My friend for Stephenville, Sir, ought to remember the advice I was once given by an old gentleman, since gone to his reward and since he was a Liberal he has gone up to his reward, a gentleman then living in Northeast Crouse, a fisherman, and he once said to me, you know, he said, 'You politicians' - and I give this as good counsel to my friend for Stephenville - he said, 'You politicians are like fish'. and I said, 'I do not understand you, Sir'. 'Well', he said, 'you only get in trouble when your mouths are open'. And

MR. E. ROBERTS: I say that to my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) because he epitomizes it.

You know the policy of bashing the feds is really just a refuge for men and women who cannot cope and they cannot cope. It is an attempt to evade responsibility. It is the oldest game in the book. If you cannot handle what you have at home you blame the guy outside.

MR. F. STAGG: Why are the feds bashing us?

MR. E. ROBERTS: Feds bashing us? The feds, I say to my friend for Stephenville, are not bashing us. It is only his paranoia and the Premier's paranoia, petulant as it is, that leads anybody to believe we are being bashed. We are not getting everything we want nor does any child. The member has a number of children and I am sure he is a good father to them and I am sure he does not give them everything they want and I am sure when he does do that they stamp their feet and that sounds exactly like the Premier. You could not have a better description of our Premier. In fact, you could not have a better description of the hon. gentleman for Stephenville.

They have no solutions to our troubles. The Budget is an admission, it is a sad, dispiriting document.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, I am not speaking of a speech made by my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). No, I am not, I am speaking of the Budget. And I would say to my friend for St. John's North, now that he has again honoured us with his presence, ineffable, inimitable his presence, I would say, Sir, that the Budget is a sad and dispiriting document.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, then, the hon. gentleman, Sir, heard better than he has often said. You know, there is a very old adage said by that very wise English person - we must be liberated - Dr. Johnson, Dr. Samuel Johnson who once said, among other things, that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. And if I was writing an epitaph for this government -

MR. B. TULK: Which you will.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I will have a hand in it, I say to my friend for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), so will he and so will hundreds of thousands of Newfoundlanders. If I were writing an epitaph that is one that I would engrave upon their political tombstones, 'Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel'. Because their whole philosophy, Sir, is to attack - not to analyze - but to attack. Do not reason! They rant and rave instead of reason. Above all they do not negotiate.

MR. J. CARTER: Who is ranting now?

MR. E. ROBERTS: Who is ranting? I am not ranting. If my friend would keep quiet I could speak in an even quieter voice. I would say to my friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that he has been a Tory for so long he does not know ranting when he sees it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the whole philosophical bent of this administration as revealed in this Budget can be summed up in Dr. Johnson's phrase, 'Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel'. Politically, Sir, the gentlemen opposite are the scoundrels - the ladies and gentlemen opposite are scoundrels

MR. POWER: (Inaudible) are scoundrels.

MR. ROBERTS: - are scoundrels, politically

they are scoundrels.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Ferryland (Mr. Power) may not think he is a political scoundrel. I would say to him, Sir, that he is a political scoundrel.

MR. NEARY: A pray-man and a rogue.

MR. ROBERTS: People, Sir, are circling upwind of the hon. the gentleman from Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: And he may think it is so they can look at his best profile from the rear, but it is not, Sir, it is that politically he is a scoundrel, that the aroma of political scoundrelism emanates from him, wafts forth.

MR. WOODROW: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Can one picture the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) wafting forth?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: I can. I have no trouble in seeing my friend from Bay of Islands wafting forth, wafting forth in a politically scoundrelly fashion.

MR. STAGG: Scurrilous personal attacks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not scurrilous, it is not personal, but it is an attack. And my defence, Mr. Speaker, is truth, because what I say is true, that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel and that this administration has no answer for the troubles and problems and the opportunities in this Province except to bash the feds, blame it all on Ottawa. No matter what our troubles, blame it on Ottawa, no matter what it is, something as entirely provincial in the Constitution as the provision of

MR. ROBERTS: a penitentiary; one of the items that the Fathers of Confederation in their wisdom decided was the responsibility of the provincial governments was the provision of penitentiaries, and when somebody gets after the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) he obfuscates and the point of his obfuscation is it is all the fault of Ottawa. And I could go on.

Any questioning, any debate, any response - and I say this to my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) because he again, lives by this creed, produces simply an ad hominem attack, a personal attack, a questioning of one's integrity, a questioning of one's motives, a questioning of one's Newfoundland and Labrador patriotism. Where does it get us? Well, it gets us in an endless series of rows with the Government of Canada - other than the gentleman from Ferryland (Mr. Power) who has learned the merits of a conciliatory approach, and as a result, he stood by his principles. The member for Ferryland realizes, as do those of us on this side, you do not have to sell your principles to negotiate a deal. True! Now, if only he could extract that serum and inoculate all of his colleagues with it, we might get somewhere. You know, it is possible to negotiate without giving up one's position. The Minister of - what is it called these days?

AN HON. MEMBER: Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. ROBERTS: Forest Resources and something else - Forest Resources. Now, that was last week. What is it this week?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: The Premier has not told him yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Has not changed? Okay. But the hon. gentlemen's titles are a little like a certificate of virginity in courts, of no value if it is dated yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: But the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, (Mr. Power) to give him his full and correct title -

AN HON. MEMBER: And Lands.

MR. ROBERTS: No, not Lands - is it?

MR. MARSHALL: Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. ROBERTS: Forest Resources and Lands.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. NEARY: This Land is our Land.

MR. ROBERTS: Forest Resources and Lands. That has a nice ring to it, a nice ring to it. You can really click your heels to that, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. How about lands and forest resources? Or how about land resources and forests? Yes, it really is the Department of Forestry, is it not? Yes. But, I mean, you see, the hon. gentleman may get to be Premier some day, stranger things have happened to him and others, and he will learn from his two predecessors, the present Premier and the former Premier, Mr. Moores, that if you do not have any solution to any of the problems, you reorganize the government and you shuffle the departments around. You do not reduce the number of ministers, you increase them usually, and you put new titles on the departments and that passes for action.

You know, we went through it with Mr. Moores. We spent - what did we spend, twenty minutes one day re-organizing nine departments in the House.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: And it took the Premier six months to - restructuring, it was called. And, you know, the Premier and a bottle of whiskey could have done a better job than was done. Anyway, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, if I - have I now got it correct? -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank him. I want to pay due honour to him - has succeeded in negotiating a deal with the



May 4, 1981, Tape 1240, Page 4 -- apb

MR. ROBERTS: feds and, I suggest, and he will concur that he has done it without selling his principles or those of his colleagues, he has done it without any offence to the policies which he endorses and which he tries to enforce. Now, if only his other colleagues

MR. ROBERTS:

would realize that, we would not be in a situation where we have no DREE agreements on roads, none, not one, not any.

MR. FLIGHT: And no Trans-Canada agreement.

MR. ROBERTS: No Trans-Canada highway agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: You would wonder why we have no money.

MR. ROBERTS: No Trans-Canada highway agreement.

MR. NEARY: It is shocking. It is shocking, shocking.

MR. POWER: In reality DREE agreements are negotiated by (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. POWER: In reality DREE agreements are negotiated by (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: In reality DREE agreements are negotiated by officials as the minister would agree. But the minister has got to learn that officials - the minister stands in relation to officials as oats do to the horse. It is the oats that make the horse go and it is the minister that makes the officials go. If he has not learned that then he ought not to be a minister.

