

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1982

The House met at 10.00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, schools throughout Newfoundland and Labrador close the 1981/82 school year today. One hundred and thirty-six thousand kindergarten to grade X students will start Summer vacation tomorrow while 9200 grade eleven students prepare to write public exams in 200 centres across the Province during the period from June 21st to June 30th. This year's Grade XI students will be the last graduates from the old two year senior high school programme. Those who do not pass Grade XI this year will have two additional opportunities to complete graduation requirements through supplementary exams written in November 1982 and June 1983. The next full class of graduates from the Province's high schools will be in June 1984. The students graduating in that year will have completed three years of the new senior high school programme which was introduced last September. The new senior high school programme is one of the most significant improvements to take place in our education system for many years. Next year thirty-two new high school courses will be available in addition to the forty-four courses introduced this year. These new courses are in the subject areas of Art, Business Education, English, Literature, Family Studies, Industrial Education, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Theatre Arts, Religious Education, Computer Studies, Science and Social Studies. During the third year of the programme additional courses will be introduced in all major curriculum areas. Besides the improvements

MS.VERGE: in the senior high school programme considerable curriculum development is taking place at all levels from primary through junior high schools. Curriculum materials approved for use in the primary, elementary and junior high school grades include new courses and test materials in Art, Health, English, French, Science and Music. In addition the department has established new policies on the teaching of written language in the elementary grades and completed work on the development of new curriculum guides for kindergarten. Both programmes are scheduled for introduction in September 1983 following extensive in-service for teachers in the coming school year.

I want to recognize the efforts of teachers and school board personnel who have served voluntarily on curriculum committees to development these improvements in our school curricula and the

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

au Port.

The hon. member for Port

MR. HODDER:

side of the House would congratulate all students who are graduating. We wish them well in their Summer vacations.

Mr. Speaker, we too on this

MR. NEARY:

I have three of those.

MR. HODDER:

And it is particularly to those students who are the last Grade XI graduates across the Province. Students in the next couple of years, the students that will be graduating after this year will be graduating from our schools with Grade XII. There are still many bugs to be ironed out in the programme, particularly in our rural areas in many of our smaller schools in the Province.

However, Mr. Speaker, we hope that the Grade XII programme will improve the quality of education and the quality of life in the Province. As far as the part of the statement which dealt with funding, we still in the Province have inadequate school buildings, inadequate equipment and inadequate libraries. And with all of the funds that we have put into education in the Province, we still find that most of the school boards in the Province are in financial difficulties and many of our schools are inadequately equipped.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that we will be able to give to the students in our high school programmes in all of the classes

MR. J. HODDER: the type of education they deserve so that they will grow up to be better Newfoundlanders and contribute to the Province.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), of which I gave him notice just before the House opened. The House will recall that the minister appointed the former Chief Justice of the Province, the hon. R. S. Furlong, to consider and make recommendations as to whether any - I think I am stating it correctly - as to whether any prosecutions or other actions should be taken as a result of the report produced by Judge LeGrow into a fire that occurred at Elizabeth Towers a couple of years ago. I think it is very much in the public interest, if the minister would agree, that the matter be put to rest. So I will ask him whether he has as yet received a report from the hon. Mr. Furlong, if he has not received it, has he any indication as to when he might receive it, and if he has not received it and has had no indication could he get in touch with Mr. Furlong and ask when it might be coming? It was some time ago, as I recall it, a matter of some months, and so I guess it is reasonable to expect that we should have the report shortly.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts), I have not to date received the report from the former Chief Justice Furlong. I understand that I will be receiving it within a two to three week period. And also I would

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1458

MJ - 2

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: mention to the hon. member that I am quite sure that when I announce the appointment of the Chief Justice Furlong to review the material and make a report to me that I will in fact be making his report public after I have received it and have had an opportunity to study it myself. But I expect to receive it within a two to three week period.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier in connection with the research that has been going on now

MR. Neary:

for some time in connection with an aluminum smelter for this Province. The ministers, during the period the House was closed prior to the election, seemed to be spending an awful lot of time in California and in other places where the climate was a little better than it is in this Province around that time of the year. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if we are near getting an aluminum smelter in this Province, is the investigation still going on, are we still funding the investigation and how close are we to arriving at a decision?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement between Anaconda Aluminum Limited of Louisville, Kentucky and the Government of Newfoundland through the Department of Development to jointly fund a study which was announced, I think it was announced in this House some time ago, a feasibility study on whether or not an aluminum smelter was a feasible activity or project to be pursued. That joint feasibility study is still under way between Anaconda Aluminum and the Department of Development. Their report I think is due in by December of this year, which will conclusively indicate one way or the other as to whether there is the probability of locating an aluminum smelter in the Province. So that is where it is, I think the California connection to which the hon. member refers, I do not think it is directly related to the aluminum prospects that are on the horizon. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had spent some time in California promoting marketing of Newfoundland fish. I am not sure whether it was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who was in California for a brief period to attend a seminar relating to offshore. But most of the activity that we have had as it relates to the

PREMIER PECKFORD: aluminum industry has been with Anaconda Aluminum out of Louisville, Kentucky, who are, by the way, a subsidiary of a larger corporation that is headquartered in California.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: What about the funding. Have the Committee studying this possibility of an aluminum smelter for Newfoundland, have they asked for additional funding? Is it on target? You know, are we running pretty well on schedule as far as the cost is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As far as I know, I will have to take the question as notice in order to give a specific answer to the question, but as far as I am aware I think it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of a half million dollars is the total cost- it could be \$600,000; I do not know the exact figure off the top of my head- but I seem to remember it somewhere in the \$500,000 to \$600,000 range. It is shared, I think, 50/50 by Anaconda Aluminum

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1460

SD - 1

PREMIER PECKFORD: and ourselves to finalize the study and there is a team set up representing Anaconda Aluminum and representing the Government of Newfoundland through the Department of Development.

MR. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Final supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the proposal that an aluminum plant be established in this Province sort or ties in with the development of the Lower Churchill, or Muskrat Falls. I think that the whole idea of trying to attract this industry, which is a big user of electricity was to find a customer in Labrador or on the Island of Newfoundland for some of the power to be generated at the Muskrat, or the Lower Churchill, and the surplus power to be exported to markets on the mainland and in the United States. If the report recommends in favour of an aluminum smelter, first of all, number one, where will it be located? Will it be in the Corner Brook area or will it be in the Goose Bay area? And number two, will that then confirm the start-up of the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls hydro power development?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all as it relates to location, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that the feasibility study is supposed to show as to where is the more appropriate location for the aluminum smelter. No final designation or site has been given and we will be looking to the committee to make recommendations in that regard. There are two sites which have been talked about most and that is in the Lake Melville area and in the Bay of Islands area. There could possibly be others but those are two which have been mentioned most often. So the report, hopefully, will give us some guidance as to the appropriate location for such a smelter.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, as it relates to the access to power which would be necessary for the industry, it is not clear whether in fact it would be Lower Churchill power or not that would be utilized in the establishment of the smelter. There is available a small amount of power from the existing Upper Churchill development on a re-call basis on a year's notice.

MR. NEARY: How many megawatts? Three hundred megawatts?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think we are entitled to, under the original contract of the Upper Churchill, somewhere around 300 or 400 megawatts, and it is not all being used, apparently, as I understand it. There is some available. The exact amount might be around 100 megawatts or so, that might be available. But in any case there is some cheap -

MR. ROBERTS: There are 300 the first time more megawatts.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - power perhaps available there a small amount of it that is available.

MR. ROBERTS: Most was used in Happy Valley and the rest to the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) will allow me to complete my answer,

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would like to give the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) some additional information. At the present moment, then, there is a small block of power available from the Upper Churchill, given if the government or the group give notice a year ahead of schedule to access that additional recallable power. The whole question of the Lower Churchill and its use, and especially Muskrat Falls, is a great question mark today. The latest figures as they relate to the development of Muskrat Falls- or Gull Island for that matter, which is a cheaper source of power than Muskrat Falls- is a highly questionable one, given the cost that that power would be even at site. It is much more likely that we would look more favourably - although as I say this is not altogether clear yet. The success of the Water Reversion Act in the Supreme Court of Canada will also be an important factor in determining access to power for industrial development, both in Labrador and in the Province, and might take a higher priority in its use for industrial expansion than the Lower Churchill.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, did I detect in the Premier's answer there that the development of Muskrat or the Lower Churchill, the cost has escalated to such a degree that it is not considered feasible to develop it even for industry in Labrador? Is that what the hon. gentleman indicated there in his answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not that categorical. I was comparing it to another development which is the existing development at the Upper Churchill, and the Lower Churchill power developed either at Muskrat Falls or

PREMIER PECKFORD: Gull Island would be a lot more expensive, and always has been a lot more expensive, than a corresponding amount of power from the Upper Churchill development, and given that we have a Water Reversion Act which has been ruled three to nothing as a valid piece of legislation by the highest court in Newfoundland, and given that the Supreme Court of Canada has now set a date for the hearing of the Water Reversion Act at the end of September of this year, it is quite likely that at the same time that the feasibility study on the aluminum smelter comes in, there will be an adjudication on the Water Reversion Act and we would therefore have at our disposal a number of alternatives available to us for access to cheap power to make the aluminum smelter industry fly.

So all I am saying is that the Lower Churchill, either site, Muskrat Falls or Gull Island, in comparison with the Upper Churchill, is more expensive, and much more expensive, and given that we have as a government gone ahead with special legislation as it relates to the Upper Churchill, and it has to this date been highly successful, that we would not want to cut off our nose in spite of our face, and given that timing

PREMIER PECKFORD: on both initiatives are coming along almost simultaneously, one, the feasibility study on the aluminum smelter and, two, the Water Reversion Act in the Supreme Court of Canada, we are going to be very cautious as to how we access and what we access as the power source for the aluminum smelter.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, last week I asked the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) if he would reduce the stumpage on pulp wood in this Province and that increase was somewhere in the vicinity of 400 per cent. As I understand from the minister the last day he was in the House, last Friday, he had then to meet with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to see if indeed he would make that reduction. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance in view of the absence of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands what action has been taken to alleviate that problem, if any?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister of Forests Resources and Lands has met with the people involved in this problem. The way I understand it is that there are two problem areas, the spruce bud damaged timber and the living, green leaves. Now I understand that the department is very anxious, of course, to make sure that there is maximum harvesting of the damaged timber, and that they have made some accommodation there of a phase-in nature to ensure that their programme of harvesting that damaged timber is not compromised in any way.

DR. COLLINS: In regard to the living trees that are being harvested, my understanding is that the stumpage change, the stumpage fee change is not going to impact on that particular aspect of things to any significant degree.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, are we given to understand then that where we are cutting the spruce budworm infected timber, infested timber, that the stumpage rate will go back to its original rate and are we also given to understand that those people who cut for Abitibi-Price in Stephenville, for example, the local independent contractors who cut for Abitibi-Price in Stephenville will still pay the stumpage rate of eight or nine dollars whichever it was that was in the Budget, whichever applied?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it would go back to the original. I said that there would be some phase-in mechanism for the damaged timber, that the stumpage fee would be phased in, there would be a mechanism there. And I think that has been discussed by the minister of the department concerned. As far as the independent woodcutters, it depends on what they cut. If they are by and large harvesting the damaged timber - and, of course, in harvesting damaged timber they do not only harvest in a block only damaged timber. There is a certain amount of green timber harvested there also and there has to be that mix.

DR. COLLINS: for utilization of material. It depends: If independent operators are harvesting by and large damaged timber that they will obviously get the benefit from this phase-in mechanism.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, this change involves a budgetary change, as the minister is well aware I asked him the question originally if it had been changed and he said he understands that there has been some discussion.

Now let me ask him point-blank again. Has the rate of stumpage been changed? What are the new rates? What is the amount of increase? And is that change retroactive to April 1, when the original change was supposed to come in in the beginning?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear. A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give the House any incorrect information, because this is a technical matter that had to be carried out between the minister and the industry concerned. And it is not unusual when there is a budgetary change that those budgetary changes be brought in in a sensible manner, and that is what this government is doing.

MR. ROBERTS: He sounds like the Allan MacEachen now, does he not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Just like the federal Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: The Budget said there would be a change in the stumpage fee and that the stumpage fee would

DR. COLLINS: end up as so and so. And there is a mechanism for bringing that policy change into effect and it will be carried out over a suitable period of time in the best interest of the industry concerned.

As to when it will start.

I am sure the minister will be able to give us the results of his discussions with the industry when he is finished with his business outside of the House and reports to the House. But again I would reiterate that there will be a phase-in of the change in the stumpage fee in regard to the damaged timber.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister is saying that there is a phase-in and he wants the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) to talk to the contractors himself, and that is perfectly acceptable. But the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands also held discussions with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Now in the interest of not forcing this issue and perhaps hurting some of the contractors in this Province, let me just ask the minister a very simple question, a very simple commitment; When can we expect to hear from the government when this budgetary change will come about, a reversion back? When can we expect to hear?

MR. NEARY: Or are they going to wait for all of them to go bankrupt?

MR. TULK: Will he now consider the other local contractors? For example, on the Northern Peninsula I understand there is very little spruce budworm infested timber, yet that wood is going into the Stephenville mill, into Abitibi-Price in Stephenville for newsprint. And I understand it is

MR. TULK: going to drive the price
of that wood up by approximately \$10 per ton.

Now would the minister
also consider with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands
(Mr. Power) whether indeed he should lower stumpage fees not only on
spruce budworm infested timber, but on the natural green
timber as well? And when can we expect to know about this
change, Mr. Speaker?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that is the precise reason why I felt that we had to await the details of this whole thing from the minister concerned. Because, as the hon. member pointed out, there are a number of aspects to it and I have given the general approach that we discussed, the minister was then going back and discussing the details with the industry concerned and then he will announce the precise results of those discussions.

MR. B. TULK: When?

DR. COLLINS: And I have no doubt that he will do that on the first opportunity when he is available to report to the House.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer).

In view of the fact that, in increasing numbers, newspapers across the Province have been filled with legal advertisements concerning homes on public auction to satisfy mortgage or non-payment; and in view of the fact that there are 5,000 new mortgages or 5,000 families in the Province who will renew their mortgage this year, and there are thousands of others from years before who will be renewing in the near future; and in view of the economic slump; I wonder if the minister is aware that most of those sales take place under Chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, Section 6, that says that, a mortgage company or bank has the right to take over a person's home and sell if it they miss only one month's payment. And in view of the tight money situation that is forcing many banks and finance companies to call loans and mortgages in more quickly than in the past, does the minister intend to

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1464

MJ - 2

MR. J. HODDER: amend the act to bring it in line with reality and with the other Canadian provinces?

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear! Good question.