MR. CARTER: What about the snake, 'Trudeau'?

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

MR. CARTER: What about the snake 'Trudeau'?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, there is a statesmanlike utterance, "What about the snake 'Trudeau'?" That is a really statesmanlike utterance from the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), the man who does not believe in personal attacks. You know, 'the snake Trudeau', a man who has been elected Prime Minister of this country four times - is it? - or five, a man who has served in Parliament for fifteen years. You know, that stands, of course, for - typical, is it not, 'the snake Trudeau'? I mean, it is not even worthy of an answer because to answer that you would have to

MR. ROBERTS: stoop as low as the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has stooped. I am not capable of going that low and I am certainly not prepared to.

Now, we have no Trans-Canada highway agreement, do we? You know fed bashing, a great sport. We have no agreement because, why? Because the feds have told us to indicate our priorities and we are refusing to do it. I have a cutting here that says, "The Federal Minister of Transport wants the Province to indicate to him their priorities for development, a request which the provincial Transportation Minister - at that stage it was the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) - says it has put the department in something of a bind. 'They want to know where we want the thrust, the minister said. But he pointed out - and he has refused to negotiate priorities'."

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Talk to (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Talk to whom?

AN HON. MEMBER: The feds.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the government have refused to negotiate a Trans-Canada highway agreement. They have refused to negotiate a DREE agreement. Offshore, again they have refused to negotiate an agreement.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right, they have. And I will deal with that a little later and I hope my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who is an able counsel, an able practitioner at the bar of this Province, if only he would resolve the Barry issue - and that is not a pun.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rejected.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, lots of people rejected the hon. gentleman for Stephenville and there will be more to come.

MR. ROBERTS: On the constitution, again our administration here has distinguished themselves. I will talk some more about that because I feel very strongly. But you wonder whether there is not a better way to do things or are we doomed to fight and fight and fight?

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) and give him time (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is by far the funniest thing the gentleman for St. John's North has said in the long time. I wonder who wrote it for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: If so he should get a new speech writer.

MR. STAGG: I would like to hear the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). He and I together make (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I agree and I say to my friend from Stephenville that he will hear the member for LaPoile again and again and again and again and it will do him good to hear the member for LaPoile.

Now, what I was saying: I want to know from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) whether he can find a better way than the way he has outlined in his budget this policy of confrontation, this policy that is no policy. You know there is a very easy answer, there is a cheap, shoddy answer. We will have it shortly from the gentleman for St. John's North. He will pretend that Newfoundlanders are not Canadians, that somehow our interests in this Province are different from those of the country of which we are a part. And he will accuse us of capitulating, those of us on this side who say that negotiation is a preferable policy to confrontation. All that shows is the poverty of the principles and the paucity of the policy of

MR. ROBERTS: those who put forth such claptrap. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are Canadians. The gentlemen opposite may not realize that. It does not conflict with our being Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, but it certainly ought to be a policy guiding any legislature in this country, any legislature that represents the people of this country, any government that tries to serve the people of this country. We have legitimate quarrels with Ottawa. We should stand up for Newfoundland but we should never forget. I say to the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins), never forget that our goal in this county has got to be a strong Newfoundland and Labrador within a strong Canada. And it is in the interest of all of us in this Province to have a strong federal government.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: It is in the interest of us all. And if the policy of this administration is designed to try to weaken the government, to weaken the ability of the Government of Canada to serve all Canada including us, it

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1242

IH - 1

MR. ROBERTS: is not in the best interests of this province.

MR. HANCOCK: Too many anti-confederates over there.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the government, whose Premier is an articulate and a thoughtful spokesman. Nobody ever accused the Premier of being in articulate, incoherent sometimes, yes, but not in articulate. Nobody ever accused him of not being thoughtful. The product of his thought is often confused but he is a thoughtful gentleman, and an articulate one. He believes that Ottawa is an agency of the Provinces. He genuinely believes that and I think the Minister of Finance shares that. They genuinely view Canada as being a country made up of ten separate provinces that have, for certain very limited purposes, got a sort of common embassy up in Ottawa. I view Canada, as I say to my friend from St. John's North (J. Carter), as being one country in which the French and the English both have a place and in which we as Newfoundlanders take our place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: That is why-that is how I view Canada, with one government and ten provinces and each of them within its own sphere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But I say to my friend from St. John's North -

MR. HANCOCK: Is he saying he is not for Canada?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, he is not for Canada, of course he is saying that.

MR. R. MOORES: He never was.

MR. ROBERTS: I say to my friend from St. John's North that Newfoundland and Labrador is far better off because we are part of Canada than if he had his way, far better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And I say we will be far better off when we have a strong federal government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: -than we will from having the kind of federal government that the Tory Party in this Province want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: No question, no question at all.

MR. F. ROWE: How would he feel about the provincial government, municipalities?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is a very good thought, I say to my friend from Trinity Bay de Verde. You know, we see this approach of the provinces, the agency of the provinces really very clearly on the constitution. I am unable to grasp how this government can espouse a policy which will see a checkerboard across Canada. Now, they are not going to get away with it. I do not know what the Supreme Court in Ottawa is going to rule, I believe, it will rule in favour of the federal side but I like anybody else will await the decision. But our Premier, our Premier, and this Minister of Finance, - and the budget reflects every word of it, the budget reflects this as its very pith and essence - want to see a Canada that is a checkerboard in which your rights depend on where you live. And I cannot think of anything, Mr. Speaker, more destructive not just to this Country - but if they want to be so xenophobic, so chauvinistic as to think only of this Province, I cannot think of anything more destructive to this Province than that philosophy that the Tory's espouse. And if I was not against this budget for any other reason, I would be against it for that reason. This government's policy is folly, is sheer folly. They pretend the provinces are equal, provinces are not equal, people are! That is what this country is about

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we cannot give away what we do not own. Only the Tory Government can do that. They take what they do not own, they can give it away to.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: You know, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of this government, the fed bashing, the whole confrontation policy -

MR. E. ROBERTS:

that is what the budget is all about, that is what the first three or four pages talk about, that is what the theme of it is -fed bashing, blame it on Ottawa. We cannot cope with it, it is not our fault, it is not our fault, it is the fault of the dirty feds! That is all that the Minister of Finance says in his budget. That, Sir, is just a cloak for those who would dismember Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: You know, it was our Premier who said on national television that, 'Prime Minister, I have heard your version of Canada and I have heard the version of Monsieur Levesque and of the two, I prefer his.'

MR. WHITE: And Jean Cretien almost threw up.

MR. HODDER: And he was trying to separate.

MR. ROBERTS: And René Levesque an avowed committed separatist. At least René Levesque has got the intellectual fibre, the intellectual integrity to admit he is a separatist.

MR. R. MOORES: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: -unlike the weasel words which emanated from our Premier afterwards. Ottawa is an agency of the Provinces. I prefer Levesque's vision of Canada to Trudeaus. That is the philosophy of this government and it shows in its budget and this honourable crowd of men and women, Sir, would rather have a feeble, emasculated federal government not realizing what that does to Newfoundland and Labrador, not realizing that whatever hope we have in this Province of getting what is ours, of getting the standard of living which is ours by right as Canadians, that the only hope we have comes



MR. ROBERTS: from being a part of a strong  
Canada -

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: - and the budget reveals the  
government's policy fully. They are leading us to  
disaster. The minister does not think so and I do not  
expect him to think so, but they are leading themselves,  
us to disaster. They are clothing themselves in this  
nationalistic vestment. I am a Newfoundlander and as  
proud of it as any man or woman in this Province, but  
am also a Canadian and proud to be that too. This xenophobic  
inward-looking, chauvinistic, feeble-minded policy  
shows up in the offshore preference, it shows up in the  
whole budget speech. In the budget now we are seeing the  
results. If the Minister of Finance had one message for  
the people of this Province in his budget it was 'boys  
and girls there is no money'. And there is not going to  
be any. We are borrowing too much and we are not borrow-  
ing enough to meet our needs. We are borrowing more than  
we can afford, but we are certainly not borrowing enough  
to build the roads and the schools and the hospitals and  
the services that our people expect, that our people deserve, and  
that our people demand. And that is why I say Sir, the  
budget is a sad, dispirited, spineless document.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your proposal?

MR. ROBERTS: Is there another way? Is there  
another way? Yes, there is. I have given up on the  
Minister of Finance, given up on him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Breathless.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he may be breathless. He is  
certainly breathtaking. But I would say, I would say  
Mr. Speaker, there is another way.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) came prepared before.

MR. ROBERTS: The Lower Churchill: Just look at that

MR. ROBERTS: no question , no question of our constitutional rights.

MR. H. BARRETT: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, my friend from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) has made one of his rare but welcome appearances in the debate and he has shown us why his appearances are so rare and so welcome because he speaks sense unlike most of his colleagues. Where is the revenue coming from? The revenue could only come from one source, from an expanded economy in Canada and an expanded economy within this Province. And if he will stick around a bit he will find out some cogent thoughts as to how that may be achieved which is more than the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has offered us because he has not got anything in this budget as my friend from St. John's West will admit. There is nothing in this budget to help the business community. Where are we going to get the revenue if the business community does not provide it? That is - St. Mary's-The Capes that pays for all. We live in a free enterprise society, the government has a half interest in every business in Newfoundland or 51 or 52 per cent-is it?- whatever the corporate tax rate is. That is where the money is going to come from. That is where it is going to come from.

MR. ROBERTS: What I suggest is a government that cares and a government that has some courage not a government that rants xenophobia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), if he will but possess his soul and patience, he will be shown vistas as yet untrammelled, and he will be shown things that even he will fall upon his knees in wonder just as

MR. ROBERTS: he wondereth at the Premier. He wonders at the ground the Premier trods upon, seeks but to touch the hem of the Premier's garment and once again he may be translated into the seats of power from which he was so rudely and cruelly ousted, lo those many years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, enough of my poetic eloquence.

MR. HANCOCK: If that is not enough to shut him up then (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: But really the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) makes one rise to poetic eloquence. He makes other things rise too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: He really reminds me of nothing more than a good burp, Sir, you feel awfully good after you get it out. Now, Sir, I want to say a few words about the Lower Churchill. No question of our constitutional rights to move the energy, there is no legitimate reason

MR. ROBERTS: that energy in electrical form ought to be regarded any differently than energy in the form of oil or the energy in the form of natural gas. You know, energy is energy. And the federal government - the Minister of Justice said it again here in St. John's last week - Have said that they will enforce that right. But where does that get us? Where does that get us? We need federal money to develop the Lower Churchill. It cannot be done by our own resources, can it?

MR. BARRETT: They are (inaudible) partner.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. BARRETT: They are a 50 per cent partner.

MR. ROBERTS: No, they are 49 per cent partner, but they are going to put up, my friend from St. John's North will recall, a great deal more than 50 per cent of the money. In fact, they are going to put it all up because it is on their guarantee that the money will be borrowed if there is no federal guarantee, there will be no financing, correct? That is correct, of course it is correct.

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) customers.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, the customers - we do not have any customers, yet. We have some guys who say they want to buy, we do not have any customers. But we are going to need federal money, federal credit, to develop the Lower Churchill. We are going to need hundreds of millions of dollars in cash and in credit. The power must move through the Province of Quebec, unless we can move it on the Anglo-Saxon route. And we all talk about the Anglo-Saxon Route and one keeps hearing about it, but there seems to be a curious reluctance on the part of those in the seats of the mighty to say that the Anglo-Saxon route is economically feasible. No doubt it is technically feasible, but I do not know whether the power loss is moving that block of power that distance - it is four or five hundred miles longer, as I understand it, than it is through Quebec.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, I say to my friend from Buchans that I am told it is technically possible. It is certainly not technically desirable, but I think it is technically possible to move high voltage DC power those distances. The Soviets have been doing it for twenty years. But you do pay a heavy price, I am told, in line losses, a very heavy price. And I think that affects the economy very directly, given that the price at the other end is fixed by what the New England market and New York will pay, if you are going to talk of sending it there. So the only answer on the Lower Churchill, the only answer is surely, negotiation. With whom - Quebec? They refuse to talk. And I cannot fault the government on that, they have consistently and constantly refused to talk. So we are left with the federal government, are we not? And the federal government's power, constitutional power to move electricity. We are also left with a practical problem, how do you move electricity? Do we have to go in and build a power line? How do we move it without access to the power transmission system that Hydro Quebec have put in to a point A which we know is just on our side of the border? Do we have to duplicate that? A pipeline one could understand because a pipeline is independent, you can dig up the ground, dig your trench, put the pipeline in it, run the pipeline, bury it back, put your oil and move your gas through the pipeline, long distances. It is going to come to you from Alaska, right down to Chicago. You can move fluids thousands of miles by pipeline. But how do you move electricity without access to the Quebec grid? I do not know the answer to that, and I will venture that nobody on the other side has given us the answer. They may or may not know it. So, what is the point of going after Ottawa on the constitutional issue on energy if we cannot have access to the Quebec Grid? Or can Ottawa force Hydro Quebec to take electricity? I do not know that, I do not think they can.

MR. GOUDIE:

(Inaudible) Mr. Chretien.

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry, I say to my -

MR. GOUDIE:

According to Mr. Chretien -

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, my friend from Naskaupi, (Mr. Goudie) says according to Mr. Chretien. No, I think legally, you know, energy, and they might have to change the NEB Act, but that is really irrelevant, that could be done fairly straightforwardly.

You know, in concept, it really is no different than oil, or gas. But I am worried about the practicality of it, the practicality of moving energy. And I say to my friend from Naskaupi district, that as I understand it, you have got to have access to the Quebec Grid, or you duplicate the Quebec Grid. And I do not just mean the conductors, not just the wires and the poles -

MR. R. MOORES:

That is right.

MR. ROBERTS:

- you have got to have access to all of the surface facilities, all the backup facilities because the electricity is not like oil. Electricity

MR. ROBERTS: cannot be stored oil can be. Electricity cannot be stored. It is used the instant it is there, and if it is not used the instant it is there then it is gone. Now, I suppose it is still in the universe somewhere, I mean Einstein established that  $E$  equals  $MC^2$  so it is around there somewhere, it is not lost to the cosmos, but it is lost to human kind.

MR. MOORES: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: So on the Lower Churchill the government have really got no alternative except to negotiate. They have to negotiate with Quebec and they have to negotiate with the feds, and their policy of fed bashing is going to get us into grief. In fact it is getting us into grief.