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that foreclosure would seldom if ever occur with a one month arrears. There are usually a number of months, because it is not an option that anybody particularly wishes, so I would think the number of foreclosures with a one month arrears would either be inexistent or at least minimal. What I think the hon. member is asking is whether we would consider an amendment to the legislation. Certainly I would not want wish to say yes or no that we will amend it, but certainly we will consider it, yes. And I would not want to go any further than saying that right now.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that mortgage money is becoming very tight and that this section of the act would give the companies the power to do that, and while it does not happen in a great deal of cases, the potential is there for it to happen and well as mortgage sales by public auction are up. I was just looking at the paper, last Saturday's edition of The Evening Telegram, and it was full of homes on public sale. In The Western Star, and some of the weeklies you see the legal notices. But the act has another

MR. HODDER: , what I would consider pretty frightening provision, in that under Section 5 the public notice does not have to be given, so that anyone could have their home taken away from them behind their backs and sold to someone else at whatever price the mortgage holder sees fit. Would the minister have a look at that provision in the act as well?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we will, Yes, Sir.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I have spoken to a number of members of the legal community and they assure me that this is a problem. And I would ask the minister would he be ready to bring in other amendments that would force public notice before a mortgage sale in the Gazette or in the newspapers? And would he take other suggestions, such as an extension of one month to three or four months and would he reduce the right of varying the sale that the act permits? Is the minister ready to make necessary changes in the act to protect Newfoundlanders and Labradorians from the threat of losing their property?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, of course, there is nothing that could be done in our kind of society to eliminate the threat of people losing their property if they have mortgages to pay or payments to make. To the best of my knowledge, foreclosures after one month in default would be perhaps non-existent but -

MR. ROBERTS: We are not talking about foreclosures, 'Gerry', it is the power of sale.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Power of sale, yes, as well. And also the

MR. OTTENHEIMER: hon. member mentioned sales without public advertisement. Again I would think that would be extremely rare but I think the point is that it can in fact legally happen. It can happen legally, there is not a legal obligation for the public advertisement. So we will certainly -

AN HON. MEMBER: Look at it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - yes, Sir, look into that.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is a most important point. And while we agree with the minister that there is no way this House should prevent people realizing upon their security, I think he agrees with us, from what he said, that it is proper and it is essential to make sure that the sales are done properly. Now I wonder if, among the suggestions he is considering, if he would consider a further one of introducing in effect a procedural code - it is with reference to Section 5 of the Conveyancing Act under which the powers of sale are exercised - a procedural code which will require not only the public notice - which is not required now, as I understand it, although as the minister says most of my brethren at the bar do advertise publicly but they do not have to - but also require a sale

MR. ROBERTS: bona fide to the highest, you know, the highest bidder for value? That is not required now in the law of this Province today. And I think the minister may know of cases and his colleague, the minister of Energy, and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) may know of cases where sales have been made for less than bona fide, and of course they go back against the mortgagor under the personal covenant. So I wonder whether he would consider developing and then introducing a code to protect people whose homes are being taken. And of course the reason for it, as my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has said, is that in the past there have been relatively few of these sales, but now every week The Evening Telegram must have a dozen in every weekend of people whose homes are being taken from them and sold under powers of sale. And it is becoming a very real problem. It is one where the Province ought to move and we wonder whether the minister is prepared to consider it and then hopefully to introduce legislation.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Justice

MR. OTTENEHIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly the concern expressed by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), and by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is I think a legitimate one and where as these matters may not have the even potential seriousness - I use the word potential because I do not know how frequently these things happen - but the potential seriousness -

MR. ROBERTS: Much more frequently than they used to be.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - in a more stable economic climate, today with the economic climate as it is, and the difficulty people have in making payments, and high interest rates, certainly these potentialities are more serious. Certainly we

MR. OTTENHEIMER: will undertake to look into and make a study on the matter suggested, including a procedural code with respect to public notice and with respect to a requirement of sale to the highest bidder.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: A further supplementary, because as we all agree it is important. I wonder if the minister would also look into the type of legislation that I understand is in effect in Western Canada, where if a mortgagee seizes his property and sells it, that extinguishes his right to go against the mortgagor. In Newfoundland of course, as many people have learned to their cost, when the property is seized and sold, if there is still a deficiency in the amount due, the debt due, then the former owner of the property, the mortgagor, is still at risk, is still liable to pay that debt. In Alberta and Saskatchewan that is not so, I understand. I do not know about BC. The analogy in Newfoundland, I would suggest to the minister, is in our conditional sales legislation where the security holder has a choice, he may either seize himself or he may sue. He cannot do both. If he takes back the car and sells it, he does then forfeit his right

MR. ROBERTS: to go against the former purchaser of the car under personal covenant for the balance of the debt, and yet in real estate we still have this hangover from the old days. So I wonder if the minister would look at that as well. It is a major point, and not one of which he would want to commit himself here. But it is an important one where, you know, hundreds of Newfoundlanders are now being caught, whereas a few years ago I understand there were relatively few, now there are hundreds every year of people whose homes are being taken from them, and they are still at risk on these personal covenants.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think what probably should be done in this area would be a study of the legislation in at least Canadian jurisdictions, and not necessarily limit it to Canada, but they would certainly be the most relevant. And to look at these and related matters in legislation of other provinces and then to consider what changes are necessary in our own legislation in view of that.

MR. ROBERTS: Ours is badly out of date.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the Premier if he is in a position to inform me or the House when he will be meeting with the Markland Hospital Improvement Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position at the present moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: On a related matter, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CALLAN: the Minister of Health

(Mr. House) is not in his seat so perhaps I can ask the Premier. In connection with the Clarenville hospital, in the budget there is approximately \$2 million allocated for the Clarenville hospital this year. Last year there was \$600,000 allocated, only \$240,000 of which was actually spent. Let me ask the Premier is the Clarenville hospital going to be built on the site that was cleared some five or six or seven years ago or will it be built a new site?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well there is a lot in the preamble to the hon.member's question. He tries to make a point before he asks a separate question. The point was that of money alloted last year in the budget

PREMIER PECKFORD: for Clarendville, only a small amount of it was spent. I think that might not be as the hon. member tries to imply that it is, because there could be invoices outstanding for the planning work that would have to be paid.

MR. ROBERTS: There should be no bills outstanding -

PREMIER PECKFORD: So I do not know just how much money was spent under that -

MR. ROBERTS: - according to the Financial Administration Act.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) will be quiet while the member is trying to answer a question he -

MR. ROBERTS: If the member would answer accurately.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It does not make any difference how I answer, it does not give the member for the Strait of Belle Isle the right to interrupt.

MR. CALLAN: I think I struck a nerve.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a verbal gymnastics battle with the member for the Strait of Belle Isle when I am supposed to have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I will go on with another speech.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman for the Strait of Belle Isle knows what he is talking about.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He thinks he knows what he is talking about. That is the problem why he is still not the leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Do not interrupt the minister. He is trying to table a report.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Have the Premier called to order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The member for the Strait of Belle Isle called me to order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I table the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum drilling regulations 1982, which have been prepared and proclaimed under the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Act of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Here is the copy, and there are copies for hon. members as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table some subordinate legislation and these are the editions of the Newfoundland Gazette, published between November 20th., 1981 and June 16th., 1982. And I am sure they make very good reading on the long weekend. I especially tabled them today for that purpose.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have answers to two questions asked by members of the Opposition on May th 10th., and May 19th.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table answers to two questions asked by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), questions 96 and 99.

MR. ROBERTS: Well tabled. Well tabled.

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1468

NM - 3

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 2, Committee of Supply.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

Before we start

this morning I wish to inform members that there are two hours and five minutes left in this part of our debate.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the Premier would remain in his seat because we have some hard questions to put to the hon. gentleman. We could not finish his departmental estimates during his absence. We deliberately stalled the passing of his salary until he returned to the House in his seat so that we could ask him a few questions about some very important matters and some very important statements that he has been making lately. The first one I would like to deal with, Mr. Chairman - and I am sure the hon. gentleman is listening to me. At least I hope he is because we hope to get some answers from him. Or is he running away because he cannot stand the heat, the pressure? Is he going to leave it to the hon. House Leader?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, you will see him coming back now.

MR. NEARY: I hope I will be able to drag him back into the House.

MR. TULK: He is gone to the auditorium.

MR. NEARY: Or is he gone down to the auditorium now to give us a lecture before we adjourn for the Summer recess? School is out and I would think that the legislature will follow suit very shortly. Mr. Chairman, would the hon. the Premier tell the House whether he has his problems with the CBC television straightened out? Has he apologized to the CBC? Has he apologized for this childish display on the part of the Premier and has

MR. NEARY: he removed the restrictions, the ban that he has placed on interviews with the CBC, namely that he will not do an interview with CBC television unless it is carried, the full version is carried and not edited? Now would the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, inform the House whether that ban has been lifted, whether the government now will stop attempting to monitor CBC television news or CBC news, period, I guess? And will the hon. gentleman stop trying to manage the media in this Province. Mr. Chairman, the Parliamentary Press Gallery took a drastic measure recently - it is unprecedented, I suppose, unprecedented in the history of this Province - when the Parliamentary Press Gallery Association had to run a public ad in a newspaper to try to get the Premier of this Province to come to his senses and to stop this foolish nonsense that he was getting on with about trying to manage and monitor and control the statements made to one .

MR. NEARY:

of the major medium of news in this Province. So we would like to find out if that has been straightened out, Mr. Chairman, or if any negotiations are going on between the Premier and the Press Gallery Association or the CBC to get this matter straightened out? That is one item we would like to get an answer to, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, also yesterday before the House rose I was dealing with the matter of the Premier's pictures. I was in the process of describing for hon. members, especially hon. members on the opposite side, that when they kiss the Premier's picture they are not kissing the original Premier. They are not kissing the Premier as he really is as a human being. Hon. members should realize that when they go into the Cabinet Room and bend over to kiss this picture lying on the cushion, when they throw themselves prostrate on the floor, Mr. Chairman, to kiss the hon. gentleman's picture, that they must bear in mind that Rostotski had some difficulty in getting the finished product.

MR. CALLAN: Who?

MR. NEARY: Rostotski. He had to touch it up considerably, Mr. Chairman, in order to make it look half decent. I understand because of the thinning of the hair on the front of the Premier's head that Rostotski had to use a brush to put some extra hair on the front of the head. I said that yesterday and I am going to say something new today. And then the bags had to be taken out from underneath the eyes. And then, Mr. Chairman, I am also told - or we were told - that they had to take a piece of white paper -

MR. TULK: Toilet paper.

MR. NEARY: No, not toilet paper - and roll it up and shove it up the sleeves, because the Premier was wearing

MR. NEARY:

a short sleeve shirt, to make it look like he was wearing a long sleeve shirt and what you can see actually is paper and not a shirt.

MR. TOBIN:

What is wrong with that?

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all fine. We do not mind him making the Premier as presentable as they can -

MR. TULK:

That is a difficult job.

MR. NEARY:

- which is a very difficult chore in itself. But what we want to know, Mr. Chairman, is

MR. NEARY: how much these photographs of the Premier that have been framed and hung in ministers' offices cost. We want an updating. We want to find out how much it is costing the people of this Province to have the Premier framed and hanged.

AN HON. MEMBER: The one in the airport?

MR. NEARY: Well the one out at the airport, I presume, that is rented space by Mr. Rostotski who wants to try to promote his business. We cannot argue about that one, Mr. Chairman, although we can argue about the fact that Mr. Rostotski did not use very good discretion in hanging a picture of a politician in a federal airport. I guarantee you that is not very discreet, and the hon. gentleman is probably losing more business as a result of that than he is gaining.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is very indiscreet, Mr. Chairman, that is a federal airport, a federal building, it is very indiscreet on the part of the photographer to use a picture of the Premier of this Province in that federal building. And I am surprised, Mr. Chairman -

MR. TOBIN: Why does he not put Trudeau's picture there?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right because Mr. Trudeau is more discreet. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the federal Department of Transport has not ordered that gentleman to remove that picture from the airport. It is alright for him to put wedding pictures there, and so forth and so on, of families and that sort of thing, but unless he is going to put up the picture of the Prime Minister of Canada, all the members of Parliament from Newfoundland,

MR. NEARY: all the member of the House of Assembly then, Mr. Chairman, I would say it is very indiscreet on the part of that photographer to put that picture up at the airport. But what we want to know is how much -

MR. TOBIN: What is wrong with it? What is wrong with putting that picture up?

MR. NEARY: What is wrong with it up? It should not be put up in a federal airport, playing politics with a federal building. Why should a picture of

MR. S. NEARY: the Premier be hanging over in the Aquarena? Why should it.

MR. TOBIN: Why should not a picture be hanging there?

MR. NEARY: Why should it be hanging in the government buildings of this Province? We are not in a South American banana republic. We found out what happened to Galtieri the other day, and the same thing will happen in this Province. A couple of weeks ago the President of Argentina was idolized, they were demonstrating in the streets. And what happened today? They flung him out, and the same thing will happen to the Premier of this Province. The next thing it will be the uniform with a little medal on it, with 'Hero', marked on the medal. That is what we will have next. A great big medal about that size with 'Hero' across it and his own uniform. I noticed, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen any bodyguards around lately. Have the bodyguards disappeared? Are they gone? I have not seen any bodyguards around the House now for a week or so.

DR. COLLINS: He is using invisible men.

MR. NEARY: They are invisible now, are they? Or are they just hiding somewhere so they cannot be seen? But I have not seen any bodyguards around recently and I am wondering if they are still around or have they been ordered back on their regular duty?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Time flies.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words to say.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The Opposition you know, they are supposed to be enquiring into the expenditures in the Executive Council, and I would just ask any reasonable person to tell us in what respect or respects the hon. member has made any remarks that are pertinent to the expenditure of money. I mean the thing he talks about is the Premier's picture, and the Premier's picture is supposed to be on a Cabinet table on a cushion and what have you, you know. And, Mr. Chairman, the thing is it might have been in the hon. gentleman's time, he might have been used to that, But there was no cushion though, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And that explains why the hon. gentleman is making the remarks he is. He has got the brains knocked out of him, whatever he had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: He kept going in there and banging his head on the table. So, Mr. Chairman, I mean that is as much sense as the hon. gentleman has made, really.

MR. SIMMS: Good answer.

MR. MARSHALL: But seriously, I mean we are into estimates here and the hon. gentleman has not asked a single question relative to the expenditures. We are talking about expending, you know, \$900 million here. We have gone through, and as I say again, nine hours, ten hours, eleven hours of listening to the hon. gentleman getting on with his inane, stupid, idiotic observations about the,

MR. MARSHALL: you know, the press gallery, he has beaten that to death, he has beaten the House to death; he has beating everything, he is beating us to death, really. But, Mr. Chairman, look, just so it will be known, there are only two hours left in these deliberations, he has not asked a question on the Inter-governmental Affairs Secretariat. The Opposition has not asked a question on the Cabinet Secretariat, it has not asked a question on Treasury Board, all very vital and important concerns to this Province.

Now the hon. gentleman there opposite talks about there would be a better investigation into the estimates if they were brought into the House. And we certainly have not seen, by what the hon. gentleman has done under his leadership, that that would be so. As a matter of fact, we have seen all to the contrary. Imagine now how edifying it would be if we brought all of the estimates back in the House and had to listen to seventy-five hours of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now I mean that really and truly. Now compare that and I suggest that people should weigh what is being said and compare it to the information that has gotten out as a result of the Committees, where you have seven members committees, and questions are asked of ministers and information comes out as to the working of the departments, information comes out as to the effective expenditure of money. So you know the proof is there. Those estimate committees are working. They are certainly working in a much more superior manner than here in the House. And he has not even allowed his Finance critic to speak. I mean, the whips are really out there with him, even only with a half a lash, which is all he has, to wield over the people in the Opposition. He will not let the Finance critic speak.

June 18, 1982

Tape 1473

NM - 2

AN HON. MEMBER:

- half a lash.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, he has got them under tow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH:

In tow.