You know what I said is not new, we have been saying that on this side for ten years.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: We said it when the government bought the Upper Churchill, Mr. Moores and his colleagues bought the Upper Churchill. They paid \$160 million for it. We have lost money consistently. The dividends which we get from our shares do not pay the cost of our shares, the cost of the loan. All we are told is we will get it back and we will control power in Labrador. But where does that get us? We got it back now, we have had it for seven or eight or nine years. Eight years, nine years we have owned the Upper Churchill, CFLCo shares?

MR. MOORES: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: We had nine points, we bought fifty-seven. In other words, we now have sixty-six points. Where did it get us? You know, -

MR. MOORES: Crosbie sold her out.

MR. ROBERTS: - we went through the Lower Churchill debauch, and that was not Mr. Moores, that was the present Premier and the present Minister of Mines and Energy

MR. MOORES:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

-(Mr. Barry) who were lock stock and sinker up to their ears in the complete waste of \$110 million, \$110 millions just gone. They did not even win the seat, they did not even win the constituencies, \$110 million dribbled away, gone! And the present Minister of Mines and Energy and the present Premier were the men responsible. Now, I know the present Premier likes to pretend that everything that happened before he changed Saul into Paul on St. Patrick's Day 1979, likes to pretend all that does not exist.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Dead rock.

MR. ROBERTS:

You know, the Public Accounts Committee doubtless has in it - I have not seen it, I do not know what is in it, but I will say to my friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) it has a finding in it about that contract for the public opinion poll. It was approved by the Cabinet, was it not?

MR. HISCOCK:

Designed.

MR. ROBERTS:

It was approved by the Cabinet, the present Premier was a part of it.

MR. HISCOCK:

All of them.

MR. WHITE:

(Inaudible) is Cabinet responsibility.

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, Cabinet responsibility. The present Premier does not know what it is. When he discovers what it is - it is just not the poll, that is bad enough, but that is a peccadillo compared to the Lower Churchill, \$110 million and naught to show for it, naught to show for it. And that is the energy policy of this administration. The hon. the Premier and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy were part and parcel of it and they still have not realized their folly. They still have not realized that we need



MR. ROBERTS: Ottawa's help.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: They still have not realized we are not going to get it, the way they are going at it. To blame Ottawa for everything is not leadership. To blame Ottawa for everything and to try, and to emasculate it is not leadership, it is folly, it is disaster.

Transportation, touched on. No agreement with Ottawa. What are we going to do with the Trans-Canada this Summer? The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawè) inherits a mare's nest, a good fellow.

MR. HISCOCK: A coastal Labrador road.

MR. ROBERTS: It may or may not be beyond his capabilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: He should be in recreation, he is cut out for it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, where are we? Here we are now the 5th. day of May, no highways agreement for DREE.

This government was told a year ago, no nine months ago that there would be none. Nothing on the Trans-Canada, and we are still saying we are not going to decide our priorities. Ottawa has told us publicly time and time again that there is a limit on the money they have just as there is a limit on the money this government has, and our minister and our ministry are refusing to indicate their priorities.

Aha, dastardly Liberal plot, except Mr. Mazankowski as the Tory Minister of Transportation was the one who first established that policy. Mr. Crosbie as the Minister of Finance

MR. E. ROBERTS:

in that gloriously short-lived Tory administration established the envelope policy. That is what it is all about and this government putting their heads in the sand. And when you put your head in the sand your rear end sticks up and the inevitable happens. The only problem is it is the people of the Province who are going to get the boot, get the duff as opposed to the government.

Where are we on the transportation? We are in for a year of next to no highways work. We are told by the spokesman for the highway industry that company after company is going to go to the wall. That is the Budget of which this minister is so proud, that is the Budget of which he is allegedly the author. Fishery; One of the few bright spots in our whole economy, the fishery. Now, would somebody tell me what this government has done to make it so. Is there anything at all they have done that has helped to make the fishery more prosperous? What have they done for all the noise? The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) whose mouth is constantly going, constantly, never-ceasingly going, it is a marvel, I do not know how he manages to get himself fed and nourished. He must take it intravenously.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has this government done for the fisheries? Fight Ottawa, sure; Fed bashing, confrontation! But what have they done? Over-built fishing boats. They have caused the depression in the boat building industry. That is clearly set forth in the document the minister tabled called, 'The Economy, 1981'. And there is a sector in there on the fishery, a sector on the ship-building industry' - it is found on page forty-eight, we see by the handy dandy index - that it is made quite clear there on page 49 that the depression in the ship building industry is a direct result of the policies of this administration. They have over-built plants or

MR. E. ROBERTS: allowed them to be over-built. I am all for fish plants. Everybody wants a fish plant but we have far more plants than we have fish. And bawling and screaming and shouting and muling is not going to produce more fish. And all of the Northern cod stocks, that issue is the ultimate phony issue, the ultimate phony issue! The fact remains, that thanks to this government's policy, we have too much capacity. The Liberal Government put in a 200 mile limit that increased the access to the fish stocks and has brought in management programmes that are increasing the fish stocks. All this government has done is over-build plants, or allow them to be over built, and over-build boats. And there they did it knowingly, deliberately, callously. And if there are hundreds of fishermen in this Province who lose their investment in the next two years in fishing boats, it will be the direct result of the fisheries policy of the Peckford administration and that ineffable genius, Mr. Walter Carter, when he was the Minister of Fisheries in the Moores administration. That comes out in the Budget too.

So what has this government done for the fisheries? What have they done? The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has returned from I know not where. What has he done for the fisheries? What has this government done to develop our fisheries? Nothing. Got into a foolish fight with the feds! A foolish fight. I do not mind the fighting if it is for a cause, but a foolish fight. I do not mind the personal ill-will there is between him and Mr. LeBlanc. It is one sided, it is only on this minister's side.

MR. MORGAN: We are good buddies. Good buddies!

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1246

DW - 3

MR. E. ROBERTS: Good buddies? Mr. Speaker, they may be good buddies -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I not only talk to Mr. LeBlanc I listen to him.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Read today's headlines.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, 'MORGAN CRITICIZES LEBLANC'. Again in the paper today, 'MORGAN CRITICIZES LEBLANC'.

MR. J. MORGAN: You are editorializing in the paper.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Editorializing in the paper -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible) criticizing the policy not LeBlanc.

MR. E. ROBERTS: That is right, that is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I say again to the Minister of Fisheries what has this administration done to develop the fisheries in this Province? And the answer is 'Nothing'.

MR. J. MORGAN: I will tell you when I speak.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, tell it when he speaks. He has been telling us for years.

MR. ROBERTS:

years - I am sorry - he has been speaking for years but has not told us anything yet. He has not even told us why he gave out those contracts against the Public Tender Act.

MR. MORGAN: What would you do?

MR. ROBERTS: What would I do?

MR. MORGAN: Yes, tell us.

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman, Sir, I say to him wants to vacate office, if he wants to do a final service to the Government of Newfoundland, namely, get out of office then, Sir, we will show him what will happen, we will show him what will happen.

MR. HISCOCK: We will have a recreation meeting (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour is trying to say something.

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Shut up and let the Speaker for a minute, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is having difficulty in hearing. I would like it a little quieter please. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. I appreciate the Chair is having difficulty in hearing. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is having equal difficulty in understanding, Sir.

Now, as I was about to say before the minister erupted again, erupted himself, that the budget at no point comes to grip with the real problems in the fisheries today, it nowhere comes even close to coming to grips. The real problem is not this foolish fight over

MR. ROBERTS: Northern cod stocks, the real problem is not the foolish, constant, childish bickering that the minister engages in with the federal government. There are real problems. Richard Cashin has pointed them out. The problem, of course, is nothing more or less than one of incomes, one of the fact that we have thousands of fishermen who are not making a decent living. We have fishing companies that a royal commission has found are not making any great pile of money and I venture to say - I have no idea what Dean Paddock and Mr. Maloney and Mr. Howley will find when they bring in their report, but I think it is a very safe prediction to say that they will find that the fishermen have inadequate incomes. The evidence is on the record now and it has not been gainsaid and it cannot be. What are the government doing about that? Asking for jurisdiction. What in the devil's name would it do? They cannot run their own shop. What are they going to do with Ottawa's shop? Now the minister will agree the answers are unpalatable, are they not? Because the problem is there are too many fishermen. And the problem is what do we do about that? There are too many fishermen for the amount of fish there is to be caught. Does the minister agree with me on that? Are there too many fishermen in Newfoundland for the amount of fish there is to be caught?

MR. MORGAN: I will speak in the debate and answer then.

MR. ROBERTS: He will speak in the debate. Well, he cannot deny it because what I say is correct. It is a very unpalatable situation, very unpalatable.

MR. STIRLING: The Premier just phoned him and told him he is not allowed to say any more.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier phoned and him and said, "Jim, if you have to have you tonsils out you know where they are coming out, do you not?".

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the fish stocks at the disposal off our shores, long-liners, trawlers, inshoremen, the whole kit and caboodle, the total allowable catches are inadequate to support the fishermen who are trying to make a living from them.

MR. HOLLETT: Ask him if he believes that again.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the minister is not going to tell me what he believes. But he does, he realizes that. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not stupid. I know there are hundreds who think he is, but I say he is not stupid. He says some stupid things but he is not stupid. And he knows that that is the problem and he knows it is going to take some action to solve it and he knows the action is unpalatable. And I do fear he has not got the courage to come to grips with it.

The union has put forth a suggestion -

MR. STAGG: When is the hon. member going to start to speak?

AN HON. MEMBER: Soon.

MR. HANCOCK: When he feels like it.

MR. MOORES: The voice crying in the wilderness.

MR. ROBERTS: You have got to admire 'Stagg', boy, he never gives up, does he. He has not got sense enough to give up. He has been cozying up actually to Mr. Cashin. There has been a lovely little correspondence underway in the papers and I compliment the gentleman for Stephenville on his adherence to the union faith. He has been somewhat late in coming to the feast but I do compliment him on it. After all he belongs, as do I, to the tightest union in the Province. Boy, you think you have heard of union shops. You have never seen the law society in action. We have a union shop that no member of the CLC could even dream of.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1248

DW - 1

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now coming back to the - I am not going to make any more sport with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. F. STAGG:

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am sorry, my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I do not want to miss the gems. I mean, they just sink there on the carpet otherwise.

MR. F. STAGG: I had to go (inaudible) the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. E. ROBERTS: My friend for Port au Port has a much greater appreciation of the needs of his constituents than does the gentleman for Stephenville. And that is why my friend for Port au Port has been re-elected unlike my friend for Stephenville.

Now, Sir, where were we? We were talking about the real problems of the fisherman, talking about the fact the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) did not come to grips with them, talking about the fact there is nothing in the Budget. There is a half-hearted attempt to claim some of the glory for the fact that the fishery is prosperous. But, of course, when we look at the reality behind the façade we see that there is nothing that this government has done. The fishery is prosperous because of a 200 mile limit, because of the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, to whatever extent it is prosperous. Because of the 200 mile limit, federal, and because of the management programmes that the feds are putting in, which are unpopular, and they are going to be more unpopular, federal. And it is prosperous because of the fact that the Canadian dollar is weak as against the American dollar and that three-fourths of our fish by value is exported to the United States, and that gives us a great competitive advantage.



MR. E. ROBERTS: It does the same thing for our iron ore and it does the same thing for many of our pulp and paper products - or our paper products, we are not exporting pulp anymore. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is making notes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - I hope he is making notes and I want him to tell us what this government has done. They bankrupted the ship building industry in this Province! They are going to bankrupt hundreds and hundreds of fishermen who have boats they cannot afford to pay for. They are going to do the same thing for that as they did for the sawmill industry with the RDA, the great Jim Reid giveaway. We have not heard of Mr. Reid since my friend for Trinity - Bay de Verde retired, the former Minister of - what was he? - Minister of Rural Development it was called then - to his private business pursuits, have not heard of him since. But the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was then campaigning to get in the Cabinet. He was much more vocal then, sometimes even made better sense.

MR. L. THOMS: You mean more vocal than he is now?

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, more vocal than now. But the fact remains, Sir, that the real problem of the fishery is the limited amount of fish. Who gets it? How much? This government has not addressed those problems at all. All they have done is carp and criticize at the feds. Now there is a lot wrong with the feds -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)  
jurisdiction over the fishery.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Ah, the hon. gentleman has jurisdiction over is nothing. The hon. gentleman has jurisdiction over nothing and that is what the -

MR. J. MORGAN: (inaudible) in Ottawa are making a mess of the fishery.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman is capable - the hon. gentleman has jurisdiction over -

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1248

DW - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am not blaming the Government of -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: If my friend for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will possess himself for about one second more, I am not blaming him. He has jurisdiction over what he is capable of looking after, nothing!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: He is responsible for the over building in plants, he is responsible for the bankruptcy in the boat-building industry. He is responsible! Sure, he is! Sure, he is!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: What about the Loan Board? What about the Loan Board?

MR. E. ROBERTS: The fact that every shipyard is shut down, the fact that fisherman after fisherman cannot afford to service his loans, sure! Find it on page forty-five.

MR. J. MORGAN: There is no bankruptcy.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Nobody has gone bankrupt. Bankruptcy is like murder, it is a state of law. Bankruptcy is like murder, it is a state of law, a legal conclusion. Death is like the ship building industry, a state of fact.

MR. J. MORGAN: Name the companies that are bankrupt, name them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if my friend for Bonavista South can control himself.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am not calling the hon. gentleman a liar, nobody is calling him a liar, we are just telling the truth and he does not like it. That is his trouble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The ship building industry in this Province today is on the verge of bankruptcy. Of course it is.

MR. MORGAN: On the verge? But you said they were bankrupt. Name the companies.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a slanging match with the hon. gentleman. He is a better slanger than I will ever be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The shipyard after shipyard closed, is the direct result of the policy of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: This year?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Name them.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: There are none.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman speaks -

MR. MORGAN: There are none (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I did not say any of them were bankrupt, I said they are on the verge. I said the industry is bankrupt. They are all closed. They are not operating. And I have also said there are hundreds of fishermen who are going to lose their boats because they cannot afford to service the loans.

MR. MORGAN: Are you hoping that?

MR. ROBERTS: I am not hoping that. The minister may be hoping that but I am not.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) paid their loans last year.

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: It was a bad year last year and they paid their loans.

MR. ROBERTS: We shall see. We shall see.  
Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister's response to all that, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), is we want more control.

MR. F. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Nobody, not ever.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Not ever, not ever.