MR. MARSHALL:

- in tow. And, Mr. Chairman, he talks about the Premier not being here. Now you know the Premier has a lot of business to transact for the Province, and the Premier is always here in the House. Of the three Premiers that we have had experience with in the House, I am sure there is no premier that has been here for ordinary routine of business moreso than the present Premier of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Can anyone really say in this House and in this Committee that his time would be better spent here than in the Estimate Committees? If that were so they would be doing it. I have been here, sitting down here waiting to answer questions with respect to the Estimates, the individual expenditures in the Estimates, and there really has not been anything to answer, there has been nothing to answer, completely and absolutely nothing.

MR. TULK: Well said. Your are perfect, yes.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman wants to comment on it, I have a press briefing in a little while on the drilling regulations, so I will be out then, but I know my colleagues will be able to respond and I do not even have to give any of my colleagues any notes on it. Because there are no questions, I repeat again, just silly things with respect to pictures and the press gallery and bodyguards, I suppose the question of the bodyguards is half legitimate but I am not going to respond to that. I mean, the matter is security of the Premier, or any elected official, and I do not think it serves the public interest at all to give out a lot of information with respect to that. I mean, the hon. gentlemen can see by looking around them at the present time, when the Premier is around of what has happened with respect to the bodyguards and what have you.

MR. NEARY: Are they gone?

MR. MARSHALL: But they are not presently there, but that is not to say that there are not necessary security arrangements that unfortunately have to be attended to on the situation. But I am not going to give it to the hon. gentleman because the hon. gentleman just makes sport of it. And not only

MR. MARSHALL: that, I do not mind him making sport of it, If the hon. gentleman wishes to make a fool of himself he can be our guest every day of the week, I mean I do not mind that. But I am not going to give out information that could have unfortunate repercussions in respect to it. Honestly though, Mr. Chairman, I say it again, you know, it is quite obvious: Imagine getting up on, you know, the business of the pictures, And as I say, he speaks from experience, He has obviously had whatever the good Lord gave him reemed out of him or knocked out of him by beating his head against the Cabinet table when the former Premier was here, because he knows the procedure. That is the procedure that they all did. Imagine every morning going in, a picture of

MR. MARSHALL: Premier Smallwood on the desk and they beating not their breasts, but beating their heads on the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: No wonder there was a one-man government, Mr. Chairman, make no wonder there was a one-man government over there. Make no wonder the hon. gentleman there opposite cannot contribute to the debate or contribute anything to the debate. So what I suggest he do, if he would allow some of his colleagues to get up perhaps we might hear something of some sense.

MR. SIMMS: The member for Bellevue asks good questions. He is sensible.

MR. MARSHALL: The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) he asks good questions. He asked a good question yesterday in the Late Show and he asked a good question of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has gotten up and asked legitimate questions with respect to the forestry and agriculture and the stumpage thing and they were very constructive. So, you know -

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak, you would almost be prepared to chant you know, 'Bring Don home for good, or it is time for Len Stirling again'. Anything is better than the hon. gentleman there opposite and his inanities, because there is nothing, and I repeat again, there is nothing that the hon. gentleman has said that warrants a reply, and he is not getting one except what we have already said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Before I recognize the next speaker I would like to rule on a point of order that

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): I reserved ruling on yesterday, a point of order raised by the President of the Council which had to do with a statement by the Leader of the Opposition. The statement was, "What else would you expect from a parrot, Mr. Chairman?" The hon. Leader of the Opposition did not actually call anyone a parrot so there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the Premier is not going to sit in this House to pilot his own estimates through the House then the least they could do is to put one of these expensive coloured pictures over there on his desk, stand it on his desk so we would not be talking to a vacant seat. At least we would have one of these expensive coloured pictures paid for by the taxpayers of this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are they listening?

MR. NEARY: They are listening do not worry - to talk to. Mr. Chairman, we are told that some of these pictures, to have them done, cost in the vicinity of \$1500. Rostotski is an expensive photographer and he believes in perfection. To have the Premier of this Province pose and have his picture taken and touched up, some extra hair put on his head and other things done with the photograph it is a pretty expensive undertaking and we would like to know how much these pictures are costing. How much it is costing to have copy prints made?

MR. YOUNG: That is not in this year's estimates.

MR. NEARY: It is not in this year's estimates. Well what year's estimates is it in?

MR. YOUNG: I do not know.

June 18,1982

Tape No. 1475

ah-3

MR.NEARY:

Oh, the hon. gentleman does not know.

MR. SIMMS:

It was years ago, you should have asked that question two years ago.

MR. NEARY: Yes. We are going to continue to ask the question because prints of the pictures are continuously be made and framed and hung in public buildings.

MR. SIMMS: When are you going to start a new line of questioning. And forget all that old stuff? Remember your speech on opening day? It was an excellent speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, so there is a very legitimate question. We want to know how much these pictures are costing. And we want to know also - if we could only get the Premier back in his seat. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, he is in a manic depressive state and they will not allow him to come into the House because he goes berserk while we are doing his estimates, while we are asking him about these matters. We would like to know how many hours a week are set aside, how many hours a week the Premier sets aside to have his picture taken, and how many hours a week he actually devotes to his job? And while we are doing his salary we would like to know that. But most important of all, Mr. Chairman, is his attitude towards Canada. We believe the Premier should be in his seat this morning to answer criticism levelled at the hon. gentleman.

MR. YOUNG: By Whom?

MR. NEARY: By the Opposition, by the newspapers and writers, editorial writers across Canada, about his anti-Canadian stance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman is listening to me - if the hon. gentleman was in his seat I would like for all hon. gentlemen on the other side, by the way, led by the Premier and the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), to stand up in their places in this House one after the other and repeat after me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I would like for the Premier of this Province, and especially the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), to go on record by saying the following: I am a proud Canadian. My country is Canada. It is the country of my children and I am proud of that. Now, Mr. Chairman, I dare the hon. the Premier

MR. NEARY: and the Minister of Energy
(Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council, and member for
St. John's East, the House Leader to stand in their places in
this House and repeat that sentence.

MR. BAIRD: I did yesterday.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did no such
thing yesterday.

MR. BAIRD: Pretend I did.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the hon.
gentleman has to tow the party line. And the party line at
the moment is separate from Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. NEARY: And I, Mr. Chairman-

MR. BAIRD: But we do have a party line, which
is more than I can say for the other side.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I now challenge
the Premier, the President of the Council, every member of
the Cabinet and every backbencher on the government side of
the House to stand and repeat what I just said.

MR. DOYLE: Sing O'Canada.

DR. COLLINS: Do you want the hon. Premier's
picture?

MR. REID: Do you have any idea what this
is costing the taxpayers?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I realize how much it
is costing. But how much it is costing the taxpayers to pay
for these trips, where the anti-Canadian statements are made?
The hon. gentleman got a lot of room to talk. Now what was
that they accused him of being? Being a puppet. The hon.
gentleman they said is a puppet for the Premier. A puppet.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman goes into a public meeting and he is scared of his constitutions, he backs away from them. He says I am going to fight for you. I am going to keep your hospital. And then he goes out and when he is interviewed by the press he does a complete flip flop, he says, ' No, that is not what I meant at all.' The hon. gentleman has done that on two occasions now, Mr. Chairman. Is it any wonder they accused the hon. gentleman of being a puppet, a puppet of the Premier.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter.

MR. DINN: It is not.

MR. NEARY: It is a very serious- why does not the hon. gentleman get up and repeat what I just said?

MR. DINN: Who would want to repeat after you?

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see, Mr. Chairman. The trouble is that they are too ashamed, they are too ashamed Mr. Chairman, they are ashamed of the Premier's statements. They hang their heads every time they hear these separatist statements made by the hon. gentleman. They hang their heads in shame, like cowards, every time they hear the Premier talk about leading Newfoundland out of Confederation, and making anti-Confederate statements and anti- Canadian statements.

MR. DOYLE: That is not relevant.

MR. NEARY: It certainly is relevant because we are

MR. NEARY: talking about the Premier's salary. And Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I can amend his salary or not to have him stand in this House - I think one of the things that the Premier should do before we pass his salary is stand in this House and repeat what I just said. I am a proud Canadian. My Country is Canada. It is the Country of my children and I am proud of it.

Do you think, Mr. Chairman, we will ever see the day when the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier of this Province will be able to stand, hold their heads high with their chests out, and say that they are proud Canadians? Will we ever see that day, Mr. Chairman? Or will they continue the course they are on now and lead Newfoundland out of Confederation?

MR. DINN: You are trying to be the next Leader.

MR. NEARY: No, I certainly am not. But I think it is time now, Mr. Chairman, it is time for members on the other side to stand up and be counted.

MR. BAIRD: We do that every time we have a vote.

MR. NEARY: Oh they do, eh? They do it every time they have a vote. Stand up. Stand up for Canada. The Liberal Party stands for Canada. We are for Canada. We are for Confederation. We are for Newfoundland. The hon. red roaring Tory, let him get up and say, "I am a proud Canadian."

DR. COLLINS: I just sang Oh Canada, for gosh sakes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman now can skirt the issue all he wants. Well, let us put it to the test today. Let us find out how many true Newfoundlanders and true Canadians are in this House. Let the minister who just walked into the House, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), I challenge him now, Mr. Chairman, and I will take my seat and I will listen to hear what the hon. gentleman says, let him stand

MR. NEARY: up and repeat after me, I am a proud Canadian. My Country is Canada. It is the Country of my children and I am proud of it.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the last speech has violated all of the acceptable tenets of good taste that we have come to look upon as acceptable in this House of Assembly. The only thing I can say in his favour is that he was approved of very highly by the space visitors here yesterday. I noticed them looking over in that direction. And they did feel right at home because there is lots of space over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: In fact they were looking at the hon. gentlemen as if they were from another world, which of course they are, the underworld.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Anyway, with those few remarks I would like to get into something serious.

The Premier's salary, of course, gives us the excuse, or at least everyone else has taken it as an excuse, to make a wide-ranging debate and so I am going to take the same privilege unless I am stopped. And by looking at

MR. J. CARTER: Page 11 in the General Budget Book - that is the one with the lighthouse on it, the one that looks like the telephone directory, except it does not have as much information in it. On page 11 we note that the revenue from SSA is going to be \$286 million this year, This is estimated, of course. Now there is also a federal sales tax on most articles, in fact there is a federal sales tax of 9 per cent on more articles than there is a provincial sales tax of 11 per cent on articles. Therefore, I think you can safely say that the amount of money that is paid directly to the federal government by any purchaser in Newfoundland is of the order of \$300 million, This is an approximate figure, but I think it is a figure we can safely write down and accept as genuine.

The amount of income tax that we pay is estimated at \$241 million, and since the provincial income tax is 59 per cent of the federal tax, it is a safe assumption to say that the amount of federal tax - this is dollars that we pay out of our pockets, directly to Ottawa - will be, this year, about \$400 million.

The gasoline tax is estimated to be \$61 million. There is also a federal tax on gasoline, I am not sure of the exact rate, I understand that it is more than the provincial rate and also it is more widely set, therefore, I think I can safely say that the amount of money paid to the federal government on behalf of gasoline and oil is \$100 million.

Corporation Tax is \$53 million, estimated. The federal Corporation Tax is almost 50 per cent, much higher, therefore, we can safely say that the amount of federal tax paid by corporations to Canada, to Ottawa directly, is of the order of \$200 million.

MR. J. CARTER: The Provincial Tobacco Tax is estimated at \$35 million. There is also a federal tobacco tax, rather more than the provincial tobacco tax and, therefore, I think we can say that the federal government will be receiving \$50 million from Newfoundlanders who smoke.

Similarly with the Liquor Tax, and there I have taken a figure out of the air saying the federal government, at least, makes as much on liquor as we do, and we are estimating \$60 million. Therefore, the federal government will be taking in about \$60 million from all Newfoundlanders who consume alcohol.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a grand total of \$1,110,000,000 cash, negotiable liquid assets, that is paid out of Newfoundlanders' pockets this year into the federal government. Now, that is hardly an estimate, it is a very close, accurate figure.

Now, then using the same page, what do we get from the federal government?

MR. CARTER: Taxequalization of \$550 million, and established programme financing - \$155 million, other - \$22 million, for a total of \$727 million. So we pay out of our pockets \$1,110 million to Ottawa, we receive in the same sort of specie \$727 million. Now I have omitted customs duties, I do not know, I have no way of estimating how much customs duties Newfoundlanders pay to Ottawa, but it must be considerable. It is not just a paltry sum, because a lot of stuff is imported from the United States and, of course, everything that is imported from the United States has a customs tax to be paid on it and sometimes quite a high tax, it can be as high as 50 per cent.

Now I realize that we also receive from Ottawa such things as old age pensions and baby bonuses, but I deliberately left out unemployment insurance, because although it is not a self-sustaining fund it is supposed to be, it is supposed to be a fund that looks after itself. And there are certain federal pensions and a few odds and ends but I do not think there is any need for us to grovel or to hang our heads in shame, we are paying our fair share of the cost of Confederation the same as any other Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CARTER: And it does not take much ability at arithmetic to be able to establish that. And for the hon. member to suggest that we are anything but, you know, reasonable Canadians who are paying our fair share, I think is a disgusting -

MR. DAWE: What about our fish, 'John', what about the fish they are giving away?

MR. CARTER: I really wonder if the hon. gentleman was born at all or if he just accumulated, I really do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So I think it is a disgrace.

MR. DAWE: Look at our fish that they are giving away.

MR. CARTER: Well, I mean, when you consider the amount of our goods and services or our resources that are being carted away, when you consider the lies that Pinnochio Lalonde - the character of Pinnochio, when he was first made by the puppeteer, whenever he told a lie his nose got a little bit longer. Now I am not going to suggest that Mr. Lalonde is a liar, but I do suggest that his nose is considerably longer in the last few months -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: - and getting longer and longer.

And, you know, while I continue on this theme, although it is a little far removed from the Premier's salary, still the remark that was made by Trudeau just a few days ago in Yugoslavia, when he sort of made an announcement to coincide with the new leader of Yugoslavia, that Israel should get out of Beirut,

MR. J. CARTER: when Israel is just trying to defend itself from the PLO, and for our Prime Minister to make what I consider to be a communist statement, that says enough, the fellow is just a fellow traveller of third world Marxists he is a disgrace and should be removed. Meanwhile, the Canadian dollar, of course, is plummeting and MacEachen says there is nothing he can do about it, I would say if he went out and hanged himself tomorrow morning the Canadian dollar would surge ahead. That is the least he could do. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I did want to make these few serious points and any hon. gentleman can go through the same exercise, the figures are there. I accept the figures that the provincial government gave us. The federal government figures obviously have to be estimated or guesstimated, but I think it is a reasonably fair and close estimate and it is a very revealing one. So with those few remarks I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, I am beginning to wonder what he does with the savory up there at Mount Scio place. I do not know if you can get high on savory or not, but the hon. gentleman certainly sounds like he is freaked out this morning, that he has had a toke before he came into the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the savory is having an unsavory affect on the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if you can sniff savory or not, Mr. Chairman, but certainly there is something wrong with the hon. gentleman to make him beside himself, He is very much beside himself this morning. The hon. gentleman, I did not hear him repeat what I asked hon. members to say, that I am a proud Canadian, I did not hear the hon. gentleman repeat that. The hon. gentleman is one of the red roaring Tories in this House who would not have the courage to get up and admit that he is a Canadian. What does the hon. gentleman do when he goes abroad, when he goes to England and Europe and these places? Does he admit that he is a Canadian?

MR. CARTER: I would not admit that I was a neighbour of yours.