MR. MORGAN: The Liberal Party's policy was to (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is a fishery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - if there is a fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador today, and there is, it is because of the Liberal administration in Newfoundland and the Liberal administration in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The Liberal administration under Mr. Smallwood did more for the fishery in one day than the hon. gentleman has done in one year. And I say to him, tell me one thing, I say to the Minister of Fisheries, tell me one single, solitary thing that he has ever done for the fishermen of Newfoundland except take a salary from them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I suggest the House is now getting a little noisy. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has the floor. Also, all comments should be addressed to the Chair and not directly back and forth between hon. members.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the grievous offenders on the other side heed Your Honour's wise admonition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us have a recess for five minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, let us have a recess? We have had one for three weeks. I mean this government works less than - I will not say it. Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where were you when the health (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Where was I when the health - since I am no longer the health spokesman, that is where I was.

Now, are we ready? Mr. Speaker, you know, if I am not careful the maw mouth from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will get the better of me. I did not say there were too many fishermen. What I did say was that there were too many fishermen for the amount of -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Name him, Mr. Speaker, name him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Name him. Name him.

MR. HANCOCK: He is on the wrong side.

MR. FLIGHT: Jaws from Bonavista South.

MR. ROBERTS: What I did say, and I will say again, is that there are too many fishermen chasing the amount of fish there is to catch. And I have an authority for that. I have an authority -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the hon. gentleman will always regret that. Mr. Speaker, threats from tin-pot tyrants never threatened me and they do not now.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I know the hon. gentleman's mouth is as wide as Bonavista Bay which is very wide indeed. Now, Mr. Speaker, Life will run the pictures and Sports Illustrated will do a feature on the minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the fishery because I want to say again to the Minister of Fisheries in case he did not grasp -

MR. WOODROW: Tell us about the -

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now, hold on now. There is an eruption from Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Tell us about the full-time fishermen in Bay of Islands who lost their lobster license and salmon license. I just talked with a man over there now this morning who has been making his living by having a trap out.

MR. ROBERTS: My answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is I congratulate the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) on talking to his constituents. I would urge him to start listening to them from now on. Secondly, I would tell him that I am for every full-time fisherman in his constituency who has got a part-time license and has been misclassified. There are ten in mine. And I would tell him as well that the appeal system is straightening all of them out. And the advice which he ought to give to his constituent, if he has not already done it, is -

MR. WOODROW: I am enjoying your speech.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, because the hon. gentleman does not hear a good speech like this very often. He listens

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1249

IB - 5

MR. ROBERTS:

to his own side, that is his

trouble.

MR. THOMS:

The President of the Council

(Mr. Marshall) has no control. I hope Brian gets back soon.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I had forgotten that. I appreciate the hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands' comments because as my friend, the Leader of the Opposition has just reminded me, the gentleman from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was after all, the first declared Liberal candidate in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: And then Mr. Moores had a talk with him in a language that the strangers do not know, one day in the suite of the Glyn Mill Inn. And I do not know what passed between them, but I know that the hon. gentleman went into that meeting a Liberal and came out a Tory. The hon. gentleman went into that meeting a Liberal and came out a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, one never ceases to marvel at the miracles -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - and Saul going up to Damascus and seeing a blinding light on the road before him, was no greater turn than the hon. gentleman's having a word with Mr. Moores.

MR. WOODROW: We are still -

MR. ROBERTS: Do you know what he was told? Can I tell them what the then Premier told you?

MR. WOODROW: No, I do not (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I see. He does not want me to tell you.

MR. WOODROW: We are still friends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come on, tell us, let it all hang out.

MR. ROBERTS: What I want to know, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Just to finish off the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. STAGG: We are only interested in -

MR. ROBERTS: - just to finish off the Minister of Fisheries -



MR. THOMS:

I wish you could -

MR. ROBERTS:

constituents do.

- finish him off before his

MR. THOMS:

The fishermen would like that too.

MR. ROBERTS:

I want to finish off the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) by simply asking him when he does honour us with his speech, with his collected thoughts, which will be a very brief speech I am sure, but I want him to tell us where his policy of confrontation is getting us and I want him to tell us what the administration, of which he is such a shining ornament, such an adornment, such a proud part, has done for the fishermen of this Province. And I want him to tell us, as well, his solutions to what is after all the problem of the fisheries, which is not that there are too many fishermen but that there are too many fishermen for too little fish, what he proposes to do about it? Richard Cashin has a solution, I wonder whether the minister accepts it or rejects it, because it is a problem in the fishery and the minister can twist and distort, and do anything he wants and he is a master of that and I respect him for that - but there are too many fishermen -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

the fish which we are catching.

- there are too many fishermen for

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman -

MR. THOMS:

And Morgan criticizes LeBlanc.

MR. ROBERTS:

- the hon. gentleman, Sir, knows full well that there is too little fish for the number of fishermen in this Province.

- the hon. gentleman, Sir, knows

MR. THOMS:

Maw, maw, maw.

MR. ROBERTS:

And that is the central problem. That is the central problem. And I want to know where our confrontation policies are getting us. I want him to tell us that.

MR. THOMS:

He cannot tell you.

MR. ROBERTS:

What has he gained from his arty-bar-gaining with Mr. LeBlanc and the feds?

MR. FLIGHT:

And Mr. Morris.

MR. ROBERTS:

And Mr. Morris. What has he gained? I want to know what he has gained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS:

Nothing.

MR. ROBERTS:

Oh, that was the Minister of Fisheries of Nova Scotia. He said that our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) bayed when the new moon came out. But that is just one Tory talking to another, and we should not get into that.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the fisheries are in a mess, I want to know what our minister is doing about it, other than making his mouth move. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can carry on now.

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) to negotiate it.

MR. ROBERTS:

Having disposed of the Minister of Fisheries with a few well-chosen words, which is more than he has ever used -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

No, I have said what I had to say. Want me to say it again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

I would. I would. If I thought it would help -

MR. MORGAN:

Give it a go again.

MR. ROBERTS:

- if I thought it would help the hon. gentleman, Sir, to understand, I would say it all again. But in the years I have had the honour and the inevitable pleasure of serving with him in the House -

MR. MORGAN:

Get rid of the fishermen.

MR. ROBERTS:

Get rid of the fishermen?

MR. MORGAN:  
(inaudible).

Get rid of the fishermen, and

MR. ROBERTS:

No, but what is the answer?

MR. THOMS:  
answer.

Get rid of the minister is the

MR. ROBERTS:

Get rid of the minister, now that  
is the answer. What is the answer?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Get rid of the minister.

MR. ROBERTS:

I posed the question, the minister  
has given us his answer. Let it be recorded in Hansard the  
minister has given us his answer, 'Get rid of the fisherman'.  
Morgan's slogan, 'Get Rid of the Fishermen'. That is his  
answer. Time will tell. That is Morgan's answer, let it be  
recorded, Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, I have talked to the fishermen,  
and more than that, I have listened to them. It is more than  
the ministers have ever done. Let it be recorded Morgan's  
answer is, 'Get rid of the fishermen'. That is the Tory  
policy.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to know what the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) - he did not even touch on it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would estimate I may be a quarter of the way through my introductory remarks. I wanted to talk about unemployment. I want to talk about the pension situation. I want to talk about something that nobody on the other side appears to have heard of but it is very crucial to this Province, the EPF programmes, the established programme, financing programmes. I want to talk about Grade XII. There is a fertile subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it ever a fertile subject.

MR. ROBERTS: A fertile subject for Grade XII. I want to talk about the offshore. Maybe I should say a few words about the offshore. Are we going on budget tomorrow?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh good, oh good. How about Thursday?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No? I have today and tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: They cannot take sustained criticism.