MR. NEARY: I see, You would not, eh?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear all hon. gentlemen get up and speak on this subject we are on. We are talking about -

MR. NEARY: We are talking about who stands for Canada and who is against Canada. Tories in this Province are against Canada, the Liberals are for Canada and for Confederation.

MR. BAIRD: That is your idea, it is not mine.

MR. NEARY: It is not my idea it is the Premier who has drawn - the Premier has drawn the battle lines. The Premier has drawn the dividing line.

MR. NEARY: The Premier has made the distinction between Liberals and Tories in this Province. The Liberals stand up for Confederation and Canada, and the Premier of this Province and his colleagues are trying to fracture it and smash Canada and smash Confederation.

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1481

RA - 3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let us hear the hon. gentleman get up and say he is a proud Canadian.

MR. WALSH: Who walked out of the House last Friday?

MR. NEARY: Yes, and for very good reasons.

MR. NEARY: And when we did walk out - the hon. gentleman, by the way, who has not the courage to speak while we are in the House, spoke while we were out, the first time, I think, he has spoken since he was elected to the House - the first time the hon. gentleman has spoken, my advice to the hon. gentleman is go and learn the rules of the House before he speaks again.

DR. COLLINS: You did not hear it the other day, you missed a marvellous speech.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we certainly did. Mr. Chairman, to put it mildly, it was uncouth.

MR. WALSH: I would have to go along way to catch up to you.

MR. NEARY: Uncouth.

MR. TOBIN: You would give away Newfoundland. You gave it away. Not give it away, you gave it away.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let hon. members stop their gutter sniping over there, stop behaving like the Muppet Show and get up and make a speech for Canada, not against Canada.

MR. STAGG: How about sitting down and I will give you one.

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. gentleman get up and say - will the hon. gentleman repeat this - write it down. Write it down - I am a proud Canadian.

MR. STAGG: I am a proud Canadian, no problem.

MR. NEARY: My country is Canada.

MR. STAGG: My country is Canada. Can I be forgiven?

MR. NEARY: It is the country of my children and I am proud of it.

MR. STAGG: It is the country of my children and I am proud of it. Now, will you sit down?

MR. NEARY: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, after I take my seat the hon. gentleman will get up and repeat what I just said, and maybe

MR. NEARY: he will be able to persuade the Premier to do it. I am more interested in getting the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to make that statement.

MR. STAGG: You are a typical Liberal, you promise something and then renege.

MR. NEARY: I would like to hear the hon. gentleman say it. It would warm the cockles of our hearts -

MR. STAGG: Warm the cockles of your heart?

MR. NEARY: - to hear the hon. gentleman say it, but -

MR. STAGG: I should have brought that down to LaPoile and run you out.

MR. NEARY: But we want the Premier to get up and say it.

DR. COLLINS: Rubbish!

MR. TOBIN: That is right you should have ran in LaPoile.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Ottawa is looking down his nose at you 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we would like to get the front row over here. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) would say it, but I do not think the hon. Premier, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would say it. I do not think they would have the courage. I do not think they are prepared to admit that they are good Canadians because they are not. According to the statements that they have been making they are not good Canadians. Mr. Chairman, they can prove me wrong.

The hon. Premier can prove to the whole world that he is a good Canadian by coming into this House, and he is listening to me down on the loudspeaker, down on the Eighth Floor, - and stand up and say I am a proud Canadian and then go across Canada and say the same thing, and travel throughout the world and say I am proud to live in Canada, it is the best country in the world to live in.

I would like to see the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) stand in this House and say that.

MR. TOBIN: Are you proud to be where you are?
(inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they are so full of anti-
Canadian slogans, they are so anti-Confederate, and anti -
Canadian

MR. NEARY: that they are ashamed, they are ashamed to stand in this House and bare their souls and admit they were wrong, that they are living in the finest country in the world, and that they should be proud to be Canadians. And every time they hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) bring down his Budget and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) announces to the whole world that 55 per cent of the revenue of this Province comes from Ottawa, all hon. gentlemen should say, Amen, I am a proud Canadian. When the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tells the House that \$600 million is coming from Ottawa this year in equalization grants, the hon. gentlemen should say, Amen, Amen, Alleluia, thank God we are proud Canadians. Every time they sign a DREE agreement, every time they sign a housing agreement, every time they sign a transportation agreement, every time a loan goes out from the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation to a fish plant, and every time social assistance recipients get their cheques, 50 per cent paid for by the Government of Canada, every time you present your MCP card, every time they collect unemployment insurance, every time veterans and old age pensioners get their allowances, the Premier and members of the administration should say, Alleluia, Amen, thank God we are proud Canadians.

MR. TOBIN: Just imagine how much would have been eliminated if you had not given away the Churchill Falls. It would be some turn around then.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing that something was developed to give them something to criticize and talk about. At least we have given them a foundation to build on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if that hon. gentleman down there who should be seen and not heard for the first year in this House is aware of it or not, but the government that he is supporting spent \$300 million to set off two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to start the lower Churchill Falls development. What does the hon. gentleman have to say about that? - \$300 million of taxpayer's money. The holes are in the ground to prove it, a hole on the Labrador side and a hole on this side and maybe they should shove, maybe they should stuff the hon. gentleman down in one of these holes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman should also learn, Mr. Chairman, that in order to speak in this House the rules say you have to be in your own seat.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right, and you have to stand up to be recognized.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he go and check the record of the development of the Lower Churchill. According to the public record, the Lower Churchill development started prior to the election in 1975.

MR. TOBIN: What about the Upper Churchill?

MR. NEARY: What about it? At least it is built, it is constructed, it is there, you can see it. What about the \$300 million?

MR. TOBIN: And you gave it away to Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I understand you are supposed to be in your seat in this House. Another little gem, by the way,

MR. NEARY: another little gem for these new members to remember is this, that the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the present Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), sat in this House when the BRINCO agreement was approved for the development of the Upper Churchill and they never raised a finger or a voice in protest of it. They were in the Opposition at that time and they voted in favour of that bill.

MR. TOBIN: What did you say against it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they voted in favour of that bill. And hindsight, you know, hindsight is a wonderful thing. At that time oil was \$1.65 a barrel and not even the Rothschilds, the Rothschilds who were the ones who negotiated the agreement, not even they knew that oil was going to go to \$34 a barrel, or \$40 a barrel, whatever it is. Not even they knew that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I will come back at this shortly then.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman, for the first time I have managed to get the floor when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) wanted to get it as well. Although I would yield to the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No, I am just turning around to hear your speech.

MR. STAGG: I see. Well, Mr. Chairman, what we have heard here this morning from the present Leader of the Opposition is another Stirling speech. It is a Stirling speech of the kind that was uttered on many occasions by his predecessor in the chair, the now ex-member for Bonavista North, the former Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that speeches of that type are going to result in the same kind of result for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as they did for the member for Bonavista North. As you probably recall, the member for LaPoile is only twenty votes shy of being in the same position as the member for Bonavista North. He won the election by thirty-nine votes and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman that-

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

MR. CHAIRMAN(Dr. McNicholas): Order, please! A point of Order-. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a quorum call, there is no quorum in the House.

MR. STAGG: Nonsense, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BAIRD: And the only one Liberal, please note. No a half Liberal.

QUORUM CALL:

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1485

MJ - 1

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!
I would ask the Clerk to count the numbers.

There is a quorum present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have recited the little poem, the little bit of verse that the member for Lapoile (Mr. S. Neary), the present in-House Leader of the Opposition comprised, because he thinks it is going to be something that we on this side of the House are afraid to say, that we are afraid to say that we are proud Canadians and we are proud that our children are Canadians and this sort of thing. Well, whatever needs to be said, consider it said, ditto to everything that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said and I will put it there is spades, capital letters or whatever, I am proud to be a Canadian. But, Mr Chairman, one of the problems that the Leader of the Opposition has is that he equates being Canadian with being Liberal. You see, he is under the impression that in order to be a proud Canadian one must support the divisive stands taken by the federal/Liberal party which have, in fact, driven wedges between portions of Canada, and they hope by doing so, that they can divide and conquer and keep you off base and hopefully the people will turn against you because of the economic problems that will be encountered. That is the plan. It is a sinister plan. It is the same kind of plan that Mr. Kirby, the man who is now supposedly investigating our fishery, it is the same kind of plan he put forward to the Prime Minister in

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1485

MJ - 2

MR. F. STAGG:

September of 1981 - '80 or '81

I am not sure which it was now - when he devised a plan, how
to divide and conquer the provinces at the Constitutional Conference.
This is how you do it. You play this one up, you play this one
against that one and hopefully they will all end up at one
another's throats and we will come out of it okay. This is Mr.
Kirby, the man who is now investigating the Newfoundland fishery.
Well, I certainly hope that Mr. Kirby does a better job in
bringing about

MR. STAGG: some reason and rationale to the federal position in the Newfoundland fishery than he did in that particular episode. Because fortunately some proud Canadian in the Prime Minister's office released that document, that nefarious document that Mr. Kirby had composed, released it to the press, and it became very much a source of embarrassment to to the Federal Liberal Party. That is the type of proud Canadians that are in the Liberal Party.

Now the real proud Canadians, the people who really want to be part of this country and the people who are striving to give to Canada and to give to Newfoundlanders their just desserts within Canada are the party led by the Premier. Now the most recent problems that we have had with the Federal Liberals - not with Canada, Mr. Chairman, we have no problems with Canada, but we do have a problem with Prime Minister Trudeau, Mr. Lalonde, Mr. Chretien and Mr. Ouelette, Mr. Ouelette who, by the way, when John Crosbie was up making his speech concerning Newfoundland's offshore, and I have it here somewhere - anyway he was interrupting Mr. Crosbie when he was making one of the greatest speeches in support of Newfoundland ever. I have it here, it is on page 18283 of the House of Commons debates. When Mr. Crosbie was speaking, he was defending Newfoundland's position as eloquently as he can, and we all know that he does it very eloquently, Mr. Ouelette was interrupting him. And what did Mr. Ouelette say when Mr. Crosbie asked for the floor? Mr. Ouelette said, "Why do you not go to hell".

MR. TOBIN: Huh! Right there and then. Shame!

MR. STAGG: That is what it says there in Hansard, "Why do you not go to hell". That is what Mr. Ouelette said. And Mr. Ouelette is also the man who some time ago said that Mr. Crosbie was the ultimate Newfie joke. It was Lalonde who said that.

MR. STAGG: Now that is the type of contempt that we in Newfoundland are being faced with time and time again when we are trying to achieve our just place in this Canada.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Chairman, what I would like for the Opposition to do, I would like for them to deal with these two proposals; the proposal made by Newfoundland to the federal government on November 12, 1981, as a framework for agreement concerning the offshore, and the proposal for a settlement of January 25, 1982, the highlights of which are available to them. What I would like for them to do, I would like for the members of the Opposition, as an academic exercise if nothing else, to read the documents. Number one, read the documents. That is a big help because they had not read it during the election. We went through a whole election when the offshore was the issue, and the proposal for settlement which was released by the Premier on the 16th. of March 1982, the election was not until April 6, was not read by any member of the Opposition. You will recall in the famous debate when the Premier held up the proposal for settlement for all the world to see, for all Newfoundland to see at least, and the Leader of the Opposition

MR. STAGG:

did not have a word in his face. Well obviously there was a good reason why.

MR. TOBIN:

Which leader?

MR. STAGG:

That was the then leader, the man who used to make the previous Stirling speeches in this House. And he did not respond to it. I thought he was being coy. Actually he was being ignorant, he had not read it. Now I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), if he wishes to do something constructive during this session of the House of Assembly, to read the proposals and then put forward what the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, the provincial Liberal Party, would consider to be a reasonable settlement. What is a reasonable settlement? What is a reasonable Canadian settlement?

MR. WALSH:

Give it away.

MR. STAGG:

Put it forward, hold a press conference and say, This is what we propose, this is what we think is acceptable. Do something like that, do something constructive and shift the onus to the government and say whether or not it is acceptable. It is something, I think, that they should do, it is something that they should do to earn their money. Because they are all making a fair amount of money, they all have executive positions over there now, there are about 50 per cent of them who have executive positions in the Opposition making all kinds of money. So do something to justify it. Read the proposals that have been put forward by the government concerning the offshore and then come up with a proposal of their own, something that might fly. They appear to have access to Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Rompkey. Mr. Rompkey, who by the way -

MR. BAIRD:

Rumpkey.

MR. STAGG: Well, I will call him Rompkey. Others may call him by other parts of his anatomy, but I will call him Mr. Rompkey. Now, Mr. Rompkey, when he got up to argue in the House of Commons after Mr. Crosbie had spoken, said that the Nova Scotians had a veto in thier agreement with the federal government. He said they had a veto. And when he was exposed by Mr. Crosbie as not knowing what he was talking about, he tried to say that they had an option. But it is there in Hansard, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rompkey thought they had a veto. Now what a man to be negotiating for Newfoundland, or be up there representing Newfoundland. He does not even know what the Nova Scotians have, yet he stands up in the House of Commons giving the Newfoundland/Federal position. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that the hon. members opposite- and I think the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) would be the man who would be most equipped of all the members of the Opposition to analyze the proposal for settlement and the Newfoundland position. I believe he has read it. I believe that of all the members opposite that he is the man, in this particular time, to whom we can look for some leadership on the other side of the House. But for accidents of history and the machinations within the Liberal Party, he would still be the Leader of the Opposition, or might even be Premier of the Province. Who knows? But he was knifed in the back in 1977. Well I suggest that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle is

MR. F. STAGG: the man who, best of all, of all members of the Opposition, and maybe of all members of the Opposition at all times, is best equipped to analyze this and put forward a comprehensive position by the provincial Liberal Party as to what is acceptable on the offshore, what is an acceptable Canadian agreement. And I suggest that they do that quickly, rather than getting up and talking about the Premier's picture and this and that and foolishness which, while it may be amusing, it is comparable to Nero fiddling while Rome burned. Now there are Newfoundlanders are out there burning, there are Newfoundlanders who are going down the tubes, bankruptcies are at an all time high. And the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) this morning, and the member for the Strait for Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), asked some very good questions of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) concerning powers of sale, foreclosures, as they are popularly known in this Province. And that, of course, is only the symptom. The real disease is that we have an economy that is going belly-up, in step with the federal economy. And it is not our fault, we are doing our best under very trying circumstances. Our people, fortunately, have a knowledge of what hard times are, so that they do have some ability to cope with hard times. But, Mr. Chairman, that is the sort of thing that hon. members Opposite should be directing themselves to. What is an acceptable proposal for the provincial Liberal Party? Let us get at it. Let us analyze it and put something forward and maybe we will find some degree of unanimity on that aspect as we found unanimity recently on some motions that went before the House concerning the federal position of taking this matter before the Supreme Court of Canada. Let us find some unanimity on proposals of that type.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1488

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, neither the Premier nor the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) are in the House to answer any questions that we have to put to the government.

DR. COLLINS:

We can answer any questions.

MR. NEARY:

Does the hon. gentleman have the little booklet in front of him to answer the questions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. NEARY:

Well, could the hon. gentleman give us some information about the Classification Appeals Board under the Cabinet Secretariat? Could the hon. gentleman give us the names of the Classification Appeals Board, and how many appeals they heard last year, and how many were upheld and how many were rejected?

DR. COLLINS:

Could you just give me the Heading for that?

MR. NEARY:

It is Heading 303-08, Classification Appeals Board.

DR. COLLINS:

Are you finished?

MR. NEARY:

Sure.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asked some information about a particular heading. Now we, of course, prepare for these sessions in Committee by getting some notes together to try to cover, if possible, any areas where questions might come up. Now, obviously, you know, it is not humanly possible to cover every possible question that might be asked. So whether that detail is in here I am not sure, but I am going to see if I can find it. 303-08 is Classification Appeals Board. The Board was established pursuant to various collective agreements between government and its employees. The Board aids as a final independent arbitration in all individual disputes with respect to employee classifications. That is the objective of the Board. Now, I do not have immediately with me -

MR. NEARY: Do you have the names of the Board?

DR. COLLINS: - I do not have immediately with me the salary Estimates-or have I? I do not have the salary Estimates here, Mr. Chairman, but I can easily - oh, here we are.

MR. NEARY: This is shocking, you know. Is there nobody here to answer any questions? This is terrible!

MR. ROBERTS: None of these working ministers in the House at all.

MR. NEARY: We get criticized for asking questions, when we ask questions we cannot get the answers, there is nobody here to answer the questions. What a farce.

DR. COLLINS: As I say, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to anticipate that there would be information readily at hand for every question. I can tell the hon.

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1489

RA - 2

DR. COLLINS: member that the secretary of the Classification Appeals Board is Ms. Judy Brophy, the other individuals on the board, I will have to take that question under notice and I will get back to the hon. member on that.

DR. COLLINS: The total expenditure on -

MR. NEARY: I gave you one under notice three weeks ago and I have not got the answer yet.

DR. COLLINS: - this may be helpful, the total expenditure on salaries is, for that particular area, \$16,000. And the total salaries for the whole Classification Appeals Board was \$102,000. So I would say there must be perhaps six or seven individuals

DR. COLLINS:

in addition to Ms. Judy Brophy. As to the number of appeals that were heard, again I will have to take notice of that, I do not have that information readily available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, -

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

MR. NEARY: - this is shameful and contemptible. We are asking basic, elementary questions of the administration. We had a lecture there a few moments ago from the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the House Leader, about we were not asking the right questions. I just asked two or three questions that any minister worth his salt would expect to be asked about this Appeals Board.

MR. ROBERTS: It is shameful.

MR. NEARY: Give us the names of the members of the Board. Tell us what they do.

DR. COLLINS: Will you explain the importance of your question?

MR. NEARY: The importance of the question is that we would like to have some information on this item of expenditure.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is refusing to answer now.

DR. COLLINS: Why the names of individuals?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is none of the hon. gentleman's business. We will ask whatever questions we want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The trouble is that the minister does not have the information.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not know the answer, that is all.

MR. NEARY: They should be prepared to admit that the Premier ran away this morning like a coward because he cannot face the music, cannot face the estimates of his department.

MR. ROBERTS: Gone off to look at his picture, has he?

MR. NEARY: Gone out to idolize his picture, down on the cushion in the Cabinet room. And the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is out trying to prop him up, the government House Leader. And so we ask two or three questions.

DR. COLLINS: No, I was just asking permission because you might not want to know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) undertook two and a half weeks ago to get me some information, he said, 'I will take it under advisement and get the hon. gentleman some information'. We have not got the answers yet. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us skip over that one and ask the hon. gentleman some questions about the Newfoundland Statistics Agency. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what that is all about, that \$271,000 and what they do, what the Newfoundland Statistics Agency do, where their offices are, how many are on staff and what kind of statistics they compile?

DR. COLLINS: What page is that?

MR. NEARY: It is the one before the Appeals Board, it is 303-07. We have a whole number of these to

MR. NEARY: run through. If the hon. gentleman has not got the answers, well, let us get the Premier back in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: 303-07 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Embarrassing.

MR. ROBERTS: It is embarrassing. Sorry about that. The Premier is an embarrassment to himself and his Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this is an awful waste of time.

MR. ROBERTS: Look, there is not an important minister in the House.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had carried on for a long period of time this morning on subjects that had no relevance whatever

DR. COLLINS: to the subjects under discussion, and when he was goaded for that by the President of the Council, he immediately ran out to his research assistant and said, 'Give me some questions to ask for which there is no real importance to the answer. For instance, give me a question to ask about the Appeals Board. And he said, 'Well, look, why do you not ask who are the individuals, what are the names of the individuals on the Appeals Board? Now, that has no relevance whatever. It is Mr. Tom Jones as opposed to Mr. Bill Brown, what difference does that make?' It is not of any relevant importance to this House, it is not a matter of information that one with any sense would bring into the House, because you would not expect a sensible member to ask for such a bit of information. However, it has been asked and we are quite willing to get the information.

MR. NEARY: Well, where is the information?
We want it now.

DR. COLLINS: It is something that is down in the files in the basement of this building somewhere. I am sure the names of all the 8,500 public servants in this Province are down in the files in the basement of this building somewhere. And if any member opposite has the inanity to ask what are the names of the 8,500 public servants in this Province, we will be able to get those names. And we will send down for them and bring them up, but it would be a total waste of the time of this committee, it would be a total waste of the expenditure of the public servants in doing it, but we are quite willing to get it, if this is what the hon. members opposite feel is important in this very important Committee. Now if they did have the real interest of the Province at heart, they would ask questions that are not designed just to

DR. COLLINS: catch out, you know, questions that are of no conceivable importance. If the answer is given it will lead to nothing, it will add to nothing, it will gain no one anything. ~~It~~ the hon. members were interested in asking questions that were of importance to the people of this Province, that would be proper work for the hon. members opposite. However, they are not interested in doing that.

Now, the hon. member wants to know what the Newfoundland Statistics Agency is.
MR. NEARY: Yes.
DR. COLLINS: This has been asked by a member who has been in this House, I think, for twenty-three years and at this point in time he still does not know what the Newfoundland Statistics Agency is. I will read it out, and I hope that he will take note while I am reading it out.

DR. COLLINS: "The Newfoundland Statistics Agency Activity consists of nine (9) established positions, see salary details below." And the hon. member has a book of salary details over there, so if he were really interested in knowing how many people were in the agency, all he had to do was look up his salary details. "And entails the collection, analysis, and distribution of statistical information to all government departments and the public sector." Now, that is a bit of information that I am glad to give a member of this House who has been in here for twenty-three years and did not know what the Statistics Agency was all about, and he was assisted by another member, on his right, who has been in here for perhaps twelve or fifteen years and he presumably did not know, because he certainly did not pass the information along. And there are other members who are in here for lesser periods of time. I have given the numbers of position, now the names - I do not have the grandparents of these individuals here but I can get that information if the hon. members opposite wish. The names are Mr. George Courage, Mr. Paul Cranford, Mr. Hugh Ridley - I see the hon. member is not writing down these names so perhaps I should repeat them because we want -

MR. ROBERTS: We get Hansard.

MR. NEARY: We get Hansard every day.

DR. COLLINS: - he wanted this information, he was burning to get this information, he felt it was a disgrace if this information was not available. I would like to see them write this down now just to make sure that we do not have a mispronunciation of one of the names or whatever. Anyway I continue on, there is also Ms. Patrician Hearn, she is also in the agency, there is Miss Roseann Norris, she is also in the agency, do we have any others? Yes, we do. We have Mr. James Warren, Mr. James Warren is in the agency. I bet no one knew that. That is some useful information, I mean, to the committee.

DR. COLLINS: Now, I have other useful information if the hon. members so wish. But let me, just whilst I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, just comment very briefly on the subject matter that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) brought up about this Canadianism business, As the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) so clearly brought out, what the hon. members opposite are confused about is that they consider Canada is the present Federal Liberal Party. This is their conception, this is their vision of Canada. This is their narrow partisan view of Canada:

MR. NEARY: Liberalism is Canadianism. Canada is Liberalism.

DR. COLLINS: Unless one accepts hook, line and sinker, without question, without query the line put out by the present rather discredited Federal Liberal Party who cannot get on with any Province in Canada, who was rejected at the economic summit in Europe recently, who approached the Prime Minister or the Premier of Japan about a certain matter

DR. COLLINS: and the Premier was asked about this later and he said, 'Oh, these minor matters'.

MR. NEARY: Time will tell about that, Mr. Chairman, time will tell.

DR. COLLINS: Now, this is the view that the hon. members opposite have of Canada and, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a tremendous shame. We are seeing a tremendously sad thing in this House, we are seeing a great Party - the Liberal Party is a great Party, it has been in this Province for many, many years - we are seeing the Liberal Party go down the tube as definitely and inevitably as anything can happen if they go on with this line of argument. Now, I am not the only one saying that, I have asked this before, I have asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and perhaps some of his colleagues: What is unity '82? And I have never gotten an answer. Now I know what unity '82 is. And, of course, you always ask loaded questions in this House, or sometimes you do anyway.

MR. NEARY: Joe Clark knows, Joe Clark knows what unity '82 is.

DR. COLLINS: Unity '82 is a section of the Liberal Party made up of the younger members of the Liberal Party, and they are trying to change the image of the established Party so that it gets away from this lap dog image it has for the federal Liberal Party in Ottawa. And they are saying, 'That has been so discredited, that attitude of being the lap dog of Ottawa, that the Liberal Party has been practically decimated, it has been practically wiped out'. And they are afraid that the rest of it will go unless the whole thing is changed. so they started this movement within the Liberal Party called Unity '82, and that is decided to get rid off the deadwood that is there who does not have the mental capacity to change their

DR. COLLINS: approach, their allegiance of many weeks, months, years past and realize that the Newfoundland people are fed up with being regarded by Central Canada, and specifically Central Canada as led by the Liberal Party, as being lesser beings of some sort and they just need to be tossed a few pennies every once in a while and they should be quite and be grateful for what they get. The Newfoundland people are fed up with that. The Newfoundland people say that we are a Province, we are a proud Province of Canada, we are going to add to Canada, we are going to give to Canada, we are giving to Canada, we are going to give more to Canada if we get the opportunity. And that is what the Newfoundland people want and they do not see that in the present established Liberal Party such as we see opposite. Now they may see something in this new part of the Liberal Party, this unity '82 part, and if so,

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1494

RA - 1

DR. COLLINS: we on this side might have a fight on our hands in days future.

MR. NEARY: You are wrong (inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: We might, We might. And we would welcome it, because there is no fight on our hands now with the discredited Liberal Party Opposite. It is a dead duck.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: And we see it in this House day after day, why it is a dead duck. They have no conception of what Newfoundland needs to progress. They have no conception of what the Newfoundland people want. They have no conception -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) in Corner Brook.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I feel like doing it too, I am a bit more partisan than my hon. colleague. I could not bring myself to go that far, but I was very much tempted to ring, I think it was the son of a former member of this House. I think it was Mr. Bennett. I think it was his son who was a prime mover in the thing, and I was very much tempted to ring him up and say, 'Look, for the good of Newfoundland I really hope that you do something about the Liberal Party as we see it now, which is in such disarray which is so bankrupt of ideas, which is so compromised, which is so much in the pocket of a few people, a few people themselves soon to be discredited -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - few people in the Federal Liberal Party, I felt like ringing him up and saying, Congratulations!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has had-

MR. CARTER: Now we will hear the hate.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order!

MR. ROBERTS: - to leave to catch an airplane which I know -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: You know paper can cut you, just like a tongue.

MR. CARTER: Like a knife.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) knows all about knives.

I noticed when his friend the - bedfellows make strange politics and politics make strange bedfellows as the sayings go - his friend the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins)-

MR. TULK: Nobody knows what he is.

MR. ROBERTS: -was speaking, the member from St. John's North was very much aware of unity and of loyalty and things like that. But what I was saying is my the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been driven from the House by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) which, of course, is a clear case of the jaw bone of the ass triumphing. Now, I do not want to get into the kind of nonsense that my friend the Finance Minister was getting on with.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, I hope, will be able to address one or two points that I want to raise. One will be very brief. Could he tell

June 18, 1982

Tape No. 1494

RA - 3

MR. ROBERTS: us about the size of the public service, You know, we are in this general area and I am not sure which subhead we are on, I am not sure, Your Honour, if we are on any particular subhead. We are getting near the end of the silly season, the Finance Minister is carrying on, we have

MR. ROBERTS: fifty minutes left, I guess, before the clock runs out, the buzzer goes, and all the estimates are passed without any further ado or any further debate.

MR. STAGG: Is the hon. member agreeing to -

MR. ROBERTS: Agreeing to what?

MR. STAGG: Dumping the Liberal Party
(inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I will agree to anything that makes good sense, which probably separates me from my friend for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) most of the time.

Now, look, let me just carry on. I have only got ten minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I am willing to debate with any hon. gentleman in this House, even with my friend from Stephenville.

MR. TULK: No, he would not like you too.

MR. ROBERTS: But I am trying to keep this one on a higher plane so maybe he could wait for another time.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, let me just come back - I have two questions. First - and I thank my friend for Stephenville for his very kind remarks, I do appreciate them. I agree with him, of course, but I do appreciate them.

Now just let me come back the size of the public service. We have heard from the minister and from his predecessors, illustrious or not as they may have been, that we are trying to restrain the growth in the public service. Maybe he could tell us where we are. He tells us we have 8,500 public servants so that, of course, I assume would not include most of the hospital

MR. ROBERTS: workers in the Province who are no longer directly classified as public servants. I would also include I am sorry, it would not include the teachers and the school board employees all of whom look to the Public Chest for their salaries, fair enough, but none of them are classified as public servants. That is not correct, perhaps there may be a few teachers who are public servants but very, very few, most work for the school boards.

The publicly funded service in this Province is, of course, by far and away the largest payroll we have. And if we are going to be serious about restraining the growth in government expenditures, and I know the minister would agree that has to be one of the aims of this government here just as it has to be an aim of the Government of Canada and other governments across Canada, one of the places is the growth in the public service.

Now I am one of these who firmly believes two things, number one, that we have a competent public service in this Province with a lot of competent individuals in it, and number two, that the public service is growing rapidly, that more and more of our money is going into administration and less and less into the people that that administration is intended to benefit or intended to serve. And this causes increasing concern to me and I think to people throughout the Province. Any of us who deals with the public service is impressed by the competence and is impressed equally by the fact that less and less seems to be accomplished of any real benefit. We are mushrooming each year, we are getting - you know, the pattern is there. We get a position and then we get an assistant and then we get an assistant to an assistant, and the next thing we know, we have

MR. ROBERTS: to create a new division
or a new department or a new something or other, and the
payroll grows-or the numbers of positions grow to staggering
levels.

MR. CARTER: Start it off by resigning.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I feel in this House that we have twice as many members as we need, and every time the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) speaks he demonstrates Sir, which half he belongs in. This House you know, is probably about 20 per cent cost efficient on any reasonable standards which makes it twenty times more cost efficient than the Cabinet and 200 times more cost efficient than the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). This House is too large. We could have a Cabinet, Sir - instead of being the swollen monster that it is with - is it seventeen or eighteen ministers now

MR. TULK: Twenty- one.

MR. ROBERTS: How many parliamentary secretaries?

MR. TULK: One, two , three, four, five.

MR. ROBERTS: There are five and then, of course, do not forget the West Coast one .

MR. TULK: Oh, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: There are six, are there not?

MR. CARTER: Does the member know where his district is?

MR. ROBERTS: Does the member know where my district is? Yes, Mr. Chairman, and more than that -

MR. TULK: Read him that letter.

MR. ROBERTS: -more than that, Mr. Chairman, my constituents know who their member is which differentiates them from the constituents of my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter). My friend from St. John's North (Mr.

MR. ROBERTS: Carter) may ask how I can say that. The proof is simple, he gets re-elected, his constituents cannot know who he is. They just vote for the party and they would literally vote for a yellow dog and -

MR. TULK: You should read him that letter.