MR. ROBERTS: Then I can have the week off. A day a week.

MR. THOMS: They cannot take sustained criticism.

MR. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) cannot take these body blows.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if I had a body like the hon. gentleman's I am sure I could not take them either, but that is another story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) of the fishermen.

MR. TULK: He said that.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is Morgan's slogan, too many fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: That is the hon. gentleman's (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I admire very greatly, Sir -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) who gets out and bicycles. And I see him bicycling regularly with his head down and wearing his cycling togs and going around and around, I admire him for that. He gets further than does the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and I would commend that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) pass the overpass.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few thousand well chosen words about the offshore, because there is a great deal in the budget about that, the Minister of Finance waxed eloquent. I want to say quite simply that it is now clear to all who would see, and I am not sure that includes the minister, but it is now clear that the Province's policy is on the edge of being a disaster for this Province. We all agree on the goals. There is no question at all. Everyone on this side of the House and everybody on the other side of the House agrees with the goal that Newfoundland -

MR. TULK: You made that -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. TULK: You made that resolution in 1975.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, that is right. In 1975 we said it, that Newfoundland owns the oil, oil and gas, the hydro carbons off our shores. We also agree that we, the people of this Province speaking through the government and the House of this Province, must have a dominant voice in its development. There is no question about any of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going to get up -

MR. ROBERTS: I know they will get up and twist it. I mean, how often do you say you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink? You can lead half a horse to principles but you cannot make them understand.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) water.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, the big question is, how are we going to achieve those policy goals?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: It is a very good question. I agree with my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), it really is the central question. The Premier's policy -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: - the policy which is now the administration's policy is all or nothing, all or nothing. It is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain that policy because it is becoming increasingly obvious that the policy is a council of desperation. That is why the Premier and spokesmen for the administration are becoming shrill and shriller all the time. They know they are on a sinking ship.

MR. STAGG: And you are (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, what this

MR. E. ROBERTS: Province is saying to the feds is that we own the oil off our shores. The feds in return are saying to Newfoundland that they own it. And then they go on to say, 'Go to court if you want and we will let the courts decide'. Or the feds are saying as an alternate, 'Let us negotiate'. What has our response been? Our response has been to stamp our foot like little children and say, 'We are going to do neither'. Now, events are not going to await the pleasure of our Premier. I know this will come as a distinct shock to some on the other side, but our Premier is not omnipotent, omniscient and all but a diety. It will come as a considerable shock I know to my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who has to have a hero to worship. And now that John Crosbie has gone on to greater things, he has fastened upon the present Premier.

MR. F. STAGG: He will be the next Prime Minister.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Next Prime Minister? Well, he may well be the next leader of the Tory Party but, as my friend should know, being leader of the Tory Party is not equivalent to being Prime Minister, for more than nine months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, events are not going to await our Premier's pleasure. First of all, it is in the national interest that the hydro carbon resources off Canada's East coast be developed. And there is that word 'national' again and that is probably offensive to gentleman opposite. Maybe it stinks in their nostrils. But I would say there is a national interest, and I would say that we in Newfoundland and Labrador should be concerned with that because we are part of a nation. And we are only strong if the nation is strong. If anybody differs with that then let them have the courage to put it to the people of this Province.

May 4, 1981

Tape No. 1252

DW - 2

MR. E. ROBERTS: Let them! Now the national interest demands -

MR. J. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS: Yes, I say to my friend for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) who has got a little toy that Richard Cashin says there are too many fishermen -

MR. F. STAGG: Bonavista North?

MR. E. ROBERTS: Bonavista South, I am sorry. I will say it to the hon. member for Bonavista North too, because Richard Cashin said it to all of them. But now, Mr. Speaker - yes, we got rid of the member for Bonavista North, a gentleman named 'Cross' and now he is back on the public payroll again. And what a cross we had to bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first point I want to make with respect to our Premier's petulant posture is that there is a national interest and the development of the hydro carbon resources off Canada's East coast - and Newfoundland and Labrador is part of Canada and the resources off our East Coast are part of Canada's East coast - that it is in the interest of the nation to develop those resources.

Secondly, if we do not go to court, somebody else will. I know the Premier all but - it is astonishing, I cannot find the precise words to describe it within the parliamentary lexicon - the Premier all but exploded when the oil industry told him that they might take it to court. He said, 'We will decide to take it to court', little tin-pot tyrant. The courts are open to anybody in this country. And may I call the Premier in that instance a tin-pot tyrant, t-i-n-p-o-t t-y-r-a-n-t, a tin-pot tyrant when he said he would decide whether a person went to court or not?

MR. STAGG: Would you have enough nerve to say it if he were here?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) Premier Brian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. E. ROBERTS: When next the Premier visits us I will be quite prepared to say to him anything I have said about him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: He will be back tomorrow.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, the Prime Minister arrives tomorrow. I did not know the Premier was due back tomorrow. Now, Mr. Speaker, the second point is if we do not go to court somebody else will, the matter is going to be resolved. And I would say there is only one lesson that comes out of that, we must negotiate, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador must negotiate! Now, does that weaken our stand? Does that compromise our position? How? How does it compromise our position? All we are doing now is saying we have got it all or we have got nothing but we are afraid to put it to the test. We are scared to put it to the test. The Province is scared to put it to the test. Let them make a reference to our Court of Appeal, if they wish.

MR. ROBERTS: They have the power, the Cabinet have the power. They did it with the constitutional issue. It is entirely a proper exercise of power to do that. Let them put it to the test. But all we are saying is we will not talk, we will not negotiate, we will not go to court, we are going to win it all. Well, I say the danger is we may not win it all. And I say that the danger is we may lose it all. And again, Sir, the budget of the Finance Minister only offers despair. It is camouflaged in the minister's ringing rhetoric. But all he does is offer despair.

MR. STAGG: Too many fishermen.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said too many fishermen. You will find it in Hansard.

MR. STAGG: The member for the Strait of Belle Isle -

MR. ROBERTS: The member for the Strait of Belle Isle said there are too many fishermen for too few fish. But it was the Minister of Fisheries who said too many fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say we must negotiate. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the administration of which he is a part have refused to negotiate. I note with some interest on page 14 of the budget they are now talking about the constitutional review process as part of the resolution of the jurisdiction issue. And if I have ever seen foolish virgins the Minister of Finance takes his place in the front rank of the foolish virgins. He belongs to the administration that opposes the constitutional review process, that if it has its way there will be no constitutional review process, that if they have their way, he and his colleague there will be a checkerboard of rights across Canada. Imagine charter of rights that does not apply to every Canadian, that

MR. ROBERTS: a bunch of elected members in any province can decide it applies to them or not. Who do they think they are? So I say to the minister in all seriousness that we should negotiate. Negotiation does not mean we have to make a deal, negotiation does not mean that we have to give up what we believe to be our principles and what we take as our position, negotiation means that we may find a way out of the dilemma. What we are being offered now is not statesmanship, it is suicide. And if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has done nothing else in his budget, he has made it crystal clear that this administration have no policy other than win all or lose all. And he now tells us that not only are we going to have to wait for oil and gas before we enter the pie in the sky range, the pie in the sky era, but he tells us that it is years and years off and we are not going to see any money for years and years and years. I do not know if it is parliamentary to say they have misled the people of the Province but if it is, they have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of special points I wanted to make with reference to the budget. I would like the Minister of Finance to talk a little when he speaks, or at some point perhaps one of his colleagues, about this pension funding we are into. The estimates are confusing. We are, I understand, putting \$16.2 million into the pension pooled fund this year. That is the figure shown in the estimates. I understand that is coming out of the current account estimates. It is not a capital account item. Now, that \$16.2 million, if I understand correctly, does two things. It is being used to pay the pensions that are being paid. We have a number of people on the pension payroll. It is also being used to build a fund. Is that correct? Can the minister confirm that? Okay.