MR. ROBERTS: - the hon. gentleman wins on that standard.

Now let me come back to the point I am making which is a sensible one, and I know my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) finds that hard to comprehend.

MR. CARTER: Bragging. Bragging.

MR. ROBERTS: So if he would possess his sole in patience let me ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he would make a statement for us, brief, hopefully comprehensive, and he can be as sarcastic as he wants. I mean, if he wants to be sarcastic that is fine and I will deal with him accordingly. If he wants to be reasonably helpful in showing us the information which I have no doubt he has - the minister works hard, he does the best he can. I may have my quarrels with what he accomplishes, but it is not his fault that he is the way he is, you have to take that. But if the minister could tell us where we are going - you know, there have been innumerable statements in Budgets that we are restraining the growth in the public service. Well what kind of percentage growth are we having? What kind do we expect this year? What kind of growth

MR. ROBERTS: not only of growth in absolute numbers but the constant upgrading. We are seeing it time and time again. You know, where formerly there was one clerk grade IV to do a job, there will still only be one clerk but the clerk will be grade XXXIV to do the job. I thank my hon. friend for whatever it is. It is a band-aid. I am grateful to hon. gentlemen opposite, the band-aid approach is the only one they know, Sir, and we see that in industry after industry. Their approach to the fishery is band-aid. I am going to talk a little bit about Baie Verte when I get on again in a few minutes. Their approach there is band-aid; their approach to the environment is band-aid; their approach to education is band-aid; their approach to the forest industry is band-aid; and the minister's approach to the finances of the Province is equally a band-aid.

So, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. Your Honour keeps moving back and forth from the Chair to Speaker, back and forth, I, in either case, humbly respect Your Honour's undoubted abilities, the prescience, the omniscience, the omnipotence, and above all the impartiality Your Honour is showing and Mr. Chairman, what I would say to the minister is could he tell us really where we are in the Public Service, the growth of the Public Service and then we will come on to some other topics. We still have forty-five exciting, glorious minutes to go.

If the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is not careful she will have to write lines this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to receive questions of this nature from the other side of the House. We did not receive them from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). He is gone to catch a plane and I presume that he did not have any cogent questions to ask before he left. Because he had the whole morning to do so and he did not ask them, I presume he

DR. COLLINS: did not have any. But we have got some cogent questions now from the Opposition and we are only too glad to respond.

Firstly, a general point about the Public Service. We do have a large Public Service. There is - how many departments are there? I think there are fourteen departments. There is a lot of pressure in an organization of that size for staff to increase almost of its own volition. It is a continuing task in an organization of that size to keep the staff numbers under any sort of reasonable control. And I think it is only reasonable to state that the effort, or the job of keeping staff numbers down is probably greater where there is not a sense of personal responsibility for funding the staff. For instance, in a private organization, especially if it is owned very closely, if it is tightly held by the owners, they are watching every dollar that goes out and therefore any staff that comes

DR. J. COLLINS:

on obviously will impinge on profits and, therefore, there is an acute desire to keep the numbers of staff down. Now, as the hon. member said, we have a very good public service, especially at the managerial and executive level. And there are very responsible people there and I do not mean in anyway to imply that they will bring on staff without any sense of looking at the necessity for so doing. But I still say that the fact that this is a public type of operation, firstly, that tends to keep the job of keeping staff under control - makes it somewhat more difficult than otherwise. Secondly, it is a very large organization and I think every large organization has difficulty keeping staff under control. Now that is just a general statement of the thing.

As far as the actual numbers go, we have at the present time, as the salary details indicate, we have at the present time 9,437 in the Public Service, that is in the various departments, and I can give a breakdown as to departments if so desired. But that is it, roughly 9,500 in the Public Service.

MR. ROBERTS: What was it last year?

DR. COLLINS: I am going to get that figure. I do not have that immediately available.

I do not think there is an appreciable increase, but we will get the actual figure.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder would the minister ask his officials to prepare and to table in the House or make public or send across to me if he wished, a table, say, for any

MR. E. ROBERTS: period he wants, five, ten, fifteen years, and again taking apples and apples because, of course, large areas of the Public Service have been moved out into quasi accommodations, but a table showing not only the absolute numbers but the percentage growth. I am not so much concerned with the dollars but the percentage growth. That ought to be fairly easy for the officials to produce, I think, very interesting and very illustrative. Would the minister do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Yes, we will be glad to do that. And, as the hon. member indicated, one would have to do it in some sort of explanatory method. You could not just give bald figures because you would not know what those mean. We do have new activities in government, for instance, just take, say, the Petroleum Directorate; there was no such thing as a Petroleum Directorate not too long ago and if one went from the year we did not have one to the year we did have one and saw an increase you might say, 'Well, look here is an unreasonable increase.' But, obviously, if you accept that we need a Petroleum Directorate, well, that increase is not unreasonable, it is a reasonable increase.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) Medicare or we put the hospitals out?

DR. COLLINS: That type of thing. So one can certainly get figures together for that. It might take a little while, but it is no trouble getting that, and perhaps giving some explanatory note with it. As the hon. member indicated there are other people who obviously are paid from the public purse also. In the teachers, I do not have the precise number here.

DR. COLLINS: but I believe it is about 8,500 teachers, roughly 8,500. In the health sector I believe it is somewhat less than that, I think it is of the order of 6,000 to 6,500, something of that order, of all types both in -

MR. ROBERTS: That is not counting the doctors?

DR. COLLINS: No, that is counting staff in board operated hospitals and in departmental operated hospitals.

MR. ROBERTS: Doctors are not paid by the public service they are paid by Medicare, are they not?

DR. COLLINS: Through Medicare. All but one I believe, and even that one actually gets his from Medicare through the patients.

MR. ROBERTS: Only one guy on the government payroll now?

DR. COLLINS: Just one.

MR. ROBERTS: We will say it but we will not name him.

DR. COLLINS: An individual whose name was actually in the public press in this context not too long ago

MR. ROBERTS: I know who he is and he is right too.

DR. COLLINS: The numbers in the public service for 1980-81 was 9,242. So that is an increase of approximately 200 roughly. It is an increase of approximately 200 from one fiscal year to the other fiscal year. And that is 200 on over 9,000 so that is - who can do that quickly? -

MR. ROBERTS: 2.5 per cent.

DR. COLLINS: - 2.5 per cent, something of that order.

Now the hon. member also asks, what is our approach on this. And we have made efforts right from certainly 1979, and I believe going back to 1975 when

DR. COLLINS: restraint became the thing to do in terms of the public finances, but certainly since 1979 we had initially a total freeze on hirings in the Public Service.

MR. ROBERTS: That is unrealistic.

DR. COLLINS: But it did turn out that one had to alter that. Then we had mechanism whereby every person hired had to go before Treasury Board not before the Treasury Board Secretariat but actually before the Board itself, again to try to put

DR. COLLINS:

it down, and we found that that was onerous. So we required that the Treasury Board Secretariat keep us informed as to how the requests were going and to bring to our attention, which they frequently did, bring to our attention where there were marginal cases, where there were requests for new positions and these were marginal requests, not totally obvious, they would bring these to the board.

Now in this fiscal year again we are tightening up even on that, we are taking a much, much closer view of hiring in the public service. And the general approach is if a department requires a new individual or a new position or a new post, that they must look and see if they can get rid of an old post before that new position will be put into place. Now obviously it is not always going to be possible. But this is an attempt to get the departments to review what they have got before putting in place new programmes, before they actually put personnel in place for those new programmes. In a way, I suppose, this is taking a sort of sunset view of public services. Some services, if you do not pay attention to them, I suppose, they can just go on and on and on, whereas in actual fact they do not need that. They do not need that and you can prune them out. So that is an attempt to do something about that.

I think that those are mainly the questions that were asked, but I will get someone working on the figures and I am sure all hon. members of the House will be interested in seeing these, And how it will be presented, will it be tabled or whether there will be a statement on it I cannot say at this point in time, but we will attempt to get an outline of the public service going back perhaps five years.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister, and given the constraints of time, you know, I am prepared to leave it. The information when we get it will, I have no doubt, be interesting and hopefully will lead to further debate. Because it is a subject I think is concerning and troubling more and more people throughout the Province and people who are not necessarily taking a partisan position, people who wonder not about the role of government, I do not mean to get into the philosophical question, it is not the point at issue, but the impact of government on day to day life.

The minister has spoken of the disciplines of the market place. I must say now that I have had four or five or six years working in a private context, where, I mean, if I want another secretary at my law firm I have to convince my partners not simply that I need another secretary but that hiring another secretary will produce some additional revenue and thus justify it. That is an interesting exercise that perhaps brings one an additional perspective.

MR. ROBERTS:

And, of course, the other point that perhaps we should get at is the - and this really gets far beyond simple numbers - the effect of the Public Service competing with the private sector for job positions. And, you know, the standards set by the Public Service, of course, have to be followed by private industry. I can tell the minister in case he is so far away from private industry or private life that I am sure my friend from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) is aware of it, what I am talking about, the standards of employment, the standards of salary and particularly benefits set by the public sector which are paid for, by the private sector- I mean the ultimate irony, or course, is that Cape St. Mary's pays for all, and Cape St. Mary's in this sense is the private sector, you know, income taxes and corporate taxes, sales taxes and what have we. That is another story.

Let me, if I may, Mr. Chairman, and I suspect I am a little far away strictly speaking from the subhead, but it is sufficiently broad that I hope I will be permitted to say what I have to say and that it will be in order.

MR. BAIRD: By leave.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank my hon. friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) and a true friend he is.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a question or two about the Baie Verte situation and perhaps the gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout, who, although he is not yet a minister I assume he will be in due course, stranger things have happened in this House and elsewhere. You know, I know he is intimately concerned and intimately involved and I am sure is very knowledgeable and in the absence of any of the ministers directly involved perhaps he can speak in behalf of the ministry which he supports. And I do

MR. ROBERTS: not know all the facts. That is the probably part of the problem. The House does not know all of them, we are only know what has been made public and precious little has been made public except, number one, that Johns-Manville, or Advocate to be precise, have walked away from it, lost a lot of money and want to wash their hands of it; number two, that the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada are together on some sort of rescue operation and that is going to involve-figures one sees in the press are of the order of 15 million of public dollars and I have no idea what sort of terms and conditions, but then again I do not particularly want to get into that in a seven or eight minute speech or whatever each of us has at this time. There will be another opportunity I am sure and I will take it.

But I want to come right through to the matter that has been in the news the last two or three days, the labour negotiations, and I assume members of the House are familiar and I will not go into them in detail. My understanding is that the representative of Transpacific, I think it is called, the new company, a company which is unknown to most of us but anyway a company unknown or not that is the only buyer, the only person willing to

MR. E. ROBERTS:

come to the table, I gather, to buy that operation and to operate it. As I understand it, Transpacific has approached the union, the Steel Workers' who are certified in respect of, I guess, all of the employees, the union employees at the Baie Verte operation, and asked them to take certain concessions. Now, again what I know is only what has come out in the press. Essentially, I guess what has come out is that the union workers' have been asked to forego the increases which they had bargained for and which they had accepted, which had been agreed. I understand that to be the situation. If the contract between Advocate Mines Limited on the one hand and the Steel Workers' Local on the other provided that certain increases would come in during the life of that contract- the contract I gather runs on until the end of March coming, March '83, and thereupon, you know, negotiations come and a new agreement presumably comes into force. Transpacific have approached those workers and have said, ' We wish you to agree to forego your raises'. I think that is correctly put. And they have indicated that the numbers of people to be employed are far fewer than were hitherto employed and that the period during which the mine is operating, or will be operating is much less than has been the case before. Now, that is all new information but again it is somewhat beside the precise point that I want to zero in on in the few minutes left to me, Mr. Chairman, at this stage. The law of this Province, and in this sense we mirror every province in Canada and mirror the federal legislation and, I guess, anywhere in the civilized world that has labour legislation comparable to ours, pretty common principles throughout, provides for what are known as successor rights which, briefly put, say that if you buy a company, or buy the

MR. ROBERTS: assets of that company, among the assets you take the labour arrangements both as to the certification and as to a collective agreement assuming one is in place. In Baie Verte the Steel Workers have been certified and a collective agreement is in place. Now, I do not know what Transpacific are buying. It seems to be most unclear whether they are buying some assets or whether they are buying Advocate or whether they are buying shares in Advocate. I do not know what they are buying. But what Transpacific seem to be doing is trying to get away from the whole successor rights concept. Now I know a contract can be renegotiated. Of course it can. Sometimes it ought to be. The upper Churchill Contract ought to be. But the fact remains that Transpacific seem as a company not to

MR.ROBERTS:

have accepted the concept of successor rights. They are trying to come into Baie Verte it would appear and trying to make a new deal with the workers. Now that strikes me as not only being contrary to the principles which underlie the law of the Province. It is not illegal, I mean, if the workers will agree to a renegotiation that is fair enough. But what bothers me is here is this company coming in now, getting astonishing public support. I have heard figures that for every dollar Transpacific is risking the public, here and in Ottawa, is risking ten. Now that is a pretty sweetheart deal. It may be justified if there is no other way to get Baie Verte going. I am not going to adopt the kind of dog in the manger attitude that the Premier fell into on the St. Anthony fish plant. If we can get Baie Verte going at any reasonable deal we should get it going and we is us and Ottawa and anybody. But I am concerned by what appears to be developing. Then it came out in the House yesterday, it came out in the news the day before, I think, that workers in Baie Verte met and with one voice said to the Transpacific they could take their proposals and do as they wished but there was going to be no renegotiation. Because in effect what Transpacific are saying is, 'No jobs!' We are not going to come in unless you agree to give up what you had in your collective agreement! If that is what they are saying I do not like it. I think it is contrary to the principles of the law and I suggest it is contrary to the principles this administration subscribes to and ought to subscribe to. I regret the Development

MR.ROBERTS: Minister is not in his seat,he is of developing something somewhere I have no doubt, but he seems to be saying that if Baie Verte does not open it is because of the mine workers not agreeing to accept these concessions. I just want to say and this is the first chance I have had to say it, Sir, that that is not correct, that it is not right of Transpacific or anybody else to try to open the Baie Verte mine on the backs and out off the pocket books of the men who work in that mine. Now I could go on at some length on that. I am probably close to my ten minutes. I do not want to trespass on that. I will hear gladly what the gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay has to say. I hope he shares my view. What should Transpacific do? I will say what Transpacific should do, they should come in and accept the successor rights. If they are buying the mine they should accept the principles of what are law, and every law in Canada says, and then if they want to sit down and renegotiate their contract then let them do it man fashion. But what they are doing now I suggest is not proper, Sir. It ought not to be permitted, it ought not to be encouraged. It ought to be prevented, in fact, by the government. I do not know what role the government are playing in these negotiations but , of course, any government that is putting up \$3 or \$4 million, or \$10 million in the case of the federal people, obviously have the right to say what is going on. And it would be wrong - and I will leave it at this depending on what my friend from

MR. ROBERTS:

Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) says.-it would be wrong for this House and this government and this Province , Sir, to be party to an arrangement that sees that mine opened at price of the workmen there having to go back on agreements and benefits and wages which they won through the legitimate and proper process of collective bargaining.

Now I will sit down at that point, Your Honour, I will hear what my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay has to say. There may or may not be more that needs to be said, but I think it is a most important point of principle and it is one that we in this House should be very quick to endorse and very reluctant ever to abandon, Sir.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has asked some very important questions about a very important matter facing the people of Baie Verte and I will attempt to answer them in the very reasonable way that they were put.

There is some background, I think, necessary to the questions raised by the hon. gentleman before I get into the very specific questions that he raised at the end. Very briefly what has transpired at Baie Verte, Mr. Chairman, is that the Advocate Mines Limited have gone into receivership. And I will not attempt in the ten minutes that I have to go into the reasons for that, but they have, and there has been a process ongoing since last December 31st., to liquidate the assets of Advocate Mines Limited. An interim receiver has been appointed and the receiver back in January, I believe it was, called for

MR. RIDEOUT: public bids for the liquidation of the property at Baie Verte. At that time there were three companies who had shown a great deal of interest in acquiring the property. There was BRINCO whom we had very exhaustive discussions with and who spent a lot of money investigating the viability or whatever of the property, there was IOC and there was Transpacific. The other two people that I mentioned previously, because of very severe marketing constraints at the moment and a number of other difficulties within their corporate structure, decided for whatever reasons, a number of reasons, that they would not pursue the interest any longer and so consequently it was down to one potential operator, it was down to one company who was interested in acquiring the property. And they have convinced - I suppose there is a risk involved, but they have made a reasonable case to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and to the Government of Canada, that they have a reasonable chance of successfully operating the property and making a viable and going concern out of it. As I said, Mr. Chairman, there is certainly

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

a risk but it appears at this time both governments think that the risk is reasonably acceptable and one that we should take.

So, that is some of the background leading up to the specific questions raised by the hon. gentleman. Now, getting into the meat of the inquiries that he made with regards to the successor rights. First of all let me say, Mr. Chairman, that Transpacific have indicated to the Government of Newfoundland and to the Government of Canada, it is my understanding-I was not present at the union negotiations last Wednesday, but it is my understanding from briefings that we have had from the officials in Labour and Manpower who did attend and Mines and Energy, I might add, who also did attend, that Transpacific has no quarrel with the union with regard to successor rights. It is the law of this Province and rightly so, it is the law pretty well across the country. They have no quarrel over successor rights, they have no quarrel over the fact that the employees at the mine if they take it over will continue to be, and ought to be, represented by the United Steel Workers' of America. That is not the problem, there is no quarrel over that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the collective agreement that is currently in place between the United Steel Workers' of America and Advocate Mines Limited, which is still a corporate entity, it is not defunct yet, 95 per cent or probably even a percentage or two higher, 95 per cent of the collective agreement that is presently in place between those two parties is acceptable to Transpacific Asbestos. They have told both governments that. It is my understanding that they have told the union that, and I certainly have seen a copy of the April 7th proposed collective agreement

MR. T. RIDEOUT: that was submitted to the union for their scrutiny and, you know, clause after clause after clause is acceptable. As a matter of fact, there was a lot of progress made last Wednesday in making acceptable a number of other clauses that were not acceptable in the beginning.

What it has come down to, Mr. Chairman, are two or three, I suppose, certainly in terms of the union, very major issues. One is the issue of salary, which is currently taken care of in the present collective agreement, as the member referred to. If the workers had continued working with Advocate Mines Limited, over the period of time since shut down, they would have been entitled to a cost of living increase of eighty-three cents an hour. The new company, Transpacific, have indicated that they will honour that eighty-three cents an hour COLA and they will take that eighty-three cents and hour COLA and add it on to the basic rate of every employee that is with the company when they go back into operation. So the COLA part of it is not a problem. That has been put aside. In addition to the lost COLA, or the COLA the employees would have received had the company stayed into operation, there was an eighty cent an hour increase due on the first of May under the present collective agreement. The employees would have received an extra eighty cents on the 1st of May

MR. RIDEOUT: The new company have indicated to the union that with the financial difficulties that they are going to be having in getting that mine back into shape, and they think it is going to take them a number of months to do so, that they cannot see their way clear to pay them that eighty cents an hour increase that would have come into effect on the 1st. of May had the mine been in operation. So that is a bone of contention between the union obviously and between the company.

However, the successor rights and the legality and so on of successor rights, as I understand it, is not being questioned and I have been assured that it is not being questioned. The company knows what the laws of the Province are, they are attempting to renegotiate certain sections of the present collective agreement that they think are overly onerous and that they think will help to continue to make the property not viable, whereas if they think there is some relief in those areas they will be able to do that.

The other thing that has been mentioned publicly is the length of the work week. I do not know if the hon. gentleman referred to that or not. The situation regarding that, Mr. Chairman, is simply this. It is proposed that the mine will go back into operation around the 15th. of August providing everything else falls into place. At the present time Transpacific has orders totalling approximately 18,000 tons for 1982. One of those orders though, Mr. Chairman, is in India and that is subject to whether Transpacific gets the property or not. If they do not get the property the Indians are not willing, obviously, and for obvious reasons, to enter into a binding contract.

MR. ROBERTS: How much of the 18,000
is the Indian order?

MR. RIDEOUT: Approximately 12,000 tons.

MR. ROBERTS: So two-thirds of it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Two-thirds of it. What the company has done,
Mr. Chairman, and this has been said clearly, again it is
indicated clearly in the correspondence that has taken
place between the officials in my friend's Department,
Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), is they have given
the union what is the worst bottom line position they see
for 1982. And if the worst comes to pass, they say that
there will be something over 100 , around 100 or 120
employees starting off in August of 1982. If the worst
comes to pass, they will be on a reduced work week, I think,
somewhere around twenty-four hours a week for the remainder
of 1982.

But the essence, Mr. Chairman,
of the problem is this, and I hope people understand this
clearly, that if Advocate Mines does not produce in 1982,
it will be effectively out of the market place for 1983.
Because most major consumers,

MR. RIDEOUT: with the odd exception-by the way, the only one that is odd, the oddball out is India, but most major consumers of asbestos in the world place their orders in November and December, and those people will not place orders with a mine that is not producing. So the problem we have to face head on is whether, even if the worse scenario is true, we go in with a very reduced production in 1982 so that the mine will be in the market place, so that they will be able to send the product to the consumers that they have already made contact with, so they can test it and so they can hopefully get orders for 1983.

Now, that is the nub of the problem for 1982. If the mine is not in production in 1982, the mine is dead for 1983. Those are just not my words, I mean, those are the words of anybody who is familiar with the asbestos industry. The orders are placed in November and December and there is nobody, is going to place a firm order with Advocate Mines, or Bay Verte Asbestos, whatever it might be called, if the mine is not in production in 1982.

I know I am running out of time, To sum up there is no quarrel, as I understand it, over the successor rights, the company has simply asked that there be some renegotiation of some items in the agreement which they find onerous. As I said, 95 per cent of it or more has been accepted by the company already.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think that answers most of the questions raised by the hon. gentleman. If there are any others I will be happy to deal with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Before I recognize the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) I wish to inform all hon. members that the time will run out for this debate at 12:44.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, how quickly the time goes by when one is doing something that one enjoys, such as watching this government dig itself in. And I am not just referring to my friend from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I am referring to the whole process of the estimates.

I thank my hon. friend for a genuine effort to respond and I appreciate the information he has given us. Some of it was information I did not have before and it puts it in perspective. And perhaps the House, I can only suggest it to my hon. friend, he is on the fringes of power if he is not in power - you know I used to sit in that seat many years ago when the government had, in fact, a bigger percentage of the House than the present administration has and, of course, history does repeat itself, you know. We see it happening every day, even to the closing of the hospitals. Boy, Markland and Botwood, how many times they have -

MR. BAIRD: Time is up.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and I say to my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird), "Those who do not remember our history are condemned to repeat it," as Santa Anna once said. Now let me come back because I was saying to my friend from Baie Verte-White Bay that perhaps it might be a very good idea

if an opportunity could be made in the government's time in the House to debate the whole Baie Verte thing, because what my hon. friend said, and I accept it without any question, confirms my worst fears, and I am sure my hon. friend is as concerned. I mean, we have our political differences, they are of his making not of mine, but I know his concern is genuine for what is happening in Baie Verte. And we have got the

MR. ROBERTS:

whole life of a community, because if that mine does not operate there is no economic reason for Baie Verte to continue. There is a human and a social reason but no economic reason. Baie Verte was a very small community before the mine went there, not that long ago. I was at

the official opening back in the Summer of '64, so it is not that long since the mine went into Baie Verte. And Baie Verte before that was a very small fishing community instead of what it is today, a large, prosperous, modern and very pleasant town in which to live. And what my hon. friend says confirms what my worst fears have been all along, which is if this whole Transpacific thing—and I am not imputing any bad feelings, the government are doing the best they can but they are trying to make bricks out of straw. And if the thing is as shaky as it would appear from what my friend from Baie Verte—White Bay said, and what he said has been echoed by the Development Minister (Mr. Windsor) and by the Labour Minister (Mr. Dinn), I mean, they are not making any secrets, the whole thing is a house of cards and the cards are very thin and very tenuous. And so the House, perhaps, ought to make an early opportunity to debate it. Because if people in Baie Verte are expecting the mine to operate and planning their lives accordingly and making their families plans and so forth, you know, there is going to be one awfully rude shock if the thing is as tenuous

MR. ROBERTS: as to depend on the workmen having to agree to work twenty-four hours a week, and having to agree to give up their collective agreements. Then it is pretty tenuous indeed. Now, I will come back to that but before I do I just want to say to my friend from Baie Verte-White Bay that he has misunderstood the whole question of successor rights. I know not what advice he has had, I know there are competent officials in Manpower, or whatever it is called and in Justice who can tell him about it, if not there are hundreds of other people who will gladly tell him successor rights involve not simply accepting the certification of the union. He says the company Transpacific has agreed to that and I do not doubt that, I have no quarrel, I have no information to the contrary. It also agrees with accepting the collective agreement. And while Transpacific may say they are prepared to and, you know, I am not trying to pick words, I am concerned with the concept, concerned with what people are going to have to go through and what they have gone through and what they are going through, Transpacific obviously are not prepared to live with the collective agreement that Advocate Mines had into place. Now, I do not need to repeat what I have said. It would appear that Transpacific are holding the miners in Baie Verte up to ransom. What they are saying in effect is if you want a job, do it at less than you agreed to. I am not going to get into the perjorative terms of slave wages and all of that, and I do not think the government of the Province should be a party to that, I know where the government should stand, it is on the side of the working man, on the side of the men and women of Baie Verte and of the people who put us here in this House. But I

MR. ROBERTS: want to go on from that to the far more important aspect of it which my hon. friend raised, I really was not intending to, but since he raised it I want very briefly to talk about. The overall proposal obviously is as shaky and as insecure as sand. I mean, here we are told that - well let me go back. Advocate walked away from it. I do not know what they lost, I have not bothered looking up - I suppose I could ring some of the creditors to see what they have lost. In fact, I think our law firm was asked to advise one or two creditors on some of the legal points, but Advocate left millions of dollars on the table - not on the table, left millions of dollars in Bair Verte. They may have made money over the years as a company, I do not know anything about that, but they have obviously abandoned the project, abandoned the mine, because they cannot see their way out of it. They are not getting out of the asbestos business. Advocate Mines Limited may, because it is just Newfoundland, but the principles in Advocate, Johns- Manville and the firm in Europe, it is called -

MR. RIDEOUT: JM are getting out.

MR. ROBERTS: JM are getting out. I thank my hon. friend. But the fact remains Advocate is being abandoned, big losses are being taken. And presumably that is being done, and presumably JM's decision to get out in part at least, is the result of their forward forecasting which indicates they cannot make a buck at it. I mean, we are out in the real world, we are out in the world with bottom lines and not government where, if you need more money you just ring up the Finance Minister and it is more zeros on the deficit, or more bonds or dollars being printed if you are the federal Finance Minister. So we have this Transpacific company coming in - they tend to remind me a little of vultures, they see carrion and their descending. And I do not know anything about the

MR. ROBERTS: company. I have heard some stuff that may not be favourable so I will not repeat it, because I do not know a great deal. But I will say IOC looked at it and walked away for whatever reason. And what was the other company? Oh, BRINCO, which are now owned by the Reisman Brothers in Toronto, if you go up the line further, a very reputable company, extremely reputable people, and they looked at it and walked away from it. And so we have this Transpacific crowd coming in, I think it is fair to say, unknown to most of us before this came along. And, because both levels of government understandably want to have this plant open, want to keep Baie Verte going, want to keep that mine going, a deal is struck. And I do not know enough about the deal to know whether it is good or bad so again I will not say anything. I am not questioning it, I am not challenging it, I do not know enough about it to know whether it is good or bad or indifferent. The only part that has really surfaced is the labour end of it, and it appears that part of the deal is that the men in Baie Verte are being asked to take significant decreases in their wage package as negotiated in an agreement that is binding, we all agree on that, secondly, that there is no guarantee of hours of work. Now, I do not quarrel with that. I am not saying that the government should make hours of work. You know, you cannot do what you cannot do. We saw that in Stephenville, where the hon. crowd over there, Mr. Chairman, burned another one half billion dollars. We got to live with real life, this is real

MR. E. ROBERTS: world, this is where economics and numbers come. And thirdly, of course, the work force is- a hundred men is what, a sixth of what was before? That is a good approximation, 15 per cent of the work force a year ago, a year and a half ago, before these troubles came on us. So the whole thing begins to look to me very tenuous. And it would appear that the labour element, which is the first part of the surface, may well be being set up as a scapegoat, and I wonder if that is so. We only got a couple of minutes left but I will finish and my friend from Baie Verte, my colleagues and I will consent to a few extra minutes to allow him, or somebody on the governments side to answer this. You know, I do not want to leave it on the record without some response to it. Are we coming to the point where the whole thing is going to fall apart with the men who work in that mine being the scapegoat? And I am not suggesting that the government set it up, I am not. I mean, I am prepared to be cynical about hon. gentleman opposite but not that cynical, at least not on the evidence I have. But the real reason it is falling apart is the deal never was there at all. It is there in the sense that the federal government and the provincial government have each agreed to put up a lot of money. My guess is the figures I gave earlier which my hon. friend did not comment on one way or the other, \$10 for every dollar this Transpacific crowd are putting up. What concerns me is that we are playing with people's lives, we are playing with people's hopes. Everybody in Baie Verte now is waiting for the mine to open. They are, you know, ready to go to work, anxious to go to work. They have held on throughout a tough winter. I know they are getting U.I., but you cannot live on U.I. when you have made good wages in a mine. And now we are coming on to the Summer and People have got to get settled for another year. So the successor rights thing, we will hear more

MR. ROBERTS: about it. Obviously the Bay, whatever it is called, Transpacific are coming in and are not prepared to accept the agreement. My hon. friend says they are prepared to accept 95 per cent, but he agrees, I am sure, that the 95 per cent they are accepting is irrelevant if they will not accept the guts of it, the wage and the benefits. Maybe 95 per cent is 95 per cent of the words. They may accept 99 per cent of the words, but if they do not accept the little numbers that say the rate per hour and escalations, I mean, they are not accepting the whole agreement. But the more important point, which arises out of what my hon. friend said in response to my original point, is, you know, where are we on this proposal, is the whole thing just a house of cards? We have all been living in hope and expectation, everybody, and the government are acting in the best of faith, I have no doubt of that, but we are coming down now to the short strokes, today is the 18th of June, and my hon. friend spoke of the 15th of August, less than two months away, hardly time enough even to put in place the legal paper work, maybe that is all done, I do not know, but hardly a lot of time to get something ready given the fact we have this government here and the government in Ottawa and the receiver and the Directors of Johns-Manville, you know, we have a lot of people

MR. ROBERTS: who have got to say 'aye or 'nay' I will conclude, Sir. The debate has not finished, perhaps the House Leader would agree to extend it for five or ten minutes to let my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) speak. My friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) wants to tell me something.