MR. ROBERTS: I also understand that all who are contributing to the pension fund are having their contributions go into the pension pooled fund. That is the teachers, the public servants, the Crown corporation employees, even the MHAs, the contributions are all going into the pooled fund. So the pooled fund has two sources of money; it has the contributions being made by everybody drawing a salary from the government payroll directly or indirectly so as to include the teachers and the hospital workers and what have you. It also has the \$16.2 million that the government are paying into it out of the current account revenue.

I wonder if the minister would be kind enough to tell us whether we are, in fact, even paying our way on current account, whether the money that is going in each year is enough to fund the service that is accruing each year? And I wonder whether he will tell us as part of that, whether the present contribution rates are high enough? I understand there is 6 per cent including the CPP portion. And the CPP is 1.2 per cent up to a maximum of \$212.40 in a year.

MR. ROBERTS: And also growing out of that, the same range of questions, can the minister tell us whether we are going to be able to pick up the past contributions? Have I made myself clear to the minister? The past service contributions, which I estimate are what? \$500 million if capitalized today, a thousand million dollars, they are of that range.

DR. COLLINS: A very large amount.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

DR. COLLINS: A very large amount.

MR. ROBERTS: A very large amount. I thank the minister. They are of that range. They are not \$50 million, they may be \$500 millions, they may be \$1,000 millions. Are we going to be able to pick those up at the current contribution rates? If we are not, are we going to raise the current contribution rates? Do the current contribution rates even cover the presently incurred service? In other words, do the amounts that are paid in each year cover the amount of pension liability that is accruing each year in respect of the people paying them? Forget the people who are on pension, forget all of the past service which we have picked up.

Now, I suspect that we are not making adequate contributions. I have spoken one or two actuaries and C.As. around town and they tell me that the \$16.2 million and the 6 per cent contribution rate, including the CPP, is not enough. I suspect, in other words, that what we are seeing is a slight of hand, because if that is the case, that we are not paying our way, I wonder if the minister could tell please how we are going to pick up the past contributions. The answer, I assume, is that they are still a contingent liability of this Province, they are an uncertain contingent liability, but they are one

MR. ROBERTS: which will come due. In other words we are still right back where we started.

It would follow then that the great step forward that the minister has boasted of in this budget, and in its predecessor, was really nothing more or less than a double shuffle and a misleading one at that.

I mentioned the established programme financing, and that, of course, is one of the crucial questions facing this Province today. The EPF legislation runs out in twelve months, if I am not mistaken. It is the end of this March. It is not twelve months, it is ten months. That is a programme, Mr. Speaker, under which 11.6 per cent of our current account money comes from Ottawa. The EPF programme is \$175 million, that is the money which has been put in place of what would have been coming under the old programmes, the hospital insurance programme, the Medicare programme, and the post-secondary education programme. I want the minister, if he would please, to tell us what is happening on that. I understand Ottawa proposes to renegotiate the formula.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: There is not a word in the budget about it. And yet the minister will concur, I am sure, when I say that that is an integral and essential part of the current account structure of this government's operations. Ottawa say they are going to cut it back. They say they are going to restrict the rate of growth. It is now pegged I believe both to per capita tax yields and to a percentage increment, it is a very complicated formula. But the minister has not mentioned it at all in the budget and yet it is surely one of the crucial items on the financial agenda in this calendar year.

MR. TULK: If it is complicated he would not understand it.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if the minister would tell us a little bit about the synchrolift. He told us precious little except it is going to cost us \$10 million and I understand it may cost us considerably more than that, if one does an honest accounting on it. I wonder if the minister will tell the House what commitments we have undertaken as a government, what authority there is for it, because nothing has been adopted by this House. Will he table the contract if one has in fact been entered into? If one has not been entered into, would he table the letters of intent and the documentation relating to it? Would he table the feasibility studies? Would he tell us why the government of this Province in its fiscal shape—we cannot afford roads, we cannot afford schools, we cannot afford hospitals—how we can afford to help the Government of Canada's Crown Corporation that makes hundreds of millions of dollars a year, this Canadian National, CN, the owners of the dockyard? We cannot have money to provide water fit to drink for people in this Province, and yet we can find a minimum of \$10 millions, and I say to the minister it will be far more than \$10 million, We cannot find money to give people a drop of water fit to drink.

There are people in Naskaupi district who do not have water fit to drink. There are people

MR. ROBERTS:

my district, in Fogo district, in every district throughout the Province, we cannot find the money as a Province to give them a drop of water fit to drink. Well, how can we find money to subsidize, to give to Canadian National. I have nothing against the dockyard. If the thing is economically feasible they do not need us. Their credit rating is better than the government of this Province's. If it is not economically feasible, why is the government subsidizing it? On a per job cost it is a very high one. And are we now going to subsidize every other failing business around the Province? That is a good question. Or is it just rank, sheer partisan politics? What is it? We have no information. The budget tells us \$10 million. That is \$10 million less to put water and sewer into the rural areas, \$10 million less for high schools, \$10 million less for grade schools. Would the minister like to come clean on it and give us some information? The budget gives us nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about - I guess I will go on to tomorrow. I will not finish today - I want to talk about Grade XII and come back to that tomorrow. I want to talk about the complete and utter failure of the minister in his budget to come to grips with the problems of economic development. Nothing in this budget - we have a Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor). I do not know what the devil he develops except his sense of self-importance. I do not know what we have. I want him to talk about the University and what this budget is going to do to the University which is the best hope - now, I have been critical of the University in the past and I will go on being critical again. They certainly do some things with which I do not agree. But I want to know what this budget is going to do to our university. It is the only one we have. It is the last best hope for hundreds and more





MR. WOODROW: He is trying to twist it around.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, I am not trying to twist. It is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who is trying to twist. What I have said I will say again and again and again. There are too many fishermen for too few fish. And we have got to get more fish. And I want to know what the Minister of Fisheries proposes to do about that.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask him what fish have been given away to the foreigners this year. The answer is none.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) pounds last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about the past I will talk about his past, a murky -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I said this year. The hon. gentleman's problem -

MR. THOMS: What is your definition of a foreigner?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman's problem is when his mouth is open his mind is closed. The hon. gentleman's problem is that when his mouth is open his mind is closed and as his mouth is always open his mind is inevitably closed.

Now, my learned and jovial friend, the House Leader on the government side has indicated that the magic hour of six of the clock has come. That being so I would move the adjournment of the debate and either he can stand and move the House adjourn or His Honour just leaves the Chair and we will come back at eight tonight if you wish.

MR. NEARY: We have all had a holiday, boy.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member adjourns the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate, pursuant to the request made by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I would like to move that the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) be a member of the Resources Committee on the estimates. And in doing so, may I mention, even though he is not here in the House, that I would like to be associated with Your Honour's words of welcome to the hon. member on behalf of the members on this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) too hard.

MR. MARSHALL: No, it is not too hard. We wish him a very fruitful and interesting time until the next election, Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. President of the Council.

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

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