MR. HODDER: I just wanted to ask if I could ask a thirty second question before we close the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. Anyway, I have said what I have to say and there will be other opportunities to debate it, but perhaps we might get a response. We are not going to do anything else before one o'clock anyway today. My friend from Port au Port

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, can I say it has been refreshing in the last few minutes -

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

Mr. Marshall: - as contrasted with what we heard before. We will be quite happy to extend the time until then with respect to the hon. member for Baie Verte- White Bay who will participate in the debate and answer the questions, the real questions that have been posed in the past twenty minutes as opposed to what was done before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed? Is it agreed that the time be extended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMANThe hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, yes, when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay gets up to address himself to the questions put to him by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, I just wanted to ask him if he would address himself to this question as well. I have heard rumors that Transpacific Asbestos had difficulties in Australia, that they had been sort of bailed out by the government. Now, I do not know, I did hear the minister yesterday-

MR. ROBERTS:

By the Australian government.

MR. HODDER:

By the Australian government, yes.

But I did hear the minister say yesterday that the Australian Government did own a certain interest in the operation there, at least in Australia, although he did not elaborate on that. I would just like to ask the member if he could give us some background on Transpacific Asbestos themselves, where their other holdings are outside of Australia, what activities they carry on in Canada and perhaps put to rest some of the fears that have been expressed and some of the rumors, or maybe not rumors, that have been circulating about the company.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member from Baie

Verte - White Bay

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, some of the

rumors that the hon. gentleman from Port au Port have referred to are basically that, rumors. We have been, and when I say we, I mean the

MR. RIDEOUT:

Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, have been dealing actively with Transpacific Asbestos since last October and November. And both governments, Mr. Chairman, have done a lot of exhaustive research into who Transpacific is, and what Transpacific is all about. The Government of Canada have done it through their Australian Embassy and through the High Commissioner's office in Australia. We have had them checked out in the market place in India and in Thailand and in Korea. We have had them, you know, checked out in the financial market place. We have letters of financial reference and credit from their bankers. We have tried to do everything to find out who this company is that nobody seems to know anything about. And let me address that for a minute or so, Mr. Chairman.

Transpacific Asbestos is a Canadian corporation, a wholly owned Canadian corporation with its head office in Toronto. It operates a fully owned subsidiary called Woods, Reef, Mine Limited which owns and operates an asbestos mine at Barraba, in Australia, in New South Wales. That mine was a very, very difficult mine to operate as the owners will tell you, and very bluntly tell you. It was an ore body that was very, very difficult to mine. And when they got into the mining of the ore body back in the beginning, seven or eight years ago, there were a lot of difficulties with it and consequently the company went into receivership. That is no secret. They spent four or five years, I believe, in receivership. They did not walk away from it, Mr. Chairman, they did not fold their arms and say, "We cannot do anything about this, it is a dead duck." But they kept fighting, they kept fighting for survival and they were able to finally survive. They were able to raise \$10.8 million in the public market place to

MR. RIDEOUT: refinance Woods, Reef, Mines Limited. They were able to get some concessions from the Federal Government of Australia. They were able to get some concessions from the State Government of New South Wales. And with their own ability to refinance the \$10.8 million that they raised publicly, they were able to successfully take the mine out of receivership and put it back on an even operating keel, and it has been operating that way ever since. The Transpacific Asbestos -

MR. HODDER: How long? How long has it been operating?

MR. RIDEOUT: It is about four years I believe. The Transpacific Asbestos is not in arrears to the federal government of Australia on any of the loans or guarantees that they gave them. They are not in arrears as of three or four weeks ago, as I understand it. They are not in arrears to the government of New South Wales. They are up to date on all their commitments to the government of Australia and to the State Provincial Government. Our federal counterparts have done a lot of research in Australia on their activity. I might also say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I indicated that Transpacific is a wholly owned Canadian corporation, it trades publicly on the Toronto Stock Exchange, I might admit, very actively. We have done a lot of research with the Toronto Stock Exchange over the last number of months. We have their trading volumes, we have their highs and their lows. They have been very, very active and still are today. So I hope that that might be some background, because there has been a lot of misconception, I believe, over who Transpacific Asbestos really is.

MR. ROBERTS: Who owns Transpacific?

MR. RIDEOUT: Transpacific Asbestos is a publicly owned corporation. The president is a Mr. Michael Clay, he is the major owner. The vice-president is a Mr. Bob Besley who is a major owner. The managing director of their Australian operation is Harry Robinson who is a major shareholder.

MR. ROBERTS: The majority of the shares are controlled by its own officers, and the rest are publicly traded.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right, and the rest are publicly traded. So I hope that this bit of information

MR. RIDEOUT: on their background - I will be the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, that they have had difficulty. They have had difficulty but the thing that they were able to do and they were able to do it by tenaciously hanging on, they were able to do it by being very aggressive in the market place, they were able to revive a mine that probably should have died. Maybe they can do it in Baie Verte. I am hopeful they can. They are the only ones left, Mr. Chairman, who have indicated and put in a proposed package the fact that they can do it. They need some assistance from us, they need some assistance from the federal government, they need some assistance from the town, by the way, the town of Baie Verte which has been forthcoming, and they are asking for some relief in the present collective agreement. I have no quarrel, Mr. Chairman, where I stand with regard to the union in Baie Verte or in the Province in general. I marched the streets of Baie Verte with that union before

MR. RIDEOUT: when I thought they were right, and I will say now as I said then -

MR. ROBERTS: That was when the Premier thought they were wrong.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, that is another argument, and if I had the time I could get into it. I played my Opposition role and I would think I played it very well, Mr. Chairman. But I will say now that they have requested that there be some changes in the collective agreement. And they have said bluntly that unless the whole package can be put together we do not think we can make a go of it. And we are not going to go in there and spend money just because government has given it to us or just because the town has given us some concessions or because the workers are giving some concessions, If we do not think we can make it we are not going to go at it. And I think their attitude has been very aboveboard. I know whatever we wanted, I know whatever this government wanted, and whatever the federal government wanted, because there has been a joint team of negotiators, and I would expect, from what I have been told by labour officials, whatever the union wanted to know about Transpacific Asbestos has been forthcoming and forthcoming in spades. Mr. Chairman, for the sake of the people in Baie Verte, I, too, like the hon. gentleman, hope that it is not a deck of shaky cards, I hope that it is not built on sand, I hope that it is not going to founder, but at the moment, Mr. Chairman, it is the only hope we got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I only have one question growing out of what the hon. gentlemen said.

MR. ROBERTS: Near the end of his remarks he said-I think he purported to be quoting Transpacific and I have no doubt he was- he said ' If we do not think we can make it, we are not going to try,' Well, that is good. But also I think he said, that Transpacific had indicated that all parts of the package had to be approved or else nothing. The hon. gentleman is nodding affirmatively. Hansard cannot record a nod. My question is a very simple one, the government has no doubt done feasibility studies or checked feasibility studies, does the government confirm that statement that Transpacific must have-he mentioned assistance from the town, I assume that is reduction in taxes or a waving of taxes of some sort, assistance from the federal/provincial governments and then the union. That will be the four components of the package as I understand it. Do the government studies confirm that?

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, the officials in the Department of Mines and Energy have laboured very, very long over proposed operating models for the Baie Verte mine, and all the models that have been developed show that in the first couple of years-because remember, Mr. Chairman, and I have to come back to this and say it again, the problem with the Baie Verte fiber is that the Baie Verte fiber is not known in the world market place it was only used by two people, by Johns-Manville, who was a 30 per cent owner and by Edder-Neit in Belgium who was the other part owner. Those are the only two producers in the world who used Advocate fiber, so there has to be a very aggressive marketing job done over the next year or so to get the Advocate fiber into the market place. And if we cannot sell it there is no point in producing it. Now, to come back to what the hon. gentleman said, yes there have been various models developed and to get that

MR. RIDEOUT: operations back on an even keel and in a profitable situation over the next couple of years, there is going to have to be government assistance, there is going to have to be assistance from the town, and the company feels and the models show that there will have to be some restraint by the labour force.

On motion Heads 302-01 through 303-03 carried.

MR. ROBERTS: To save time why do you not just say put them all through?

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): Do them all, just one head?

MR. ROBERTS: You know, the reality is that the seventy-five hours are out. The rules are specific. Whether I think it is a charade or not is beside the point. There is no point in Your Honour or the Clerk sitting there calling heads. I mean, they are all going to go through now debated or undebated. I mean, let us complete the charade and get it over with and go home and have our lunch.

On motion, Head 111, Executive Council, in total carried.

MR. MARSHALL: I move the Committee rise.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of supply have considered the matters to them referred, have approved Head 111 Executive Council, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Speaker, for the information of members that on Tuesday when we reassemble we will be doing the concurrence debate on Government Services.

MR. ROBERTS: Just one question. Monday is a holiday, the following Monday is a holiday as well, am I correct?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

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

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 18, 1982

QUESTION

Mr. NEARY (Leader of the Opposition) - To ask the Premier to lay upon the table of the House the following information:

A list of all the expenses incurred on a daily basis to provide for a private dining room on the first floor of the Confederation Building, this list to include:

- (a) salaries of employees;
- (b) costs of food;
- (c) costs of printing menus, wine lists, or other materials;
- (d) costs of cleaning of linen, dishes, and cutlery;
- (e) costs of renovations made in the fiscal years 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981 82.

ANSWER

- (a) refer to salary details tabled with the budget documents;
- (b) \$19,000;
- (c) no such menus or lists are in use;
- (d) cost for these items are included in (b) above;
- (e) none.

May 19, 1982

QUESTION

MR. HISCOCK (Eagle River) - To ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Number of trips taken by the Minister during the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981.

- (a) reason for trip;
- (b) places visited;
- (c) date of departure;
- (d) date of return;
- (e) cost of travel;
- (f) other costs;
- (g) cost of air travel;
- (h) airline used;
- (i) individuals not directly related to Government business who accompany the Minister at Government expense.

ANSWER

For the period requested only one such trip was taken. The Honourable W. W. Marshall represented the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs at a Communications Ministers meeting in Quebec City in 1981. Details are as follows:

Place - Québec City;
Period - Feb. 14, 1981;
Cost of travel - \$600.90;
Airfare - \$388.00;
Airline - Air Canada;
Class - Economy.

May 10, 1982

QUESTION

99. - MR. LUSH (Terra Nova) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Education to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The amount of land held by school boards in the Province under conditions of charitable or other trusts, listing:

- (a) the location of the properties;
- (b) the school boards that control them;
- (c) their square footage, metreage, acreage, or hectareage;
- (d) their current status, or use, and whether they are being used for the purpose set out in the Trust.

ANSWERED

The Department of Education does not have records on the titles to school board property in the Province. However, the Executive Secretary of the Roman Catholic Education Committee informs us that Roman Catholic School Boards in the Province do not own any land. Land occupied by boards is actually owned by the Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporations of the various dioceses. The Executive Secretary of the Integrated Education Committee advises that his office is unaware of any land held by school boards under conditions of charitable or other Trusts. He is persuing the matter further with Business Managers to determine if the information is correct. The Pentecostal Education Committee also advises that its board does not hold any such property.

QUESTION

96. - MR. DASH (Miramichi) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Education to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) the number of students registered in secondary schools in Newfoundland and Labrador, according to grade level, in the school years 1972-1973, 1973-1974, 1974-1975, 1975-1976, 1976-1977, 1977-1978, 1978-1979, 1979-1980, 1980-1981, 1981-1982;
- (2) the number of graduates from secondary school who have completed studies:
 - (a) for their senior level Matriculation;
 - (b) for a general Diploma alone.
- (3) The estimated number of students who failed to complete their secondary school studies, according to the years listed above.

ANSWER

- (1) The table below refers to question (1) regarding secondary school enrolment:

YEAR	ENROLMENT		
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11
1972-73	11,813	10,335	9,481
1973-74	11,944	9,936	9,250
1974-75	12,347	10,382	8,661
1975-76	12,362	10,802	9,139
1976-77	12,566	10,469	9,003
1977-78	12,565	10,741	9,377
1978-79	12,726	10,554	9,481
1979-80	12,379	11,247	9,218
1980-81	12,537	12,530	9,708
1981-82	11,713	10,487	10,128

- (2) Public examination results are not tabulated according to the classifications "senior level matriculation" and "general diploma", but rather in the categories "pass" and "honours pass". Successful candidates writing the November supplementary examinations are only graded as "pass" or "fail".

The following table provides this information for the years requested, except for 1981-82 as examinations are still in progress.

YEAR	CANDIDATES		JUNE RESULTS			NOVEMBER RESULTS	
	WRITING COMPLETE	WRITING INCOMPLETE	CANDIDATES ACHIEVING HONOURS	CANDIDATES ACHIEVING PASS	TOTAL ACHIEVING PASS	CANDIDATES WRITING	DIPLOMAS AWARDED
1980-81	8169	590	1692	4575	6267	1585	299

YEAR	JUNE RESULTS					NOVEMBER EXAMINATIONS	
	CANDIDATES WRITING COMPLETE	CANDIDATES WRITING INCOMPLETE	CANDIDATES ACHIEVING HONOURS	CANDIDATES ACHIEVING PASS	TOTAL ACHIEVING PASS	CANDIDATES WRITING	DIPLOMAS AWARDED
1979-80	7705	510	1377	4476	5853	1232	325
1978-79	7592	549	1197	4371	5568	1372	291
1977-78	6951	563	1100	4055	5155	896	273
1976-77	7218	609	1018	4251	5269	1266	253
1975-76	7296	802	1448	4121	5569	1008	316
1974-75	6840	1143	1070	3860	4930	1079	295
1973-74	7234	1069	1425	3917	5342	1019	286
1972-73	7059	1375	933	3654	4587		
1971-72	6800	1771	1037	3779	4816		
1970-71	6938	2457	521	3831	4352		

- (3) The Department of Education does not have an accurate estimation of the number of students who do not complete their secondary school studies.

The figures below indicate the enrolment in Grade XI for the years requested and the original Grade I enrolment for that year class ten years earlier. The difference between these figures may be considered as a "rough attrition rate" but data not take into consideration the following:

- the enrolment in special education programs
- the migration from this province
- enrolment in other educational programs
- drop-outs who subsequently returned to school to complete their studies
- students repeating various grades
- mortality over the ten year period

Year	GRADE I	SUBSEQUENT GRADE XI		Attrition
	Enrolment	Year	Enrolment	
1962-63	15,815	1972-73	9,481	6,334
1963-64	15,665	1973-74	9,250	6,415
1964-65	15,128	1974-75	8,661	6,467
1965-66	15,469	1975-76	9,139	6,330
1966-67	15,535	1976-77	9,003	6,532
1967-68	15,297	1977-78	9,377	5,920
1968-69	15,164	1978-79	9,491	5,673
1969-70	15,043	1979-80	9,218	5,825
1970-71	14,919	1980-81	9,708	5,211
1971-72	14,428	1981-82	10,128	4,300

These enrolment figures can be compared with the previous table to see the proportion of the Grade XI enrolment who subsequently wrote public examinations. Graduation by means other than public examinations, such as local school learning certificates and recommendations to Memorial University, however, are not taken into consideration here.